



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 62:	
International Year for Human Rights (<i>con-</i> <i>tinued</i>):	
(a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary- General;	
(b) International Conference on Human Rights Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/ L.1637/Rev.2 (<i>continued</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 62

International Year for Human Rights (*continued*) (A/
7194, A/7195, A/7195/Add.1 and Add.3-9, A/
CONF.32/41, A/L.1637/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1638/Rev.1
and Rev.1/Add.1, A/C.3/L.1639, A/C.3/L.1640/
Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1641/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1642/Rev.2,
A/C.3/L.1651, A/C.3/L.1654):

- (a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion
with the International Year for Human Rights:
report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) International Conference on Human Rights

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.3/
L.1637/REV.2 (*continued*)

1. Mrs. CONDE (Guinea) said that her delegation, as Chairman of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and as a sponsor of the draft resolution under discussion (A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2), regretted that the situation in southern Africa continued to deteriorate. Despite the resolutions of the United Nations, the South African régime was systematically pursuing its in-human policy of apartheid. That being so, the Teheran Conference should serve to stimulate the efforts of all those men of goodwill who had set themselves the task of ensuring respect for human rights throughout the world. No one doubted that the peoples of southern Africa would recover their freedom, however savage the oppression and however great the obstacles placed in their path. It was incumbent upon those who believed in the legitimacy of their struggle to do everything possible to bring about rapid change, even by violent means, since peaceful action had not produced any result. Mankind saw no likelihood that certain Powers, which professed the ideals of freedom and racial equality, would take positive measures against the fascist Pretoria régime. The longer a solution to the problem was delayed, the more tragic would be its consequences, and the responsibility for that would

rest with the major countries trading with South Africa. Her delegation would remind those Powers for which realism meant the safeguarding of their interests that, despite their unholy alliance, imperialism and colonialism would never be able to recover from the defeats that the peoples fighting for their freedom had inflicted on them.

2. She was sure that the draft resolution would be adopted by a large majority.

3. Mrs. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo (Brazzaville)) commended the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2) and said that she would vote in favour of it. The International Year for Human Rights could not be properly celebrated when in South Africa, Namibia and the Territories under Portuguese domination grave violations of human rights were still being committed and innocent peoples continued to suffer because of their racist oppressors. She therefore appealed to all delegations to give their unanimous support to the draft resolution, and she hoped that all men of goodwill who were attached to peace and justice would spare no effort to ensure that the International Year could truly be celebrated in that part of Africa.

4. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) deplored the fact that twenty years after the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, despite the many United Nations resolutions condemning South Africa and Portugal for their policies of apartheid and colonialism, the situation remained completely unchanged. The countries of Africa, deeply dismayed at that fact, were struggling with all the means at their disposal to eradicate those evils, but they nevertheless believed that effective action at the international level was essential. Unfortunately, some great Powers not only refused to take effective measure against South Africa, but continued to trade with it and thus to strengthen it. As a result, the world was witnessing the perpetuation, in the middle of the twentieth century, of the evil doctrine of apartheid, which caused shame and degradation to millions of human beings. One could not but wonder why, in an age in which mankind had affirmed its faith in the Charter of the United Nations and in the dignity and worth of the human person, a system like apartheid still existed. One certainty was that some great Powers had not entirely abandoned their policy of exploitation and, in defence of their material interests, were refusing to take effective measures to remedy the situation.

5. During the International Year for Human Rights, all men must join forces to free the peoples concerned from the yoke of slavery and exploitation. His delegation therefore appealed to those Powers to yield to that humanitarian movement. That, in brief, was

what the draft resolution co-sponsored by his delegation was asking for.

6. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) stated that her delegation, despite its sympathy with the spirit which had prompted the draft resolution, would be unable to support it. Although it shared the view of the sponsors that the policy of apartheid and the subjection of a people by a governing power were violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, it did not agree with the language that had been used and it objected to some of the legal and political implications of the draft resolution.

7. In the first place, the United Kingdom condemned the policy of racial discrimination of the illegal minority régime in Rhodesia, and it had taken the lead in the Security Council in appealing to all countries to follow its example in breaking off relations with the illegal régime. Consequently, it could not accept, in operative paragraph 2, the language "refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom ... to take effective measures" to suppress the illegal régime. Her Government had indeed refused to use force—if that was what was meant by "effective measures"—and it was her belief that the African countries would at some future stage realize that that had been in their best interests. It was very easy to start a war, but extremely difficult to stop it. With the authority of the Security Council, all Member States, including the United Kingdom, had embarked on a policy of mandatory sanctions. It might well be a long haul before the desired objective was achieved, but she believed that in the meantime Governments should do their utmost to make the sanctions effective.

8. The draft resolution referred in a number of places to "colonialism". With regard to those few remaining Territories where there was a British Governor, but where the day-to-day government was in varying degrees carried on by representatives of the people themselves, her delegation utterly rejected the thought, expressed in the draft resolution, that that form of colonialism was a subjection of peoples which required them to fight for their freedom. Her delegation also had serious doubts about the legal implications of operative paragraph 5, since it did not agree that freedom fighters in southern Africa could be regarded as prisoners of war in the precise terms of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. With respect to paragraph 7, her Government had already severed relations with the illegal régime in Rhodesia, but to sever relations with a legal Government was a most serious step which any Government must weight carefully. Her Government was not prepared to take any such step in relation to any country as the result of a debate on the International Year for Human Rights. It was its policy to remain in relations with those Governments and to use its influence—as requested in other resolutions of the United Nations—to remind them of their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

9. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (The Legal Counsel) replied to the question put by the representative of Peru, who

kind provided for in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution was within the competence of the Third Committee. Article 10 of the United Nations Charter stated that the General Assembly might discuss any question or any matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, might make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council. Article 12 provided that, while the Security Council was exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the Charter, the General Assembly should not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requested. The matters relating to South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese rule were on the agenda of the Security Council and, in principle, the General Assembly could not make any recommendations. However, the Assembly had interpreted the words "is exercising" as meaning "is exercising at this moment"; consequently, it had made recommendations on other matters which the Security Council was also considering. Thus, in accordance with that practice followed by the General Assembly, there were no obstacles to the recommending of measures of the kind provided for in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2.

10. Miss CHILILA (Zambia) deplored the fact that millions of persons were still suffering the ignominy, terror and brutality involved in South Africa's policy of apartheid and racial discrimination. Neither repeated condemnation by the United Nations nor world public opinion had had any effect on the South African Government. The racist régime in South Africa refused to comply with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stated that all human beings were born free and equal in dignity and rights and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. It should be remembered that the question of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa had been under consideration in the United Nations ever since the first session of the General Assembly; yet the South African Government, despite the many resolutions threatening it with diplomatic or economic sanctions, had maintained its racial policies and displayed utter contempt for its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

11. The South African régime constituted a great obstacle to the efforts of nations to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination throughout the world and ensure respect for the dignity of the human person. In the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, it was stated that discrimination between human beings on the ground of race, colour or ethnic origin was an offence to human dignity, a denial of the principles of the Charter, a violation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations. The Government of the Republic of South Africa was ignoring that eloquent and peremptory Declaration, and it refused to recognize the right of every person to live in peace and dignity.

12. His delegation also sincerely shared the senti-

to the illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia. As the administering Power was doing nothing to suppress the rebellion in that Territory, it deserved the condemnation expressed in the draft resolution.

13. Portugal, too, must be severally condemned for its repression and torture of the indigenous African population of its so-called overseas provinces. His delegation hoped, for all those reasons, that the draft resolution would receive the maximum support.

14. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) referring to the Portuguese representative's remark that the Committee was being unfair to his country in comparing his Government's policies with the system of apartheid and racial discrimination of South Africa, pointed out that the General Assembly, in its resolution 2270 (XXII), strongly condemned the colonial war being waged by the Government of Portugal against the peaceful peoples of the Territories under its domination, and also the policy of that Government, which violated the economic and political rights of the indigenous population. As the policies of Portugal in the Territories under its domination violated the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Third Committee had the duty to examine the situation in those Territories. He requested a roll-call vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

15. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her country's stand on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa was well known. Her Government was supporting the struggle against that régime because it was openly violating the human rights of the South African people. Her Government was also supporting that struggle because a minority was keeping itself in power in South Africa, by force, thus violating all the norms recognized in a free society governed by law and, in turn, preventing the majority from fully enjoying its fundamental and inalienable rights. Costa Rica had accordingly decided to sever all relations with South Africa as long as the Government of that country persisted in carrying out those policies.

16. As her delegation had always maintained that violations of human rights must be condemned wherever they occurred, it found it difficult to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2. In the first place, it had reservations concerning operative paragraph 2, in which it was stated that the Government of the United Kingdom had refused to take effective measures to suppress the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Her delegation was unable to support that affirmation. With regard to operative paragraph 7, it could not commit the stand to be taken by its Government, as any such stand would require the approval of the legislature. Costa Rica had severed relations with South Africa but could not bind itself to do the same regarding Portugal even though it did not agree with that country's colonial policies. To sever relations with Portugal would be tantamount to condemning it for policies which, in one form or another, were being practised by various Members of the United Nations. Her country would, for all those reasons, abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. de GUZMAN (Colombia) explained that his disagreement with some delegations regarding the time-limit on their statements did not in any way mean that he was opposed to those delegations. The Committee was witness to the fact that he had not made any statements that exceeded three minutes and that he had not any time had the intention of vexing any of its members. He reiterated his respect for the rules of procedure and the Committee's decisions; he desired only that the rules of the game should be applied impartially and equitably in all cases. His delegation disapproved of a question as important as that of human rights being discussed with a haste which did not honour to a spirit of reflection, moderation and equity.

18. Referring to the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2), he said that his country repudiated every form of racism and colonialism. His delegation therefore categorically rejected the baseless and unfair allegation that it was guilty of colonialism. It must not, however, be forgotten that a country was entitled, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to determine the direction, the degree and the extent of its diplomatic relations. He therefore reaffirmed the right of his Government to establish or sever such relations as it saw fit. In the present year, for example, Colombia had re-established relations with the Soviet Union and the majority of the socialist countries. The international community, acting through the General Assembly, could not recommend that Member States should give up that sovereign right. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on operative paragraph 2 and would request a separate vote by roll-call on operative paragraph 7.

19. Mr. ČALOVSKY (Yugoslavia), noting that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, said that, at the Teheran Conference, the lawfulness of the struggle against apartheid and colonialism had been recognized, and an earnest plea had been made for the use of every possible means to eliminate such evils. The denial of human rights which was taking place in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the colonial Territories of Portugal in Africa constituted not only a serious obstacle to world social development but also a grave threat to international peace and security. If a satisfactory solution was not soon found, the nations would find themselves divided into hostile groups based on racial motives. After stating that the main reason for the lack of progress in the struggle against apartheid was to be sought in a lack of co-operation from the States whose influence could have been decisive in that regard, he recalled the statement made at Teheran by the Secretary-General (see A/CONF.32/41, annex II) in which the Secretary-General had said that the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination must become a reality at the present time and that their implementation must not be left to future generations.

20. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) said that, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, he found it regrettable that, after eight years since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, there were still forty-six territories under colonial rule and some 20 million Africans who were subjected to the most conspicuous kind of mass violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The collective determination of the United Nations to put an end to colonialism in southern Africa had met a solid wall of defiance which could be broken only if the former colonial Powers put aside their economic interests and unreservedly lent their support to the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Most of the Western Powers failed to recognize the evils of colonialism and its ramifications, which lay not so much in the subjugation of one people by another as in economic exploitation of the worst kind and in a cultural misrepresentation and a distortion of history the ramifications of which would be felt for a long time to come.

21. The international community was well aware of the barbaric subjugation of the indigenous peoples and the freedom fighters by Portugal, South Africa and the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia in order to suppress the legitimate aspirations of those peoples and to crush the patriotic liberation movements in southern Africa and in colonial Territories. It was only on 3 December of the current year that the news had been received of the action taken by the High Court of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia in dismissing appeals against the death sentences imposed on thirty-two freedom fighters in August 1968, although legislation abolishing the mandatory death sentence had been introduced since that time. On 6 December 1968, the Prime Minister of India had expressed her grave concern over that situation.

22. A similar struggle was being fought by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to regain their national dignity and their national independence. It was therefore imperative to safeguard the interests of the freedom fighters by extending all possible political, moral and material assistance to the peoples who were fighting against all forms of racial discrimination and colonialism.

23. He concluded with an appeal to the Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

24. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, which was in keeping with the spirit and letter of the resolutions adopted at the Teheran Conference that were mentioned in the text. He could not understand, however, why the Committee could not at the present session designate the year which was to be the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, in accordance with resolution XXIV, which had also been adopted at the Teheran Conference. In that connexion, he thought it regrettable that the United Nations Secretariat had not sent Governments the questionnaire asking for their comments on a programme of measures for the observance of that international year until 21 October 1968, thus wasting valuable time for making the necessary preparations. Furthermore, there was no reason why the International Year should not be observed in conjunction with the commemoration of any other objectives that the United Nations

25. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that he was sorry to note that the chief countries that supported South Africa had resorted to devious tactics in order to circumvent the objectives sought in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, of which his delegation was a sponsor and which, in keeping with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, was designed to put an end to an inhuman situation that constituted a threat to international peace and security. He agreed that the draft resolution was prompted by political considerations, but it should be borne in mind that the colonial phenomenon was the result of an imperialist policy, and he would not allow himself to be moved by the crocodile tears of the Powers which for the past 200 years had been exploiting the countries of the Third World in the most iniquitous way. He hoped that the countries which supported South Africa would change their opinion when the national liberation movements reached their height.

26. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2 had replaced the word "Africa" in the second preambular paragraph by the words "southern Africa and in colonial Territories".

27. Mrs. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the African countries knew perfectly well what measures should be adopted in order to bring about the elimination of colonialism and apartheid and they were also aware that the legalist objections put forward by certain countries to prevent the effective application of those measures were based on purely selfish and material considerations. The developed countries continued to trade with South Africa and, through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, they were giving Portugal military assistance which was used for the repression of the national liberation movements of the people of Angola, Mozambique and the other Portuguese territories. The situation of those people was intolerable in every way. She hoped that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, of which her delegation was a sponsor, would be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

28. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, which it considered extremely moderate in view of the gravity of the acts to which it referred. It felt, however, that operative paragraph 9 lacked the necessary precision and it therefore proposed that all the words following the word "prepare" should be replaced by the words "a programme for the observance in 1969 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination".

29. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that his delegation had always been opposed to racism and the policy of apartheid, wheresoever it was manifested. In that sense it fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2. It disagreed, however, with the idea expressed in operative paragraph 7, for it did not think that the States which were violating the United Nations Charter should be isolated from the international community, away from any possible

30. Mr. NKONGO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that he whole-heartedly supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, since it was impossible, from every point of view, to admit that there were any extenuating circumstances in connexion with neo-colonialism and apartheid. They were inhuman practices, contrary to the United Nations Charter, which should be especially condemned in the present International Year for Human Rights. He deplored the attitude of certain Western countries which were providing Portugal with armaments that were used to suppress the liberation movements of the Portuguese colonial territories, and denounced the policy pursued by the Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis.
31. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), referring to the Byelorussian amendment, recalled that at the Teheran Conference it had been proposed that the year 1969 should be designated as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination; after consultations, however, it had been agreed that such action would be premature, and the relevant resolution had accordingly been couched in flexible terms. His delegation would therefore vote against the Byelorussian amendment.
32. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2 had already discussed the question raised by the Byelorussian representative and had come to the conclusion that a hasty decision would not contribute in any way to the success of the observance of the international year in question. Bearing in mind the fact that the year 1970 would be dedicated to the eradication of illiteracy, he suggested that the year 1971 should be the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.
33. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) expressed her support for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2 but said that she was opposed to the Byelorussian amendment, not because she denied the importance of the measures to be adopted to combat racism and racial discrimination, but precisely because she attached importance to them and therefore was opposed to the adoption of a hasty decision in a matter that should be the object of the most careful preparation.
34. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) pointed out that the year 1969 was close at hand and that it would be materially impossible for the Secretariat to draw up a suitable programme of measures for the observance of an International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Secretariat should be allowed the greatest latitude in drawing up such a programme. He therefore appealed to the Byelorussian representative not to press his amendment but to agree instead that the Rapporteur should state in the report that the year 1971 had been suggested as the occasion for the observance of the international year.
35. Mrs. HLAAS (Jordan) asked the Byelorussian delegation to modify its amendment in accordance with the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, namely by replacing "1969" by "1971", in view of the concern shown by the sponsors that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be given the most careful preparation.
36. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that there was every justification for the Byelorussian amendment, which would result in a speedy decision regarding the time for the observance of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Unless that year was definitely established in the draft resolution under study (A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2), the same situation would be repeated at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, it would be objected that there was not enough time to allow of the adoption of a final decision, and the specialized agencies would adopt their respective programmes without the international year becoming anything more than a good intention.
37. At the Teheran Conference it had been proposed in all seriousness that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be observed in 1969 or 1970. In view of the fact that it had been arranged that the year 1970 should be dedicated to the eradication of illiteracy, while nothing had been decided for the year 1969, there would not appear to be any alternative. In any case, the question was of the greatest urgency and it was imperative that the text under study should name the year—whether it was to be 1969, 1970 or, at the latest, 1971—which should be proclaimed International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Only thus would it be possible to make a start on the preparations for the corresponding programme.
38. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) said that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2 did not present any difficulties for his delegation but that, in the light of the USSR representative's remarks, his delegation thought that the text should designate 1969 or 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, so that the same situation might not arise again at the twenty-fourth session. He asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to accept the amendment in question.
39. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that, since the Byelorussian delegation had not responded to his appeal, he proposed, as a conciliatory formula, that operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2) should be amended to read:
- "Further requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with Member States, to prepare a programme for the celebration in 1971 of an International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination".
- In that version, which would be acceptable to the sponsors, the indefinite article "an" would be retained before the words "International Year", to show that the General Assembly had not yet adopted a decision with regard to the observance of that year.
40. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he accepted the compromise solution proposed by the representative of Upper Volta and would therefore not press his delegation's amendment to a vote.
41. Mr. PAOLINI (France) requested the representative of the Secretary-General to inform the Committee of the financial implications, if any, of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution under

consideration (A/C.3/L.1647/Rev.2). He saw no reason why that paragraph should result in additional expense, since the Secretariat would be able to prepare the programme for the International Year without any outside help.

42. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), replying to the French representative's request, said that no statement of the financial implications of paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2 had been submitted because it was not considered that special resources would have to be allocated to carry its provisions into effect. He pointed out in that connexion that the draft resolution under consideration was in line with resolution XXIV of the Teheran Conference, which recommended that the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be celebrated in 1969 or the following year, and that the matter was referred to in the statement of financial implications of the resolutions of the International Conference on Human Rights, which provided for the possibility of engaging a limited number of specialists on questions of racial discrimination.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.2, with the oral amendments submitted by the sponsors, as soon as requests for separate votes had been dealt with.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a separate vote was taken on the phrase "and deplores the refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, to take effective measures to suppress this illegal régime and to ensure human rights and fundamental freedoms to the people of Zimbabwe", in operative paragraph 2.

At the request of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Mexico, Panama,

The phrase was retained by 62 votes to 19, with 18 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 as a whole was adopted by 65 votes to 10, with 21 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Peru, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 3.

At the request of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, Brazil.

Abstaining: France, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mexico, Panama, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 84 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Colombia, a separate vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 7.

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

In favour: Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia.

Against: Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great