



Tuesday, 27 November 1951, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) (continued)	45
--	----

Chairman: Mrs. ANA FIGUEROA (Chile).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) (continued)

[Item 11]*

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY FRANCE, PAKISTAN AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that she would call upon the representatives of Yugoslavia, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Lebanon and Chile to reply to certain observations that had been made at the previous meeting, since those delegations had claimed the right of reply, in accordance with rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

2. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) wished to reply in particular to the allegation that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution wished to divert the attention of the Committee from social progress. The revised text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) and the Soviet proposals (A/C.3/L.160) were not mutually exclusive, since the methods of orienting United Nations efforts towards practical activities in the social field could in no way hamper the purposes which were specifically referred to in the USSR amendment. If, however, the USSR delegation had a genuine wish to solve social problems, especially in under-developed countries, it should either have co-operated with the sponsors of the joint draft resolution or submitted its proposal in a separate draft resolution or as a supplement to the joint draft. The fact that the proposals had been submitted as an amendment served to prove that they had not been presented in good faith.

3. The USSR proposals were an exact copy of those which the Soviet Union delegation had submitted to the Social Commission at its seventh session¹. At that time, the Yugoslav delegation had submitted supplementary amendments to the USSR proposals, in connexion with the protection of factory and agricultural

workers. The USSR delegation had then made every effort to obstruct the vote on the Yugoslav proposal and had subsequently voted against it, although the Yugoslav delegation had voted for all the items in the USSR draft. Moreover, the Social Commission had already agreed to include one of the five problems listed in the USSR amendment in its programme and to receive information from the specialized agencies through the Secretary-General on the other items. There was therefore no reason to bring them before a Main Committee of the General Assembly.

4. If the USSR delegation had introduced any additional items, the Yugoslav delegation would have voted for them; since, however, the only motive for such repetition could be propaganda, the Yugoslav delegation would vote against the USSR amendment as a whole.

5. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) stated that he would disregard the irrelevant political allegations that had been made by the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR at the previous meeting. He was surprised, however, that representatives to the General Assembly could display such ignorance as to assert that there were no maternity services in the United States of America and that 60 per cent of the wages of workers in the United Kingdom was absorbed by taxation.

6. Although ignorance might be pardonable, insincerity was not. The Ukrainian representative had alleged that the purpose of the United Kingdom amendments was to hamper social progress. Such remarks were especially uncalled for from the representative of a country that did nothing to further the United Nations activities which were carried on through the specialized agencies.

7. The representative of the USSR had alleged that the adoption of the United Kingdom amendments would result in various disasters, including the abolition of the Social Commission; that allegation seemed to be inconsistent with the position of the USSR, which had been advocating the abolition of the Commission for some time.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

¹ See document E/AC.7/L.88/Rev.1.

8. He was glad that the representative of the Soviet Union had raised the question of duplication, since the USSR amendment proposed the duplication of the work of the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Labour Organisation. The Soviet Union had every opportunity of becoming a member of the specialized agencies; if it did not wish to do so, it should cease to interfere with the work of those agencies, which most Members of the United Nations considered to be useful.
9. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) wished to remind the USSR representative that his own delegation had a well-known reputation for logic and consistency. He would abstain from voting on the USSR amendment on the grounds of that reputation.
10. It was illogical to introduce into the joint draft resolution an enumeration of specific problems which would, in fact, represent a list of exceptions. It was not the purpose of the resolution to state the priority of certain social problems. The Economic and Social Council had to concentrate on reviewing the social activities of the United Nations and on considering the report on the world social situation; the USSR proposals absolutely disregarded those basic purposes.
11. In conclusion, he pointed out that it was inconsistent for the USSR to propose action on additional social problems when Soviet Union representatives in the Fifth Committee were proposing the reduction of funds to be used for social activities.
12. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) wished to refute the Ukrainian representative's allegation that his own defence of the Economic and Social Council's work was due to the fact that he presided over the Council. Although he had himself criticized many aspects of the Council's work, it was absolutely incorrect to assert that the Council had ignored its responsibilities in social matters.
13. He agreed with the Soviet Union delegation that the five points it had enumerated were vital; nevertheless, the Council considered the specialized agencies concerned to be perfectly competent to deal with those matters and gave those organizations annual directives for the improvement of their activities. The Social Commission had been established especially to deal with matters which were not covered by the specialized agencies.
14. Whereas the joint draft resolution proposed a definite plan of action, the USSR amendment merely reiterated the fact that five specific subjects had to be studied. Although the specialized agencies had not fully achieved their purposes, they had gone further than the studies proposed by the Soviet Union; it was possible to point to certain concrete achievements by ILO, WHO and UNICEF in the very fields referred to in the USSR amendment.
15. With regard to the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.171) in which the phrase "both self-governing and non-self-governing" was included after the words "under-developed countries", he suggested that difficulties might be avoided if the phrase proposed by Syria were replaced by the more general expression "and regions".
16. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) was astonished at the Byelorussian representative's assertion that there were no maternity and child welfare services in her country. The Federal Government had a Children's Bureau, with the establishment of which she had been closely associated, and also a Women's Bureau, which dealt mainly with women's labour problems. Although the legislation of certain states in those matters lagged behind, the maternity and child welfare situation in the country as a whole was advanced, and the Federal Government made every effort to promote improvements where they were required.
17. She pointed out that all the political questions that had been raised would be answered in the First and *Ad Hoc* Committees.
18. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not wish to make any political statements and would await the replies made by the United States delegation in the political committees.
19. Certain representatives had asserted that the specific points referred to in the USSR amendment were all dealt with by the specialized agencies. Nevertheless, the joint draft resolution referred to the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission in particular, and the existence of the specialized agencies could not be held to exonerate the Council from its responsibilities in social matters.
20. He questioned the United Kingdom's representative's right to infer that the USSR ought to be a member of certain specialized agencies; that was a matter for the USSR to decide. His country had left ILO because its proposal for the reorganization of that specialized agency on a more democratic basis had been rejected.
21. The United Kingdom amendment concerning the duplication of work seemed to be directed against the USSR amendment, whereas the adoption of the latter would imply no criticism of the intentions of any other country. There was nothing in his country's amendment that could be unacceptable to anyone who genuinely wished to improve world social conditions. The Soviet Union had every intention of co-operating with other countries in the implementation of United Nations social activities, if its proposals were adopted.
22. The Lebanese representative's argument that the report on the world social situation had to be taken as a basis for work in that field merely represented an excuse for hindering social progress. The USSR had submitted its proposals in the form of an amendment because the problems concerned were so urgent and because there was no guarantee of the subsequent adoption of measures in connexion with the five specific points.
23. In view of the fact that certain delegations might object to the preamble to his amendment, but might be in favour of certain concrete proposals in the first paragraph of the operative part, he proposed that the amendment should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

24. The CHAIRMAN announced that those delegations wishing to do so could explain their votes, in accordance with rule 127 of the rules of procedure.

25. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) said that his delegation would support the joint draft resolution submitted by France, Pakistan and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.162), the operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of which contained useful recommendations.

26. As regards the amendments suggested to the preamble of the joint draft resolution, Guatemala would support the joint Afghan and Lebanese amendment to paragraph 3 (A/C.3/L.172), which had already been incorporated in the revised text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1), and also the oral amendment proposed by Chile. Guatemala would likewise support the Syrian amendment to paragraph 3 of the preamble (A/C.3/L.171), calling for addition of the words "both self-governing and non-self-governing" after "under-developed countries", but would reject the Syrian amendment to the first paragraph of the preamble, suggesting re-insertion of the words and its commissions" after "Economic and Social Council", since the Economic and Social Council in any case issued directives to those commissions.

27. As regards the operative part of the joint draft resolution, the joint Afghan and Lebanese amendments (A/C.3/L.172) were already incorporated in the revised text. Guatemala would support the proposal made in the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.166/Rev.1) to insert the words "together with the pertinent activities of the specialized agencies" after the words "United Nations"; the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.169) suggesting the addition of the words "and the Non-Self-Governing Territories" at the end of paragraph 1 of the operative part, and the Chilean oral proposal to add the words "and regions" after "under-developed countries" at the end of the third paragraph of the preamble.

28. Guatemala could, however, not agree to the amendment put forward by the United States (A/C.3/L.167) replacing the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.163) to paragraph 1 of the operative part by the following text: "without duplication between the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies". He thought that phrase might lead to misunderstanding. The United Nations had, after all, set up specialized agencies for the purpose of performing certain specified duties.

29. The amendments put forward by the Soviet Union delegation (A/C.3/L.160) would likewise be rejected by Guatemala. The USSR amendment suggested that the third paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.154) should be replaced by a paragraph stating that the Economic and Social Council and its Social Commission had ignored certain important social problems. That was not the case, since in fact the work of the specialized agencies set up by the Council did include a study of the subjects listed in the Soviet Union amendment. Similarly, the second paragraph of the Soviet Union amendment suggested that the programme of work of the Council and its Social Commission for 1952-53 should include study of a number of subjects

which had in fact already been considered by the specialized agencies for a number of years. To take an example, the International Labour Organisation had been dealing with the problem of social insurance against sickness, old age, disablement, etc., for twenty years. The remaining problems mentioned were being studied by others of the specialized agencies, including WHO and UNESCO. The Guatemalan delegation would therefore reject the Soviet amendment as repetitious.

30. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that neither the text of the joint draft resolution nor the arguments advanced during the general debate had altered his feeling that the whole subject was far too vaguely dealt with and that it would be best for the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies to shoulder their own responsibilities, as indeed they had done in the past. The General Assembly could do no good by interfering; it might in fact impede the Council's work. The President of the Council had himself given the specialized agencies due credit for initiating important programmes in the social field. UNESCO, for example, had made rapid strides in promoting basic education; thus, there was no need for the Third Committee to intervene.

31. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution and all amendments thereto.

32. Mr. REYES (Philippines) took the opportunity to explain his delegation's vote, as he had been attending another committee when the list of speakers was closed. He would support the joint draft resolution and any constructive amendments thereto which would ensure that the Economic and Social Council's work re-orientated on the broadest possible basis consistent with the United Nations Charter. The need for new and greater efforts in the social field was urgent, because, as the Secretary-General had repeatedly stated in his annual reports, the gap between the social and economic levels of the under-developed and the advanced countries imperilled international peace and security. It was to be hoped that the report on the world social situation and the practical programmes developed therefrom would match in their boldness and scope the political plans for collective security advanced in General Assembly resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for peace".

33. Mr. ICHASO (Cuba) said that the USSR amendments were entirely new proposals. The proposed first paragraph of the preamble contained a plain misstatement in its depreciation of the Economic and Social Council's work. The remainder of the proposals contained nothing new. To say that the Council was not carrying out programmes at least as good as, if not better than, those proposed in the USSR amendment was absurd.

34. As the USSR amendments were simply designed as political propaganda, he would vote against them and for the joint draft resolution and all amendments likely to improve it.

35. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) would support the revised joint draft resolution, in which his own

amendment (A/C.3/L.165) had been incorporated; his support would be whole-hearted if the Syrian (A/C.3/L.171) and Saudi Arabian (A/C.3/L.169) amendments referring to the Non-Self-Governing Territories were adopted.

36. If they were rejected, he would support the Chilean oral amendment on the understanding that it would be interpreted as the Chilean representative had explained.

37. When the various parts of the USSR amendment were voted on separately, he would vote against the proposed paragraph of the preamble, in favour of the proposed first and second paragraphs of the operative part. He would abstain on the remainder and he would abstain on the amendment as a whole. He would abstain from voting on the amendment as a whole because he supported the principles behind it but felt that the incorporation of the Afghan (A/C.3/L.165) and Lebanese (A/C.3/L.164) amendments into the revised joint draft resolution had already covered many of the points raised, because the matters enumerated in the proposed first paragraph of the operative part had been directly dealt with by the appropriate specialized agencies for many years and because such an enumeration was not only outside the scope of the draft resolution but also could not fail to be incomplete.

38. He would not vote for the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.173). He wished to make it clear, however, that his abstention did not imply that a reference to the specialized agencies' work was unnecessary, but only that nothing should be done to interfere with that work. He would not vote against that amendment because, as a member of most of the specialized agencies, his Government would never oppose any action that would redound to the credit of those agencies.

39. Mr. WAHLUND (Sweden) explained that his opposition to the USSR amendment did not imply that he did not think that the Economic and Social Council should cover as broad a field as possible in dealing with social welfare. The Third Committee should not, however, impose on the Council at that stage an over-ambitious programme.

40. Mrs. HARTMAN (Israel) would support the revised text of the joint draft resolution.

41. Most of the amendments would not materially alter its spirit. Despite the importance of its objectives, the amendment submitted by the USSR delegation was premature in view of the recommendations contained in it, since most of the items suggested fell within the scope of the work currently performed by the specialized agencies. The view that the Council's progress should be in conformity with its resources was adequately provided for in the initial draft of the resolution and did not require additional emphasis. Moreover, if the specialized agencies were working effectively, there would be no duplication of work between them and the Council.

42. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) said that the directives for the Economic and Social Council had

been clearly stated in the United Nations Charter, and the General Assembly should see that they were carried out. True, the joint draft resolution cited the text of the Charter, but out of context and vaguely; no appropriate practical action was recommended. The USSR amendment stated clearly the basic problems which the Council should tackle, whereas there was no reference to them in the joint draft resolution or in the other amendments submitted. Those representatives of the under-developed countries who believed that the joint draft resolution would answer their hopes were doomed to disappointment. The joint draft resolution was based on misconceptions which could not prevent the workers' living standards from being sacrificed to the needs of armaments programmes, whereas the USSR amendment would make for peace through the raising of social standards and the spread of education.

43. The joint draft resolution would be a step towards the final elimination of the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission; he would vote for the USSR amendment.

44. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) reserved her right to explain her vote at a later stage.

45. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that it had been agreed to take a separate vote on each paragraph of the operative part of the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.3/L.160) to the joint draft resolution, and he asked that the votes might be taken by rollcall. He understood that each of the sub-paragraphs of the first operative paragraph of the Soviet Union amendment would be voted on in conjunction with the introductory clause "proposes to include in the programme of work of the Council and . . . recommendations thereon".

46. The CHAIRMAN agreed. She announced that the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) would be taken as a basis for voting.

47. She put to the vote first the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.171) to the first paragraph of the preamble.

That amendment was rejected by 27 votes to 7 with 16 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN observed that no amendment had been submitted to the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1).

49. She put to the vote the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160) to the third paragraph of the preamble.

That amendment was rejected by 40 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (a) of the first paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Iran, Liberia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Against : Haiti, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Guatemala.

Abstaining : India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia.

Sub-paragraph (a) was rejected by 23 votes to 7, with 23 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the first paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia.

Against : Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark.

Abstaining : Luxembourg, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Colombia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Israel, Lebanon.

Present and not voting : Afghanistan.

Sub-paragraph (b) was rejected by 16 votes to 15, with 21 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (c) of the first paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Pakistan, Poland, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Against : Guatemala, Haiti, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France.

Abstaining : India, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Colombia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece.

Sub-paragraph (c) was rejected by 22 votes to 13, with 18 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (d) of the first paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Against : Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, Haiti, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden.

Abstaining : Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines.

Sub-paragraph (d) was rejected by 20 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (e) of the first paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Poland.

Against : Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru.

Abstaining : Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Israel, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia.

Sub-paragraph (e) was rejected by 23 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour: Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Iran, Liberia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Afghanistan, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China.

Abstaining: Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Chile.

The paragraph was rejected by 21 votes to 9, with 23 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN called for the vote on the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.171) to the third paragraph of the preamble.

57. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on the words "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" which, in his opinion, were controversial.

58. Mr. BARMADA (Syria) withdrew that phrase.

59. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked for a vote by rollcall.

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour: Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Thailand, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Chile, Denmark.

The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Chilean oral amendment to that paragraph thus fell.

61. She called for the vote on the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.163) to paragraph 1 of the operative part.

62. AZMI Bey (Egypt) asked for a vote by rollcall.

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour: Iran, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark.

Against: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

Abstaining: Mexico, Thailand, Argentina, China.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised United States amendment (A/C.3/L.166/Rev.1) to paragraph 1 of the operative part.

The amendment was adopted by 31 votes to 12, with 6 abstentions.

64. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile), Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) consequently withdrew their amendments to that paragraph (A/C.3/L.173, A/C.3/L.167, A/C.3/L.170 and A/C.3/L.163, second point).

65. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) withdrew his oral amendment.

66. At the request of Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) amended the second point of his amendment (A/C.3/L.169) to that paragraph to read "and both the self-governing and Non-Self-Governing Territories".

67. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised text of the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.169, point 2) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1).

The amendment was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

68. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part (A/C.3/L.160, point 3).

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.171, point 3) to paragraph 2 of the operative part.

The amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions.

70. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) observed that his delegation had amended its own amendment (A/C.3/L.163, point 3) to that paragraph, replacing the words "as soon as practicable" by the words "if possible".

71. The CHAIRMAN put the revised United Kingdom amendment to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 22 votes to 7, with 19 abstentions.

72. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the vote should be taken separately on the preamble and on the operative part, both as amended.

The preamble, as amended, was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The operative part, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended, was approved by 43 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.