

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1077th
MEETING**

Thursday, 19 October 1961,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights</i> <i>(continued)</i>	
<i>Article 19 of the draft Covenant on Civil and</i> <i>Political Rights (continued)</i>	87

Chairman: Mr. Salvador P. LOPEZ (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 35

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annexes I-III, A/2907 and Add.1-2, A/2910 and Add.1-6, A/2929, A/4789 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.903, A/C.3/L.919-921, A/C.3/L.923/Rev.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.926 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.927 and Rev.1, A/C.3/L.929 and Add.1) (continued)

ARTICLE 19 OF THE DRAFT COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (E/2573, ANNEX I B) (continued)

1. Mr. DARAI (Iran) pointed out the similarity in substance and form which existed between article 19 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and articles 1^{1/} and 2^{2/} of the draft Covenant on Freedom of Information. That being the case, he felt that article 19 could not be studied without keeping in mind the provisions already adopted on the same subject, which reflected the general opinion of the Members of the United Nations.

2. After briefly recalling the arguments which he had put forward at the fifteenth session (1039th meeting) to justify the imposition of detailed restrictions on freedom of information for the purpose of preventing abuses, he stressed the importance of the article under discussion.

3. It was the duty of the Committee, moreover, to make every necessary effort to draft a text which would meet with the approval of States, by taking into account all the proposals and suggestions which had been made. As a matter of fact, that was a duty which had been assumed by all those who, by signing the Charter of the United Nations, had proclaimed their faith in the fundamental rights of man and the dignity of the individual. The purpose of the draft Covenants at present being prepared was to enshrine the principles which were the foundations of universal respect for the rights of man, and which should therefore be made as widely applicable as possible. But the Committee would

not achieve that goal if its members were divided amongst themselves, each trying to make his own point of view prevail. His delegation hoped therefore that all delegations would show a spirit of compromise, so that the article under discussion might command the unanimity which would give it the weight and the value which it deserved.

4. Article 19 should rest on the principle that just restrictions on freedom of information were necessary. That principle had been debated at length at the fifteenth session, and its cogency had been admitted. The various restrictions proposed at that time had thus been merged and crystallized in the first two articles of the draft Covenant on Freedom of Information. The Iranian delegation thought that article 19 should be drafted in the same spirit as those two articles, and was therefore ready to accept any proposal along those lines, regardless of the form the proposed restrictions might be given. It would also support the amendment proposed by India and Indonesia (A/C.3/L.923/Rev.2), and both parts of the seven-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.929 and Add.1).

5. Mr. SITA (Congo, Leopoldville) pointed out that, if the freedoms proclaimed in article 19 were to be guaranteed to the citizens of all countries, they must also be protected by institutions having obligations towards the community.

6. On the other hand, the new States still had to educate their peoples; he was glad, therefore, that certain amendments, particularly those dealing with censorship, had been withdrawn. Broadly speaking, censorship should be abolished, it was true; but it could be useful in certain cases—for example in connexion with public entertainments.

7. He appreciated the action of the delegations of the eleven Latin American countries in withdrawing their amendment (A/C.3/L.926 and Add.1) to article 19. His delegation could have voted for that amendment—with the necessary changes—but felt that it was not indispensable.

8. He regretted that the Indian and Indonesian delegations had not followed that example, but on the contrary had proposed a new amendment which was less complete than the text submitted by the Latin American countries and which he could not support.

9. His delegation wondered whether the sponsors of that text and the Soviet delegation could not submit their respective amendments when the Committee took up article 26 of the draft Covenant. In its present form, article 19 seemed to him clear, precise and complete, since it implicitly expressed the ideas contained in the amendments. Since his delegation had no objection to those ideas, it would vote against the amendments, rather than abstain, purely out of its desire to avoid any unnecessary overloading of article 19 and in the hope that the proposed amendments

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 35, document A/4341, annex.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 35, document A/4636, annex.

would be examined when article 26 came up for discussion.

10. Miss GRIÑAN (Cuba) said that the original text of article 19, good though it was, could be improved by the incorporation of amendments designed to ensure that the right of freedom of information was exercised as honestly as possible. During the fifteenth session (1031st meeting), her delegation had submitted a proposal in that sense while article 2 of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information was under consideration, and had then withdrawn it after the adoption of the formula appearing in the present text, which in particular included the phrase "systematic dissemination of false reports harmful to friendly relations among nations". She considered it essential that that form of abuse of freedom of information should be expressly forbidden, and accordingly supported the Indian delegation, which had tried to achieve that objective in its amendment (A/C.3/L.919), and the USSR delegation, which was also aiming at that goal (A/C.3/L.921).

11. The second part of the Brazilian amendment (A/C.3/L.920) was less satisfactory than those two proposals, since it did not mention propaganda which, without being directly warlike, was harmful to good relations between States.

12. The first part of the Brazilian amendment, on the other hand, would have been supported by the Cuban delegation, which felt that the prohibition of anonymity was closely linked with the "prevention of the dissemination of slanderous rumours" referred to in the USSR amendment.

13. It was certainly desirable, as proposed by the Indonesian delegation (A/C.3/L.923), that the principle of peaceful coexistence amongst nations should be protected. But good-neighbourly relations, while they might be ideal so far as concerned States, were not sufficient between races, since the latter had not only to coexist but to live together in genuine community.

14. The Cuban delegation was therefore not satisfied with the Indonesian revised amendment (A/C.3/L.923/Rev.1) and regretted also that the amendment sponsored jointly by India and Indonesia failed to introduce into article 19 any restriction on information conducive to racial discrimination. Although it was quite unnecessary in a country like Cuba, the Cuban delegation felt strongly that such a clause should be inserted in article 19, for racial discrimination, "apartheid", existed in too many countries for her delegation not to be concerned about it. The USSR amendment was aimed at racial discrimination; that was another reason why she would support it. On the other hand, the amendment submitted by the eleven Latin American countries—though racial discrimination was often to be found in those countries—contained no reference to the subject. Because of that, and also because it failed to define the position of the Latin American countries regarding war propaganda, the Cuban delegation was glad that the amendment had been withdrawn by its sponsors.

15. For the people and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, genuine freedom of expression was that which transcended and protected the proclamation of the truth. Freedom of expression limited not by censorship but by subordination and the power of money certainly did not deserve that name. Cuba had recently set about defending itself against the many attacks on its revolution, directed both from abroad and from

its own territory, by a Press in the service of the monopolies. In that connexion, she read a document which had been published jointly by the Committee on Freedom of the Press of the National College of Journalists, the Provincial College of Journalists of Havana, the National Federation of Graphic Arts and the National College of Speakers. That document dealt with the notices and warnings to be included at the end of any dispatches, reports, articles and commentaries transmitted through the Press, radio and television on Cuban territory which were prejudicial to Cuba's interests in any sphere.

16. Certain eminently anti-Cuban and habitually discriminatory editors of wealthy newspapers, proclaiming themselves champions of freedom of information and therefore victims of the revolution, had given up their businesses and settled in the United States. She mentioned the case of Jorge Zayas, former editor of the Cuban newspaper *Avance* and a follower of the dictator Batista. On his arrival in the United States, Mr. Zayas had at once been appointed Vice-President for the Caribbean area of the Inter-American Society for Freedom of Information, and had lost no time in writing defamatory articles about Cuba that had been published in two Miami newspapers—which, incidentally, had refused to print the evidence collected against Mr. Zayas by the Cuban Government.

17. Cuba was unable freely to make known its views or the true facts about itself and attached the highest importance to article 19. Of course, it would be difficult to formulate the article in such a way that it would protect the most honest news agencies, prevent the gagging of journalists who were too strongly on the side of the people's welfare and rule out the imprisonment of those who, in the exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression, followed left-wing ideals. That, nevertheless, was what the Committee must try to do. The struggle for freedom of information was not an end in itself but a means of attaining the truth and thus ensuring world peace and the welfare of the peoples.

18. Mr. GRISHCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had been prepared to vote in favour of the original text of article 19, since the freedoms set forth in that article were recognized in article 105 of the Constitution of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and since the latter contained various measures guaranteeing the effective enjoyment of those freedoms to all Ukrainian workers.

19. However, some parts of the text under discussion were not absolutely clear; paragraph 3, in particular, left something to be desired, for while the right of everyone to hold and express an opinion had to be affirmed, it was also necessary to bear in mind the possibilities of that right's being abused, and consequently to take the necessary steps to prevent private individuals or powerful monopolies from spreading slanderous rumours or carrying on propaganda for racial discrimination. Such steps would be consistent with the provisions of Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, to insert a condemnation of war propaganda in paragraph 3, would be giving effect to General Assembly resolution 110 (II).

20. If information was to be accurate and objective, information media must be made to accept certain responsibilities: when the activities of individuals were subject to the control of the police and the courts, how could complete freedom be permitted to information media which could cause infinitely more serious

harm to humanity? He would therefore vote in favour of any amendment aimed at preventing machinations calculated to impair friendly relations between peoples and races: such activities were condemned in article 103 of the Ukrainian Constitution and were punishable under articles 67 and 63 of the Ukrainian Penal Code.

21. He would support the text submitted by the delegations of India and Indonesia, which supplied one of the deficiencies in paragraph 3, and, if necessary, the USSR amendment, which, moreover, was more concrete and more precise.

22. Mrs. SIVOMEY (Togo) said that she was prepared to vote for the original text of article 19, which, while comprehensive, was clear and concise. She therefore thanked the delegations which had withdrawn their amendments for their spirit of co-operation; she was the more gratified at their attitude because the proposed changes had added nothing to the original text, but had tended rather to make it more cumbersome.

23. She pointed out in passing that in view of the connexions between articles 19 and 26, it would be advisable to consider article 26 immediately after article 19 and to make it article 20.

24. With respect to the first part of the seven-Power amendment, the idea of replacing the word "seek" by "gather" was not a very good one, for although the word "gather" might have the meaning of "seek", it could also mean "receive"; the word "seek" was preferable, therefore, since it meant to apply to sources of information of one's choice, or in other words, manifest the wish to obtain information.

25. She found the original text of article 19 satisfactory, and would vote against all the amendments still before the Committee.

26. Mrs. DELLA GHERARDESCA (Italy) said that she was in favour of the original text of article 19. She would like to be able to vote for the insertion in paragraph 3 of a clause relating to friendly relations among States. Unfortunately, she feared that a formula of that kind would necessarily be vague, and would be open to use to prohibit the dissemination of opinions which, although unfavourable to some country or other, should nevertheless be expressed. Italy had on occasion heard itself criticized in foreign radio broadcasts, and still did, but it was unwilling to prevent such hostile voices from making themselves heard, because it felt that all should be able to form an opinion freely. The inevitable price of censorship was impoverishment; she pointed out in that connexion that the cultural heritage of humanity would never have been enriched by certain great works of art if their publication had been forbidden. She asked all delegations to vote in favour of a progressive text.

27. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that the main consideration by which his delegation would be guided in voting was the fact that there was a basic difference between the juridical structure of the draft Covenants—which were general in character—and the various conventions on specific human rights—for example, the draft Convention on Freedom of Information. The detailed enumerations which were fully justified in the second type of instrument were out of place in a covenant and might even falsify its nature. For that reason, his delegation had not submitted an amendment on the subject of the licensing of radio broadcasting enterprises; nevertheless, it intended to make a

proposal along those lines when the relevant article of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information came up for discussion.

28. He was glad that some of the amendments submitted had been withdrawn; those which were still before the Committee did not improve the original text—indeed, the reverse was the case—and, with one exception, were not in line with his delegation's general views on the draft Covenant.

29. The amendment submitted by India and Indonesia would be more appropriate in a declaration than in a binding instrument. Moreover, it might give rise to varying interpretations, according to the form of government prevailing in the different countries—for example, according to whether the predominant part was played by governmental authority or by private initiative. The original text of article 19 was entirely satisfactory to his delegation.

30. Mr. COX (Peru), recalling the origins of the draft Covenants, said he wished particularly to stress the connexion between civil and political freedoms and economic, social and cultural rights affirmed in General Assembly resolution 421 (V). The suppression of civil and political freedoms inevitably led to the withdrawal of economic rights and weakened national sovereignty, which was based on popular sovereignty—the very foundation of the legal structure of democracy. Free determination could be based only on universal suffrage; hence, freedom of opinion and expression, which permitted the free circulation of ideas and the development of public opinion, was a fundamental freedom which must be clearly and definitively guaranteed. Such freedom prevented the abuse of authority and was an indispensable means of counteracting propaganda.

31. The articles of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information adopted so far laid down the precise rules and minimum restrictions which were common to the constitutional systems of all the States Members of the United Nations. The problem now was to proclaim the right to freedom of opinion and expression, not in a theoretical manner as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 217 (III)), but within the framework of the Covenants, legal instruments which must contribute to strengthening the new international order emanating from the United Nations. Peru believed in that new order and was determined to respect it, for today it was the only guarantee of progress and security.

32. Of course, inconsistencies and discrepancies between the text of article 19 and the adopted articles of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information must be avoided. That was why, when amendments reproducing the text of those articles had been submitted, eleven Latin American delegations had submitted an amendment relating to prior censorship. Since, however, the text of the article in its present form could not in any way be interpreted as authorizing prior censorship, the Latin American delegations, including Peru, had decided, after mature consideration, to withdraw their amendment.

33. His delegation would vote in favour of the existing text and would oppose any change in it. It was prepared, however, to consider the Brazilian amendment relating to propaganda in connexion with article 26, which was to become article 20.

34. Mr. BRONNIKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he would vote for article 19, which was a necessary part of the draft Covenant. His delegation had from the outset considered that the article must at once state the principle of freedom of opinion and expression and include safeguards against possible abuses; those were two complementary aspects of the same problem, aspects which it was the more difficult to dissociate in that freedom of information undeniably gave rise in practice to abuses.

35. Several delegations had expressed doubts concerning the feasibility of including a list of restrictions in paragraph 3; in fact, the restrictions set out in paragraph 3 and in certain of the amendments did not in any way impair genuine freedom of information, which should promote the peace and progress of mankind.

36. The real danger was elsewhere: it came from the fact that in some cases information media (press, radio, television) served the interests of an oligarchy. Consequently, he was prepared to support the Soviet amendment, which he found clear, precise and succinct, and which was aimed at preventing the most baneful abuses threatening friendly relations between States and undermining the cause of peace. Furthermore, that amendment was consistent with the legislation of the Byelorussian SSR.

37. His delegation was also prepared to vote for the amendment submitted by India and Indonesia and the other amendments still before the Committee.

38. Mrs. BERNARDINO CAPPÀ (Dominican Republic) said she was in favour of the original text of article 19, which was precise and raised no problems of interpretation. Consequently, she would abstain from voting on the amendments.

39. Mr. DOMINGUEZ CABALLERO (Panama) drew attention to the distinction which should be drawn between principle and practice. The Committee should base the rule it drew up not on what was but on what ought to be: it was true, for instance, that prior censorship existed, but it should not exist; and it was that principle which a draft Covenant should reflect. Freedom always carried responsibilities with it; without them, it became licence. Those who availed themselves of the freedoms of opinion and expression must understand their responsibilities and realize the possible consequences of their acts.

40. In conclusion, he said that in view of the existence of article 26, he was prepared to support the original text of article 19.

41. Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador) pointed out that paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 19 enunciated two aspects of the principle of freedom of thought, namely, freedom of opinion and freedom of expression. The third paragraph defined the restrictions to which those freedoms might be subjected. It was the third paragraph which was most debatable, for it was always difficult to achieve a proper balance between freedom and discipline. Freedom of thought had been won at a great cost in blood and sacrifice and must not be subjected to any impairment. While the system that had been evolved in the democratic countries was far from perfect, it had steadily improved. In that connexion he said that the principle of the separation of powers was scrupulously observed in the Latin American countries: offences involving the exercise of the right to hold opinions were brought before the courts and not before the executive power, and nobody

could be punished for exercising freedom of expression in the absence of a law defining his act as an offence.

42. His delegation did not oppose the formulation of a clause aimed at the prevention of war propaganda or racial discrimination. For its part, Ecuador had long ago solved the problem of the coexistence of races and had many times declared its opposition to wars of aggression. Because the eleven Latin American countries wanted America to be the continent of law, they had submitted the amendment which they had later withdrawn. By withdrawing that amendment, they had merely sought to smooth out certain differences of opinion, considering that the principle which they had wished to lay down might be deemed to be included in the original text of article 19.

43. In that connexion, he drew the attention of the countries which had recently won their independence to the fact that they should not replace colonial domination with domestic tyranny.

44. He would vote against all the amendments and in favour of the original text.

45. Mr. KASLIWAL (India), speaking on a point of order, stated that the sponsors of the seven-Power amendment, including his delegation, were prepared to withdraw the second part of their amendment if the Committee accepted the interpretation of the words "public order" which had previously been given by the representatives of Chile and the United Kingdom, and if their interpretation and the Committee's decision appeared in the summary record of the meeting.

46. The CHAIRMAN, while thanking the sponsors of the amendment for the spirit of compromise they had shown, said he feared that the procedure suggested by the Indian representative was somewhat equivocal. Although the members of the Committee might, on behalf of their delegations, indicate their interpretation of a text, it did not seem to be the province of the Committee itself to interpret the texts; that task belonged to the courts. Moreover, there was some risk that, if a specific pronouncement was made concerning one of the elements included in the concept of public order, it might lead to further interpretations of a possibly harmful kind.

47. Mr. GORBAL (United Arab Republic) wished to thank the Latin American delegations for the spirit of compromise they had demonstrated in withdrawing their amendment.

48. As for the seven-Power amendment, of which his country was a co-sponsor, he felt, after having heard the Chairman's comments, that the second part could be withdrawn unconditionally, without resort to the procedure suggested by the Indian representative. The interpretation of the words "public order", to which he had referred, had in fact been put forward by the Chilean representative (1076th meeting) and supported by the United Kingdom representative; it had not been contested by any member of the Committee and had once more received the support of the sponsors of the seven-Power amendment.

49. After a further exchange of views in which Mr. KASLIWAL (India), Lady TWEEDSMUIR (United Kingdom) and the CHAIRMAN took part, the CHAIRMAN said that all statements made in the Committee appeared in the official records on their authors' responsibility.

50. He then stated that the second part of the seven-Power amendment had been withdrawn.

51. At the suggestion of Mr. O hEIDEAIN (Ireland), the CHAIRMAN suggested that, in article 19, the words "ordre public" should be inserted in parenthesis after the words "public order", as had been done in articles 12 and 14 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 2 of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information, which the Committee had already adopted.

The suggestion was adopted.

52. Mr. BOUQUIN (France) said that he would be unable to vote in favour of the first part of the seven-Power amendment, to replace the word "rechercher" (seek) by the word "rassembler" (gather) in paragraph 2. In the first place, the amendment seemed to him inappropriate in substance, for it would confine journalists to a purely passive role. In the second place, it presented a drafting difficulty for French-speaking and probably for Spanish-speaking delegations. The expression "la liberté de rassembler, de recevoir et de répandre" (freedom to gather, receive and impart) was difficult to grasp in French. Furthermore, none of the sponsors of the amendment used French or Spanish and many delegations which did work in French, including those of Togo and Morocco, had opposed that amendment. He could have compromised on the use of the word "chercher" (look for), which appeared in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but could not accept the word "rassembler" (gather).

53. In reply to a question from Mr. GORBAL (United Arab Republic), the CHAIRMAN said that in the French text of article 1 of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information the word "gather" was translated "rassembler".

54. Mr. BOUQUIN (France) pointed out that, for the reasons he had just given, the French delegation had also voted against the amendment to article 1 of the draft Convention; moreover, that amendment had been adopted at the fourteenth session by a majority of only one vote (979th meeting).

55. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee to vote on the three paragraphs of article 19 and the amendments thereto.

Paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously.

At the request of the Ecuadorean representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on the first part of the seven-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.929 and Add.1) to paragraph 2.

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

In favour: Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Libya.

Against: Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay,

Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Thailand, Afghanistan, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Federation of Malaya, Jordan.

The first part of the seven-Power amendment was rejected by 59 votes to 25, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

At the request of the Ecuadorean representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on the Indian and Indonesian amendment (A/C.3/L.923/Rev.2) to paragraph 3.

Turkey, 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, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia.

Against: Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Togo.

Abstaining: Upper Volta, Burma, Cameroun, Chad, Dominican Republic, Jordan, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

The Indian and Indonesian amendment was rejected by 44 votes to 34, with 13 abstentions.

56. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela), speaking on a point of order, asked for a separate vote on the phrase "the dissemination of slanderous rumours" in the USSR amendment. His delegation favoured the inclusion of the first part of that amendment, not in article 19, but in article 26, which was to become article 20. It accordingly wished to abstain on that phrase, although it would vote against the last part of the amendment.

57. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee to vote on the first part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.921), up to and including the words "racial discrimination".

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 25, with 23 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN decided, in view of that result, not to put the second part of the amendment to the vote.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 71 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions.

Article 19 as a whole was adopted by 82 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.