United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE 306th

MEETING

Tuesday, 7 November 1950, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Draft first international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1384, A/C.3/534, A/C.3/535, E/1681 and A/C.3/L.76) (*continued*) 221

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

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

[Item 63]*

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

1. Mr. CASPARSSON (Sweden) explained that, in voting against the Yugoslav (A/C.3/L.92) and USSR (A/C.3/L.96) amendments at the previous meeting, the Swedish delegation in no way intended to raise any objection to the rights mentioned in those texts.

2. His delegation considered that the rights listed in the Yugoslav amendment in particular should normally exist in all democratic States. Swedish workers were entitled to organize themselves freely in trade unions and had extremely powerful workers' organizations; no legislative or other provisions deprived them of the right to strike. The Swedish delegation, therefore, did not wish to prevent the guarantee of those rights on an international plane.

3. It had nevertheless voted against the Yugoslav and the USSR amendments, because it considered that the question deserved more study than the Committee could bestow upon it, and that the rights referred to in those amendments might be dealt with subsequently in a special covenant.

4. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had to consider amendments to the joint draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Turkey and the United States (A/C.3/L.76).

5. The first text to be considered was the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) to paragraph 2 (*b*) of the basic text.

6. Mr. SAVUT (Turkey) recalled that when the Committee had considered the order in which amendments to paragraph 2 (*b*) of the joint draft resolution of Brazil, Turkey and the United States were to be considered, certain representatives had said that the text submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) was to replace the sub-paragraph concerned.

7. That sub-paragraph, however, constituted a part of the draft resolution which the Committee had decided to select as a basis of its work and which had been sponsored by the delegations of Brazil, the United States, and Turkey itself. Judging by the text that the United States delegation had submitted together with the delegations of Egypt and the United Kingdom, it might wish to redraft paragraph 2 (*b*), thereby doing away with the original text. The Turkish delegation, however, could not agree to such a procedure and considered that the text of paragraph 2 (*b*) of the basic text, in the form in which it appeared in document A/C.3/L.95, should be retained.

8. The texts submitted jointly by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States could not be considered as a revision or a modification of the original sub-paragraph (*b*). In the first place, it had not been submitted as an amendment to that text, but as an amendment to amendments submitted by the Yugoslav and USSR delegations. From the point of view of substance, the ideas expressed could not replace the principles enumerated in the original text, but only supplement them. Although in paragraph 2 (*b*), as it appeared in the basic text, the Commission on Human Rights was requested to take into consideration, in its work of revision of the draft covenant, the views expressed during the current session of the General Assembly and during the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council, the new text laid stress on the views which related to the inclusion of other rights in the covenant.

9. The Turkish delegation had no objection to such provisions, but doubted whether it was advisable to pre-

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

vent the Commission on Human Rights from taking into account the other views that had been expressed in the Third Committee.

10. Although the new text used the same terms as the original sub-paragraph (*b*), that was also the case with the amendment submitted by Lebanon and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.94), the purpose of which was to add a phrase at the end of sub-paragraph (*b*).

11. He therefore proposed formally that the Committee should regard the joint draft submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) as an addition to the original text of sub-paragraph (*b*); if the Committee adopted that proposal, it could examine and put to the vote the text of sub-paragraph (*b*) and then decide, if necessary, whether it should be supplemented by the joint draft submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States.

12. The wording of the text submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) was not altogether satisfactory. There might be some doubt concerning the exact intention of the sponsors when they suggested that the Commission on Human Rights should take into consideration the views expressed on articles 13 and 14, which related to certain special rights, "with a view to the addition, in this first covenant or in other covenants, of other rights". It also seemed incorrect to speak of the "addition" of other rights in "other covenants", in view of the fact that those "other covenants" did not as yet exist. The word "addition" should be replaced by the word "incorporation".

13. It was inadvisable to quote the views or suggestions submitted by any specific delegation in a draft resolution of the General Assembly.

14. He asked for a separate vote on the last phrase of paragraph 2 (*b*) of the joint draft resolution beginning with the words "relating to the rights . . .".

15. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked the Committee to postpone a vote on the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.99) and the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76) until it had considered the two parts of the preamble proposed by Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.92) for insertion after paragraph 2 (*a*), which had not yet been put to the vote.

16. The CHAIRMAN had no objection, in principle, to granting the Yugoslav representative's request; nevertheless, the Committee had decided at its 305th meeting to vote on the three amendments submitted to it, by Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.92), by the USSR (A/C.3/L.96) and jointly by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), before resuming its consideration of the paragraphs of the preamble.

17. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) pointed out that through force of habit the term "amendment" continued to be applied to a text which was in fact not an amendment. If the Committee recognized that the text submitted jointly by the Egyptian, United Kingdom and United States delegations was a document in itself, it would not be obliged to take a decision on that text before voting on the preamble of the Yugoslav amendment. Furthermore, by replacing the word "considering" in the first part of the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92) by the words "considers", as had been done at the 304th meeting, the nature of those two paragraphs had been changed, so that they had become part of the operative part of that amendment. While it had been logical to study them last when they had been part of the preamble, that was no longer the case when they had become part of the operative part of the text.

18. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with the decision he had taken at the 305th meeting, the text submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) would be considered as an amendment and not as a separate proposal.

19. He saw no objection, however, to voting on the question whether the Committee wished to vote on the two paragraphs of the preamble of the Yugoslav draft resolution before that text.

20. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) pointed out that the Chairman's ruling that the three texts should be considered as amendments, though correct according to the rules of procedure, might give rise to certain objections if examined from the point of view of substance. He therefore suggested that the various texts should be graded according to their main provisions.

21. The original sub-paragraph (*b*), as it appeared in the joint draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Turkey and the United States (A/C.3/L.76), recommended that the Commission on Human Rights should take into consideration all the views expressed during the discussion on the draft covenant by the General Assembly. The amendment submitted jointly by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) was more specific on the question of the rights which should be added to the covenant. It might therefore be considered as a logical continuation of the first paragraph of the preamble of the Yugoslav draft, according to which the list of rights in the first eighteen articles of the draft covenant did not contain certain of the most elementary rights. The second paragraph of the preamble of the Yugoslav amendment and the joint Lebanese and United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.94) referred only to the drafting of the text and not to its contents, and should therefore be considered after the above-mentioned texts.

22. The Lebanese representative suggested, therefore, that the Committee should examine the texts submitted in the following order: first, the joint draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Turkey and the United States; secondly, the first paragraph of the preamble to the Yugoslav amendment; thirdly, the text submitted jointly by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States; fourthly, the second part of the preamble to the Yugoslav draft; and fifthly, the joint amendment submitted by Lebanon and the United Kingdom.

23. It might be considered that such a procedure would be contrary to the decision just taken, but the rules of procedure laid down that it was possible for a decision to be overruled if the Committee decided by a two-thirds majority to do so.

24. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) thought that it would be more rational to follow the Chairman's ruling that the text submitted jointly by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States should be put to the vote first.

25. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) said that if the Egyptian and United States delegations agreed, he

was ready, if that would facilitate the Committee's work, to suggest that the joint text (A/C.3/L.99) should be amended in such a way as to make it an addition to the original text of sub-paragraph (*b*). Paragraph 2 (*b*) of the joint draft resolution would then read as follows:

"(*b*) To take into consideration in its work of revision of the draft covenant, the views expressed during the discussion of the draft covenant in this session of the General Assembly and in the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council, including those relating to articles 13 and 14 of the draft covenant, and, with a view to the addition, in this first covenant or in other covenants, of other rights, those relating to the rights set forth by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/C.3/L.96 and by Yugoslavia in document A/C.3/L.92."

26. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) and AZMI Bey (Egypt) accepted the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom representative.

27. Mr. CABADA (Peru) said he would prefer the Egyptian, United Kingdom and United States delegations to withdraw the suggested addition in favour of the original text of sub-paragraph (*b*).

28. AZMI Bey (Egypt) and Mr. KAYALI (Syria) thought that the new wording which had just been suggested by the United Kingdom and which had been accepted by Egypt and the United States, and which was an addition to the original text, was really an amendment and should therefore be put to the vote after the text of sub-paragraph (*b*).

29. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) explained that his delegation would have to abstain from voting on the original text of sub-paragraph (*b*) whether or not it was completed in the sense indicated by the United Kingdom representative. In either case, it was simply a question of transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights the views which had been expressed in the Third Committee.

30. That did not seem to be in accordance with the instructions received by the Committee, which had been asked to decide on the principles to be followed in the drawing up of the draft covenant. The views expressed in the Third Committee had simply been a reiteration of those expressed in the Commission on Human Rights and in the Economic and Social Council, and could therefore hardly serve as fresh directives to the Commission on Human Rights.

31. He deplored the tendency of certain delegations to discourage the efforts made to arrive at true decisions of principle. It had been stated that the Third Committee should not try to draft the text of the articles of the covenant, and the Pakistan delegation had been one of the first to approve that suggestion. But it had also been stated, and with that proposal the delegation of Pakistan did not agree, that it was impossible to give the Commission on Human Rights precise instructions. At the previous meeting, when the Third Committee might have hoped to adopt a positive recommendation by studying the contents of the Yugoslav amendment, that hope had been dashed by the decision to put to the vote separately the introduction to the operative part, namely the words "*Decides* that the following rights should be added to the list of the rights to be defined in the covenant".

32. The Lebanese representative had stated that by following that procedure the results of the vote would be the same as if the Third Committee had voted on the text as a whole, for if the majority of the members wished sub-paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) to be adopted, they would also vote for the introduction to the operative part, and if that part of the text was adopted, the remainder of the text would naturally be adopted too. That reasoning seemed to him to be fallacious. Assuming that ten delegations only supported sub-paragraph (*a*), ten others sub-paragraph (*b*), ten others sub-paragraph (*c*), and ten others sub-paragraph (*d*), they would all support the paragraph which began with the word "decides", which would thus be adopted. Yet sub-paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) would then be rejected in turn, since they would not receive the support of a majority of the members. The Committee would thus be placed in a ridiculous position, as the paragraph it would have adopted would be devoid of all meaning.

33. The procedure followed in connexion with the examination of the Yugoslav amendment had done considerable harm to the Committee by depriving it of the opportunity of adopting a decision of principle regarding the drafting of the covenant. The amendments and the texts still before the Committee were not at all in accordance with the objective assigned to it by the Economic and Social Council, and the Pakistan delegation would therefore have to abstain from voting.

34. Mrs. MENON (India) stated that her delegation would vote against the text of sub-paragraph (*b*). It would be useless to send the summary records of the discussions on the question of the drafting of the covenant to the Commission on Human Rights. The Third Committee had not in fact adopted any decision of principle except on the question of the inclusion of a colonial clause.

35. She was sorry to note that the Committee was shirking the task entrusted to it.

36. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) recalled that he had proposed that the vote should be taken in five parts in order to enable the Committee to meet the request of the Economic and Social Council, which had asked for decisions of principle and not decisions on drafting details.

37. The amendments before the Committee answered the questions regarding the number of rights listed in the first eighteen articles of the covenant, the quality of the text of the articles and the possibility of including economic and social rights. The General Assembly would thus take many decisions of principle if it instructed the Commission on Human Rights, as suggested in the amendments submitted by Yugoslavia and the USSR, to add other rights to those listed in the first eighteen articles. It would do the same if it stated, as the Yugoslav amendment suggested, that the list of rights did not contain certain of the most elementary rights. It would also be taking a decision of principle if it stated that the first eighteen articles were not sufficient to protect the rights to which they referred, and that was the aim of the Lebanese and United Kingdom amendment which instructed the Commis-

sion on Human Rights to define with more precision the rights set forth in the covenant and the limitations thereto.

38. He considered that those instructions were sufficient to enable the Commission on Human Rights to continue its work and to emerge from the impasse in which it found itself. For that reason, the Lebanese delegation would vote in favour of all the amendments which had been submitted.

39. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) concurred in the remarks made by the representative of India and stated that her delegation would vote against paragraph 2 (*b*).

40. Mr. CAÑAS FLORES (Chile) said that he would vote in favour of paragraph 2 (*b*) since the Third Committee had been requested to express general ideas and the sub-paragraph in question fulfilled the required conditions.

41. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) stated that his delegation was prepared to accept the addition proposed by the delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) although it had been fully satisfied with the wording of paragraph 2 (*b*) in the basic text (A/C.3/L.76). Although the Netherlands delegation had also proposed the inclusion of certain rights in the covenant, it had not considered it necessary to make any additions to the original text because of its conviction that the Commission on Human Rights would give due attention to the views expressed by the members of the Third Committee. Nevertheless, since a number of delegations were of the opinion that the text of paragraph 2 (*b*) should be clarified, the Netherlands delegation was prepared to accept the proposed addition.

42. He wished, however, to point out that in the original text of the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.99) the words "with a view to the addition . . . of other rights" referred to the views expressed in the Third Committee, including those relating to articles 13 and 14 of the draft covenant and the rights set forth by the USSR and Yugoslavia. Yet, in the addition which had just been suggested by the United Kingdom representative, the phrase "with a view to the addition . . . of other rights" was so placed that it related only to the opinions on rights set forth by the USSR and Yugoslavia. In his view, that restriction seemed unjustified.

43. Since the addition was designed to take into account the opinions relating to article 13 of the draft covenant and aiming at the deletion of the words "freedom to change his religion or belief", he wished to make a brief comment on the matter.

44. In view of his deep respect for the religious convictions of others, he opposed the deletion of that provision because true freedom of conscience was non-existent if the right to change one's belief was not acknowledged. The representative of Egypt had agreed to that point when he had stated that the expression of that right, which was already included in freedom of religion, was superfluous, but the doubts and misgivings of others in that connexion must be taken into account. It was easy to imagine the serious consequences which might result from the deletion of those words: it would be tantamount to denial of the right to change one's religion.

45. In an effort to understand the difficulties of some representatives, he was ready to agree with them that objectively that provision was unacceptable. In the objective sense, every religion would and must be opposed to any change of religion because it rejected other religions. In the covenant as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, however, the subjective rights of persons were at stake and the Netherlands representative considered it necessary to maintain a provision stating that the right to change his religion or belief was one of the undeniable fundamental rights of every human being.

46. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) stated that his delegation would vote in favour of the joint text proposed for paragraph 2 (*b*) (A/C.3/L.99), as modified, because, by making special reference to article 13, that text requested the Commission on Human Rights to take into consideration the views expressed in connexion with the article of the draft covenant which was often called the "religious clause".

47. The delegation of Saudi Arabia would be the last to deny the right to change one's religion; it considered, however, that that right was implicitly proclaimed in the first part of article 13, which guaranteed freedom of religion. There was no more reason to proclaim the right to change one's religion than, for example, to proclaim the right to change one's political opinions. The words which the delegation of Saudi Arabia wished to delete therefore served no useful purpose; on the contrary, their consequences might be serious. While the majority of the countries of Asia admitted missionaries to their territory, they did not wish to run the risk that those missionaries might act as instruments for infiltration and exploitation by foreign Powers. History offered too many examples of that kind to permit under-estimation of that risk.

48. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that some countries were more favoured than others as regards the propaganda instruments available to them. The activities of missionaries were a form of propaganda. Thus, the countries in question had a considerable advantage over others in their attempts at conversion. That was an inequality which was inadmissible.

49. For all those reasons, the delegation of Saudi Arabia attached the greatest importance to amending the religious clause in the manner which it had repeatedly indicated both in the Commission on Human Rights and at previous sessions of the General Assembly. It was glad that paragraph 2 (*b*) of the resolution proposed for adoption would again draw the attention of the Commission on Human Rights to that matter.

50. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) endorsed the remarks of the representative of Saudi Arabia. The delegation of Afghanistan had had occasion to state its views on the subject during the first part of the third session of the General Assembly, in Paris,[1] its point of view had not changed since then.

51. In Afghanistan, where the Moslem religion was dominant, religious freedom was guaranteed to all citizens without exception by the national Constitution. That freedom extended of course to the right to change one's religion. The amendment to article 13 of the draft covenant proposed by Egypt (A/C.3/L.75/Rev.1)

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Third Committee*, 128th meeting.

was nonetheless extremely important in the Afghan delegation's opinion because of the significance which it attached to religion and to the role of religion in the world by virtue of its direct appeal to the emotions and feelings of the masses.

52. He reserved the right to take up that question again when it was discussed in the General Assembly.

53. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) said that he would vote for the text proposed for paragraph 2 (*b*) (A/C.3/L.99), as modified, but that he would like the authors of the text to replace the words "or in other covenants" by "or in other instruments".

54. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) stated that on behalf of Egypt and the United States he accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of Greece.

55. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) deplored the decisions which the Committee had been obliged to take at the 305th meeting for procedural rather than substantive reasons.

56. In expressing its views on the text proposed for paragraph 2 (*b*), the Committee was again called upon to take a supremely important decision of principle. If it adopted that text as it stood, the Committee would in effect be deciding in favour of the preparation of other covenants to complete the covenant under consideration, thus putting off to a later date and possibly for ever the proclamation of economic, social and cultural rights without which the covenant on human rights could not be considered as an instrument of implementation worthy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or truly fulfilling the aspirations of all the peoples of the world.

57. As it stood, the covenant was at best a covenant regarding the political rights of the individual, and the exercise of those rights was generally assured; in that form it could not contribute to the progress of humanity, particularly if it was considered that the problems requiring solution were essentially economic and social. The Third Committee should therefore not evade the obligation of giving precise instructions to the Commission on Human Rights to include economic, social and cultural rights in the covenant.

58. To that end the Mexican delegation formally proposed the deletion from the text of paragraph 2 (*b*) (A/C.3/L.99), as modified, of the words "first" and "or in other covenants". The phrase in question would then read as follows: "with a view to the addition in this covenant of other rights".

59. If that amendment was adopted, paragraph 2 (*e*) of the original draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76), recommending that the Commission on Human Rights should proceed with the consideration of additional instruments and measures dealing with economic, social, cultural and other rights not included in the covenant would have no further *raison d'être* and should be deleted.

60. Mr. LESAGE (Canada) stated that his delegation would vote for paragraph 2 (*b*) of the original draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76), the text of which appeared to him to be entirely satisfactory.

61. It seemed to him that no purpose would be served by making special reference to articles 13 and 14 of the draft covenant or the proposals of the USSR and Yugoslavia, since it was understood that the summary records of the discussions would be communicated to the Commission on Human Rights. The original text of paragraph 2 (*b*) requested the Commission to take them into consideration, and that would seem to meet the needs of the case completely.

62. Mr. CASSIN (France) wished to remind the Mexican representative that the Assembly must not close its eyes to reality. The French delegation also would have liked a single covenant, but it doubted whether a single commission, which would have sat for a month, could present a complete and detailed draft in one year. In order not to disappoint the peoples of the world, he considered it preferable to tell them that those engaged in defining their rights and freedoms were pushing forward slowly but surely. He himself had the firm intention of taking part in the drawing up of instruments on personal freedoms and on economic, social and other rights.

63. But for the time being, and in order to enable the Commission on Human Rights to perform its task, he would vote against the Mexican amendment, which might result in compromising the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

64. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) stated that the United States delegation could not accept the Mexican amendment.

65. She associated herself with the remarks made by the French representative: it was in fact impossible to foresee to what point the Commission on Human Rights would be able to carry its work.

66. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), replying to Mr. Cassin, observed that it might be feared that the Commission, far from advancing, was taking a retrograde step. He wondered whether goodwill had been completely exhausted after the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The argument that the Commission on Human Rights should not be overburdened was hardly justified: it could base its decisions on the preparatory work carried out in connexion with the Declaration, and on the views expressed during the past three years, whether in the Economic and Social Council or in the General Assembly. The difficulties to be surmounted were trifling compared to the importance to the whole of humanity of including economic, social and cultural rights in the covenant. Without those rights — and despite the enjoyment of political rights — the well-being of man could not be ensured.

67. He emphasized that the General Assembly would take its final decision on the subject only at its next session: hence, it could hardly show more prudence. But the position of the United Nations on the principle of economic, social and cultural rights — rights that were claimed by large groups of human beings — would be revealed to the general public by the vote on the Mexican amendment. It might therefore be regarded as a historic vote.

68. Mr. KAYALI (Syria) recalled that at the 305th meeting, his delegation had submitted an amendment similar to the one just proposed by the Mexican delegation.

69. He whole-heartedly associated himself with the observations made by the Mexican representative, and stated that, if the Mexican amendment were rejected, his delegation would be unable to accept the text proposed for paragraph 2 (*b*) (A/C.3/L.99), as modified.

70. Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) stated that he would vote for the joint amendment, although he shared the views of the representatives of Canada and France on the subject and would have preferred the original text (A/C.3/L.76), which did not refer to any particular proposal.

71. He would vote against the amendment proposed by the Mexican delegation.

72. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) recalled that his delegation had declared itself in favour of including economic, social and cultural rights in the covenant on human rights and would accordingly vote for the amendment proposed by Mexico.

73. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) recalled that her delegation was one of those which considered that the Commission on Human Rights should not be overburdened and that it would be advisable to draw up further covenants covering economic, social and cultural rights. In pursuance of that policy, she would vote for the text of paragraph 2 (*b*) proposed by the delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), as modified by those delegations, and against the Mexican amendment.

74. Mr. RODRIGUEZ ARIAS (Argentina) said that he would vote for the Mexican amendment.

75. If it was not accepted, he would have to abstain from voting on paragraph 2 (*b*), for he considered that what was indivisible should not be divided.

76. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) supported the Mexican amendment and said that its fate would decide the attitude of the Yugoslav delegation in respect of the text of paragraph 2 (*b*). If that amendment was not adopted, the Yugoslav delegation would abstain when the paragraph as a whole was put to the vote.

77. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would vote for the Mexican amendment, but added that, even if that amendment was rejected, paragraph 2 (*b*) should on no account be taken to mean that the Commission had decided not to include economic, social and cultural rights in the first covenant and that it was declaring itself in favour of several covenants relating to human rights. It should be understood that the question remained open and that it was for the General Assembly, in the last resort, to decide.

78. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Mexican amendment to the effect that the words "first" and "or in other covenants" should be deleted from the text of paragraph 2 (*b*) proposed by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), as revised.

79. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) requested a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Peru.

Against: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

Abstained: Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines.

The Mexican amendment was adopted by 28 votes to 18, with 3 abstentions, 11 delegations not being represented at the time of the vote.

80. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the text for paragraph 2 (*b*) proposed by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States, as amended.

81. Mr. CABADA (Peru) having requested a separate vote on the references to articles 13 and 14 of the draft covenant and the documents submitted by the USSR and Yugoslavia respectively, and Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. LACHS (Poland) having objected to the request, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for division.

The motion was rejected by 19 votes to 14, with 15 abstentions.

82. Mr. CAÑAS FLORES (Chile) observed that the decision just taken by the Committee placed those delegations which feared that the recommendation in paragraph 2 (*b*) might be regarded as indicating general approval of all the provisions proposed by the USSR and Yugoslavia in a very difficult position.

83. So far as the Chilean delegation was concerned, it had already had the opportunity to state that it was strongly opposed to section (*c*) of the Yugoslav proposals (A/C.3/L.92), for reasons which would be found in the summary record of the 305th meeting. It desired formally to reiterate that position.

84. Mr. RODRIGUEZ ARIAS (Argentina) wished his abstention to be recorded. Like the Chilean representative, and as he had stated several times, his delegation could not accept all the provisions included in that paragraph.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment proposed by the delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), as amended.

That text was adopted by 25 votes to 18, with 6 abstentions.

86. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote paragraph 2 (*b*) as a whole.

The text was adopted by 27 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

87. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) desired to point out that the vote just taken would automatically entail the deletion of paragraph 2 (*e*) from the original draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Turkey and the United States (A/C.3/L.76).

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

Printed in U.S.A. A—39450—November 1950—3,400