

Monday, 14 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris



	Page
Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1883, A/1884 (chapter V, section I), E/1992, E/2057 and Add.1 to 5, E/2059 and Add.1 to 8, E/2085 and Add.1, A/C.3/559, A/C.3/L.88, A/C.3/L.180, A/C.3/L.182, A/C.3/L.186 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.203) (continued) .....	235

Chairman : Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

**Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1883, A/1884 (chapter V, section I), E/1992, E/2057 and Add.1 to 5, E/2059 and Add.1 to 8, E/2085 and Add.1, A/C.3/559, A/C.3/L.88, A/C.3/L.180, A/C.3/L.182, A/C.3/L.186 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.203) (continued)<sup>1</sup>**

[Item 29] \*

1. The CHAIRMAN recapitulated the draft resolutions and accompanying amendments before the Committee. She indicated that the Secretariat had prepared a note (A/C.3/L.208) summarizing them and proposing an order for their examination, beginning with the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180), which had been submitted first. She therefore opened the discussion on the order in which the various texts before the Third Committee should be put to the vote.

2. AZMI Bey (Egypt) thought it would be of value to begin with a consideration of the draft resolutions proper. The first two were the draft resolution submitted by Chile (A/C.3/L.180) and the joint draft resolution submitted by Chile, Egypt, Pakistan and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.182). The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182) referred directly to the Economic and Social Council's decision (Council resolution 303 I (XI)) on the inclusion in the draft covenant of articles relating to economic, social and cultural rights, whereas the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180) principally concerned the length of time which should be allowed for the Commission on Human Rights to complete the work entrusted to it by the Council.

3. The representative of Egypt considered therefore that it would be logical to examine first the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182), which constituted a direct reply to the Economic and Social Council. He added

<sup>1</sup> See 372nd meeting.

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

that he was speaking on behalf of all the sponsors of that draft resolution.

4. The CHAIRMAN replied that, if there were no objections, that procedure would be followed.

5. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) signified that he had no objection to make with regard to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182) but considered it inappropriate to consider the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180) after it. The Chilean draft resolution reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 421 (V) and could thus be interpreted as confirming section D of that resolution, which referred the question of the right of peoples to self-determination to the Commission on Human Rights; whereas by adopting the joint draft resolution submitted by the Thirteen Powers (A/C.3/L.186 and Add. 1) the General Assembly would be deciding to include in the covenant an article expressly stating that right.

6. There was some confusion in that respect. He therefore asked the Chilean representative whether, if his draft resolution were adopted, the question of the right of peoples to self-determination would be referred to the Commission on Human Rights, or whether it would become the subject of a General Assembly decision different from that taken at the fifth session (resolution 421 (V)). The Afghan delegation's vote would depend on the reply to that question. Adoption of the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180) must not exclude a vote on the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.186 and Add.1). The Chilean representative might be able to redraft his text in order to eliminate any ambiguity that would not involve any procedural difficulty.

7. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) replied that the Committee ought perhaps to confine its attention for the moment to the Egyptian proposal for immediate consideration of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182). The order of voting on the various drafts could then be decided as the work proceeded. He did not believe

that the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182) and the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180) duplicated or excluded each other. In submitting its draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180), his delegation had had in view the whole of the work done by the Commission on Human Rights, whereas the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182) dealt with a particular aspect of it, that of economic, social and cultural rights. The Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.180) did not exclude the joint draft (A/C.3/L.182): it rather confirmed it. Neither did it exclude the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.186 and Add. 1), which was in no way incompatible with General Assembly resolution 421 (V) but on the contrary implemented one of its provisions. If there were any incompatibility between the two draft resolutions, his delegation would withdraw its text.

8. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) thanked the Chilean representative and requested a clear understanding that the Committee should in any case consider the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.186 and Add.1).

9. The CHAIRMAN replied that there was no question of the approval of any given draft resolution excluding consideration of another.

10. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) proposed that the consideration of the draft resolutions should begin with the draft resolution submitted by Poland (A/C.3/L.203), the object of which was to save innocent persons from death. The most elementary justice demanded the liberation of the twenty-four men imprisoned at Barcelona, who had only been fighting for their rights. The Third Committee could not fail to appreciate the importance and urgency of the Polish draft resolution and, just as it had adopted (350th meeting) without delay the Uruguayan proposal concerning the flood victims in Italy (A/C.3/L.156), it would certainly wish to give priority to such a purely humanitarian proposal.

11. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it two procedural motions, one by Egypt referring to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182), and the other by Poland concerning the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203).

12. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) supported the Polish proposal in view of the particular urgency of the matter.

13. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a vote should be taken first on the Egyptian and then on the Polish motion.

14. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Polish motion was an amendment to the Egyptian motion and that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, a vote should first be taken on the amendment. In the case of the Polish proposal, human lives were at stake; from the strictly humanitarian point of view, therefore, that proposal should have priority over all others. No delegation could be opposed to that, and in any event, as in the case of the resolution on the flood victims in Italy, a discussion of a few minutes' duration was all that was required. The Third Committee could not better defend human rights than by saving lives that were directly threatened.

15. Mr. ROY (Haiti) supported the Guatemalan representative's statement. The proposal contained in the draft resolution submitted by Poland (A/C.3/L.203) was not in fact directly connected with the Third Committee's agenda, as the Secretariat document explicitly recognized.

16. Mr. Altaf HUSAIN (Pakistan) declared himself in favour of the order proposed by the Chairman.

17. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) considered that the Polish procedural motion could not be regarded as an amendment but really raised a new question. The best defence of human rights would in any case be the adoption of the covenant.

18. She proposed that the Committee should continue its study of the covenant. It was not through any lack of interest that she was making that proposal but because she felt that any fresh subject should in the first instance be submitted to the General Committee, in accordance with rules 40 and 97 of the rules of procedure.

19. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) thought that the situation had been clearly stated and moved the closure of the debate.

20. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that the debate could not be closed as long as nothing had been decided. He requested the immediate examination of the Polish motion.

21. Mr. de ALBA (Mexico) said that the question raised in the Polish proposal deeply interested his delegation, and likewise Mexican public opinion. However, the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203) dated from 4 January 1952, and the situation had had time to develop since. It was therefore necessary to obtain precise information, which would enable the Committee to make a statement with proper knowledge of the facts.

22. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it a motion for closure, which she proposed to put to the vote.

23. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) pointed out that the Mexican representative's proposal was a motion for adjournment of the debate and therefore had priority.

24. At the request of Mr. ROY (Haiti), Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) withdrew his motion for the closure of the debate.

25. The CHAIRMAN took the view that the Polish draft resolution in fact raised a new question, as the United States representative had said, and that the usual procedure would be the one she had indicated; but she ruled that, after the exception which had been made for the Uruguayan draft resolution on flood victims, the Commission could not refuse to treat the Polish motion in the same way. She therefore asked the Mexican representative to explain his proposal.

26. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) proposed that consideration of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203) should be postponed for forty-eight hours in order to enable the Committee to obtain factual information.

27. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) and Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) both expressed their support for the Mexican proposal.
28. Mr. ROY (Haiti) thought that, if the delegation which had submitted that draft resolution was in a position to supply the required information, there was no reason for not examining it immediately.
29. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Committee had been seized of a letter from the organization *Notre solidarité*, with headquarters in Brussels, which he thought had been distributed as a document, and from which he quoted passages.
30. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) pointed out that the Committee was discussing the substance of the Polish draft resolution, whereas it was supposed only to consider the procedural question of the order of voting upon the Egyptian and Polish motions. He also wondered by what means the Secretariat would endeavour to obtain the information requested by the Mexican representative.
31. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) asked why the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.207) had been distributed under the title "Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation", and what the Secretariat's customary procedure was concerning texts of that nature dealing with new questions.
32. Mr. STEINIG (Secretary of the Committee) replied that the Polish text had been distributed in the form in which it had been submitted by the Polish delegation, with the title of agenda item 29. The question whether it came within the scope of item 29 or not, was for the Committee to decide.
33. Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) considered the Mexican representative's view sound and said that he would support it unreservedly. Similar cases might conceivably arise and the Committee would do well to lay down the principles which it intended to follow.
34. He questioned whether the period of forty-eight hours proposed by the Mexican representative was sufficient and whether it should not be extended to eight days. He thought that such a proposal would have the approval of all representatives, except perhaps those who, after prolonging the debate on the book *The Refugee in the Post-War World*<sup>2</sup> for over three days, were showing unwonted haste since the Committee had passed to another question.
35. He also wondered from what sources the Third Committee would seek the information requested and what confidence it could place in it.
36. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) said that the Committee was not competent to address observations to a State which was not a Member of the United Nations. The debate was supposed to be on procedure but certain members were in fact examining the substance of the question.
37. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) said that when he had stressed the need for obtaining information on the question as quickly as possible, he had not been aware that the Third Committee already possessed pertinent documents, and he was therefore no longer in favour of postponing consideration of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203).
38. Mr. STEINIG (Secretary of the Committee), in reply to the Belgian representative, pointed out that by virtue of decisions taken by the General Assembly (resolution 32 (I) and 39 (I)), the Secretary-General could not contact the Spanish Government, and therefore would not be able to obtain the information requested by certain delegations unless the General Assembly, at the Committee's request, gave him instructions to do so.
39. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) remarked that certain delegations would be in a position to obtain the necessary information, especially those whose governments maintained friendly relations with the Franco Government, whose prestige was at stake.
40. Mrs. BEGTRUP (Denmark) observed that the question raised in the Polish draft resolution should, before being submitted to the Third Committee, have passed through the General Committee of the Assembly, and that it was not relevant to a discussion of the draft international covenant on human rights.
41. The Committee had waived its customary procedure in favour of the Uruguayan resolution on flood victims in Italy, but an exceptional measure should not be made into a general rule.
42. The Danish delegation therefore associated itself with the United States and Argentine delegations and was of the opinion that the Committee was not competent to examine the Polish draft resolution.
43. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the attitude of the Danish delegation, in wishing to reverse a decision already taken, was inadmissible.
44. In a communication (file number SG/GA/317/02), the Secretary-General had supplied important material on the case of the twenty-four persons in Barcelona threatened with the death penalty. The Committee could not therefore plead lack of information as an excuse for postponing the consideration of the question.
45. Mr. ROY (Haiti) noted that some members had contested the Committee's competence to examine the Polish draft resolution, while others had maintained that it was competent. He therefore thought it necessary to settle that question once and for all to ask the Committee to decide on its own competence in the matter. Under rule 120 of the rules of procedure such a motion should be put to the vote before the proposal itself.
46. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, proposals for the adjournment of discussion on a question took precedence over others. The Mexican representative's motion therefore took precedence over that of the Haitian representative.

<sup>2</sup> Document A/AC.36/6 (Geneva, December 1951).

47. Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) remarked that the Committee need not decide on its own competence but rather on whether the question raised in the Polish draft resolution should not have been submitted to the General Committee before the Third Committee. However, it would seem logical to put the Mexican proposal to the vote first, as that vote would not in any way prejudice the substance of the question.
48. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that his only purpose in submitting his proposal was to make the Committee's task easier. If the Committee approved the Mexican proposal it would only be postponing the problem without solving it, because at the suitable time the delegations which had questioned the Committee's competence to consider the Polish draft resolution would raise their objections again.
49. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would be prepared to accept the Mexican representative's proposal.
50. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) observed that his delegation could not pass on the Committee's competence unless it knew how the President of the General Assembly would request the Spanish authorities to take the steps required by the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203).
51. Mr. YU TSUNE-CHI (China) thought that the rules of procedure required the Committee to take a decision first on the Mexican representative's proposal without considering the question of its own competence.
52. Mr. DA COSTA REGO (Brazil) said that, if the Mexican proposal was adopted, similar steps should be taken with regard to political prisoners in other countries.
53. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that he was prepared to withdraw his proposal that the Third Committee should decide on its own competence.
54. He was in favour of considering the Polish draft resolution; nevertheless he suggested that, in order to facilitate the Committee's work, the Polish delegation might provisionally withdraw its request for priority. The Polish resolution would be examined in due course and the Secretariat would have an opportunity to obtain the information requested and submit it to the Committee at the appropriate time.
55. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) said that her delegation was prepared to approve the Mexican proposal that consideration of the Polish draft resolution should be postponed for forty-eight hours. The information could easily be obtained from various sources without applying to the Spanish Government.
56. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that he would be able to vote for the Mexican proposal, as the proposed delay would enable members to study the various aspects of the question.
57. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) observed that the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had ruled that that Committee was not competent to examine cases involving individuals. In virtue of that decision the Polish draft resolution was out of order.
58. The United States delegation reserved the right to raise again the question of the Third Committee's competence to consider the Polish draft resolution, either in the course of the meeting if the Committee rejected the Mexican proposal, or later.
59. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the situation was in no way connected with what had happened in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The Third Committee was called upon to consider a flagrant violation of human rights. It was not only entitled but also obliged to examine without delay the contents of the Polish draft resolution. It might be asked where the question could be considered if not in the committee responsible for examining social, humanitarian and cultural questions.
60. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) requested that the vote on the proposal made by the representative of Mexico be taken by roll-call.
61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote, by roll-call, the proposal made by the representative of Mexico.
- A vote was taken by roll-call.*
- Canada, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*
- In favour* : Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.
- Against* : Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil.
- Abstaining* : Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Syria, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Afghanistan, Australia, Burma.
- The proposal was adopted by 30 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.*
62. Mr. YU TSUNE-CHI (China) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal for procedural reasons, as it was his firm belief that the rules of procedure, in the case in point rule 118, should be respected. Besides, the Chairman had given a ruling which had not been contested by any member of the Committee, taking as her precedent the resolution on the flood victims in Italy. However, the Committee had known when adopting that resolution that it would be universally approved and had therefore, perhaps wrongly, paid little attention to the question of competence. In any case the Chairman's ruling held. The Chinese delegation had complied with it, but wished to make clear that it in no way approved of the substance of the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation.
63. Mr. CASSIN (France) had voted for the Mexican proposal because he considered that the General Assembly was competent to deal with humanitarian questions and that the Third Committee shared that competence,

though it should use it judiciously and only when sure of its ground. When it fulfilled its function of defending the right, it must do so according to its own rules and after due reflection, and not act on impulse.

64. Mr. DE MIRANDES (Costa Rica) said he had voted against the Mexican proposal because he would have liked the Third Committee to consider forthwith whether it had competence in the matter. If the Committee ultimately examined the Polish delegation's draft resolution, he would vote against it. During a visit to Spain he had found that life went on normally there and no one was interested in his comings and goings; that might not have been the case in some other countries.

65. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion was rejected by 26 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions.*

66. Mrs. BEGTRUP (Denmark) had voted for the Mexican proposal, on the understanding that the question of competence could be brought up again.

67. Mr. DE COSTA REGO (Brazil) recognized the Committee's competence but could not agree that discriminatory measures should be taken against States not Members of the United Nations, when it would seem that some Member States were not above reproach.

68. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said he had abstained for reasons of procedure. He understood that the Mexican proposal had been voted on under rule 115, since it requested the adjournment of the debate "on the item under discussion", whereas the Committee had not yet decided whether the item would be discussed. Even if item 29 of the agenda were given its widest interpretation, it would be difficult to bring the draft resolution submitted by Poland under it. The vote could not therefore solve the difficulty.

69. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) said that out of sympathy for the appeal contained in the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203), his delegation had spoken once requesting that the time allowed for obtaining the requisite information should be as short as possible. When the USSR representative had pointed out that the Secretariat had circulated an official document containing that information, the Israel delegation had taken the view that the Polish draft resolution could be examined without delay. However, as the sponsor of the draft resolution had agreed to a deferment of forty-eight hours, it had seen its way to vote for the Mexican proposal.

70. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that she had voted for the Mexican proposal but reserved the right to explain, at the appropriate time, her view that the Committee was not competent to examine the matter, which came within the domestic jurisdiction of a State, that is to say the jurisdiction of the courts of the affected country.

71. Mr. Altaf HUSAIN (Pakistan) declared that he had abstained, not because he considered that the Polish draft resolution did not warrant examination by the Committee, but because the discussion had given rise

to some confusion. Several delegations had adopted an attitude towards that draft resolution denouncing a violation of human rights inconsistent with the attitude they had adopted not long previously in the case of Morocco (353rd and 354th plenary meetings of the General Assembly). The General Assembly did not seem to be sure when it was entitled to consider complaints of violation of human rights. It was impossible to adopt two different attitudes, one for Morocco and the other for Spain. He preferred to abstain until the United Nations decided on one course which it would follow consistently.

72. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal without committing himself on the Polish draft resolution. He thought that when the Committee had the requisite information it would be in a better position to reach a decision on the substance of the question or decide whether it was competent or not. Ecuador had abolished the death penalty more than fifty years previously and his country would like all other countries to take a similar step. He realized that there was a great difference between intervention in the domestic jurisdiction of a country and the offer of good offices, with a humanitarian purpose such as had been made by Ecuador in the United Nations on previous occasions.

73. Mr. HOLMBACK (Sweden) agreed with the Danish representative's remarks.

74. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) said he had voted against the Mexican proposal because he thought it impossible to postpone a debate that had not begun. Moreover, he did not think the Committee was competent to consider the draft resolution submitted by Poland. He reserved the right to give his reasons for that view later.

75. Mr. ALFONZO-RAVARD (Venezuela) said he had voted against the Mexican proposal because he considered that the Committee could not deal with the matter to which the Polish draft resolution referred. Under rules 40 and 97 of the rules of procedure, the matter should first be submitted to the General Committee; Committees could not introduce new items on their own initiative. He regretted that Poland had not followed the regular procedure. He hoped the long discussion would at least have the advantage of showing delegations the situation in which the Third Committee would be placed if it agreed to lend itself to an exchange of complaints and charges. He considered that the questions of procedure should have been voted on first.

76. Mr. SMITT INGEBRETSEN (Norway) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal because he considered that the Committee should have all the necessary explanations. Nevertheless, he associated himself with the observations made by the representative of Denmark.

77. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal because he had hoped that by voting for an adjournment the Committee would put an end to the discussion on procedure. He noted, however, that the discussion had merely been postponed, for

several delegations had announced their intention of resuming it, founding themselves on rules 120 and 97 of the rules of procedure.

78. Mr. GARIBALDI (Uruguay) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal with the idea that the Committee should subsequently decide whether or not it was competent to deal with the matter.

79. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal. He was convinced that the Committee was competent to study a humanitarian appeal. The Committee's affirmative vote seemed a favourable sign to him, in the sense that in deferring the matter it had presumed the need to consider it. It had adopted a just decision and one worthy of its task, and in doing so had merely acted in accordance with the Chairman's ruling and the precedents she had already established. Questions of violation of human rights were not new, but in the case in point the proposal was to intervene directly to save human lives, and the Committee could not shirk its responsibilities. For the rest, the draft resolution had been submitted in good time and was certainly relevant to item 29 of the agenda of the General Assembly. His delegation had always been opposed to interference in the domestic affairs of a State, but he did not see how the Polish draft resolution amounted to any kind of interference.

80. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said he had voted against the Mexican proposal because the matter did not seem to him to fall within the Committee's competence. He regretted that the representative of Haiti had withdrawn his motion requesting the application of rule 120 of the rules of procedure, which would have enabled the Committee to decide immediately on its competence and would have made the discussion much shorter. He did not think that by adopting the Mexican motion the Committee had prejudged the question of competence, as the representative of the USSR had affirmed; the question of competence could still be raised, and none of the arguments of the representative of the USSR was sufficient to bring the Polish draft resolution within item 29 of the agenda.

81. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said he had voted for the Mexican proposal so as to give all members of the Committee the necessary time to study the question. His vote did not imply approval of the draft resolution submitted by Poland nor was it an expression of opinion on the competence of the Committee to consider it. Furthermore, he contested the interpretation which the representative of the USSR had placed on the Committee's decision in affirming that by adopting

the Mexican proposal the Committee had prejudged the question of its competence.

82. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) said he had supported from the outset the draft resolution submitted by Poland. He was convinced that there was no doubt about the competence of the General Assembly and the Third Committee in a case in which the violation of human rights was so flagrant. In his view the matter was relevant to agenda item 29, which concerned the preparation of a covenant regarding all human rights—a task which could not be carried out in an academic way, without taking account of realities. The draft resolution submitted by Poland placed before the Committee the case of violations of the most elementary human rights, for defending which certain persons were in danger. The Third Committee should listen to the voice of the peoples and attend to the case reported to it by Poland.

83. He deplored that some persons had raised questions of competence to cover their defence of the fascist régime condemned by the General Assembly in 1946 (resolutions 32 (I) and 39 (I)). The Czechoslovak delegation appealed to all men of goodwill to oppose those manoeuvres. It had other documents at its disposal which supplemented the statement referred to by the representative of the USSR, and it had voted for the Mexican proposal simply in order to give some delegations an opportunity to study that statement.

84. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said he doubted the Committee's competence and noted that almost all representatives, in explaining their votes, had felt the need to refer to that matter. Since he had not received the explanation he had requested, he had been forced to abstain. Like the representative of the USSR, he thought the Committee should do all it could to save human lives, but he stressed the need to determine the authorities to whom the President of the General Assembly could apply for the necessary information.

85. So far as the Committee's competence was concerned, he did not see any objection to studying the draft resolution submitted by Poland in so far as it dealt with human rights, but that could not be done so long as the draft bore the title "Draft international covenant on human rights".

86. The CHAIRMAN announced that at the next meeting, if no member had any objection, the Committee would consider first the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.182).

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.