*United Nations*

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*SIXTH SESSION*

*Official Records*

**THIRD COMMITTEE 405th** *MEETING*

*Saturday, 26 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.*

***Palais de Chaillot, Paris***

CONTENTS



*Chairman :* Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

**Tribute to the memory of Sveinn Björnsson, President of the Republic of Iceland**

1. The CHAIRMAN expressed her sympathy and that of all members of the Third Committee with the people of the Republic of Iceland in the loss of their President, Sveinn Björnsson, whose death was a great blow to Iceland and to all democratic countries.

**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.190/Rev.1) *(continued)***

[Item 29]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY GUATEMALA (A/C.3/L.190/Rev. 1) *(continued)*

2. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1), which had been discussed at the 404th meeting.

3. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia), who had been unable to speak on the previous day, said that the Yugoslav delegation had some misgivings, because various representatives had pointed out that if the Committee approved the Guatemalan draft resolution it would not reach any decision on the question of reservations. The Guatemalan draft resolution requested the Commission on Human Rights to decide during the current year whether reservations were admissible or not. That decision would then be transmitted to the Economic and Social Council, which in its turn would have to decide the question of principle. Once a decision was taken by the Council, it would be difficult to change it. The Third Committee should therefore immediately express an opinion on the question.

4. He understood the reasons which had impelled the representative of Guatemala to submit his draft resolution, but thought that it might have unforeseen and unfortunate results. It might therefore be wiser to adopt the solution suggested by certain representatives, namely to include the main points of the draft resolution in the Third Committee's report and not to submit a formal draft resolution.

5. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) requested a roll-call vote on his draft resolution.

6. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) asked for a separate vote to be taken on the words "or non-admissibility" in the first paragraph of the preamble and in the operative part, and also on the words "and to the effect to be attributed to them" in the first paragraph of the preamble.

7. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Chilean representative's proposal was tantamount to asking the Committee to decide forthwith on the principle of admissibility or non-

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

admissibility of reservations. It completely changed the sense of the Guatemalan draft resolution (A/C.3/L.190/Rev. 1), which no longer proposed to refer the question to the Commission on Human Rights but to take a decision on the substance. He considered that the Third Committee was not in a position to settle that question immediately.

8. Pointing out that he had not spoken during the general debate on the previous day or during the explanation of votes, he said he wished to explain his position towards the Guatemalan draft resolution. His delegation might perhaps change its opinion of that text if it were put to the vote at a later date, but for the time being it would have to vote against the draft resolution as a whole and against each of its paragraphs.

9. The first paragraph of the preamble referred to two covenants, while the draft resolution approved by the Third Committee at the 403rd meeting mentioned a covenant or covenants. The USSR delegation insisted that there should be one covenant only on human rights, and considered that such contradictions between different texts adopted by the United Nations should be avoided.

10. The second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution mentioned the General Assembly resolution on the question of reservations, adopted at the 360th plenary meeting, on 12 January 1952. The USSR delegation had voted against that resolution.

11. The operative part of the Guatemalan draft resolution also referred to "two covenants". Delegations which wanted one covenant would, if they supported the Guatemalan text, be voting indirectly for two separate covenants, which they could not do.

12. Referring to the Guatemalan draft resolution as a whole, he said that the Commission on Human Rights was not competent to deal with the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations. Each State had the sovereign right to decide for itself whether or not it wished to make reservations on a covenant or convention, and to decide what position it should take towards reservations made by other States. That was a matter for the domestic jurisdiction of each State concerned.

13. If the question had to be submitted to an organ of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council would not be competent to deal with it. The more logical course would be to submit it to the International Law Commission.

14. On the previous day some representatives had suggested that the Guatemalan draft resolution should not be studied, but that the question of the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations should be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights without approving a formal draft resolution. He wished to know whether that proposal would be put to the vote.

15. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) withdrew his request that the proposal should be voted on in parts.

16. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution of Guatemala (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1) to the vote.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France.

*Against:* Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Chile, Cuba, Egypt.

*The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1) was approved by 28 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.*

**Programme of work of the Committee**

17. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), referring to the schedule of meetings, formally moved that the Committee should hold one night meeting at most during the following week, but that statements by representatives should be limited to ten minutes in order to speed up the Committee's work.

18. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) supported that proposal. Instead of adopting the inefficient method of holding night meetings, members of the Committee should show a spirit of self-criticism and self-discipline. The limiting of the length of speeches would, in his opinion, enable the Committee to finish its work within the time limit. If, however, that proved impossible, the Committee could defer the question of freedom of information to the seventh session of the General Assembly, as the representative of France had proposed.

19. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, while the other Committees of the General Assembly had already finished or would finish their work at the beginning of the following week the Third Committee still had a heavy agenda before it. The Joint Second and Third Committee had also not finished its work. Though she was not in favour of night meetings, she thought they might nevertheless be necessary.

20. Mr. STEINIG (Secretary of the Committee) observed that the schedule of meetings was decided in the light of all the facts at weekly meetings in which the President of the General Assembly and the Chairmen and Secretaries of all the Committees took part. If every Committee took its own decisions on the schedule, the work of the General Assembly might be disorganized.

21. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) proposed that the Committee should decide to hold only one night meeting during the following week. Its day meetings, on the other hand, might last from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. If, despite that time table, it could not finish its work within the time limit, it might in case of emergency consider holding a larger number of night meetings.

22. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed by way of amendment to the proposal made by the representative of Afghanistan that the Committee should meet from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.

23. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Third Committee had to refer to the Sixth Committee the legal issues which had arisen in connexion with the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons (item 58 of the agenda of the General Assembly). Since the Sixth Committee would probably finish its work that day, the Third Committee might refrain from considering the question at the current session and thus save time. Alternatively, it could refer the relevant sections of the draft protocol to the Sixth Committee forthwith.

24. The CHAIRMAN explained that the General Committee had decided to place the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons on the agenda of the Third Committee, which was free to refer the results of its work to the Sixth Committee, but only if it thought it necessary.

25. She proposed that a decision on the best method of organizing the Committee's work should be postponed until the afternoon meeting.

*It was so agreed.*

**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.190/Rev. 1, A/C.3/L.191/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.193, A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.196/Rev.2)** *(continued)*

[Item 29]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY GUATEMALA (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1) *(concluded)*

26. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that he had voted for the draft resolution submitted by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1) because he considered that the special character of the draft international covenant on human rights to be submitted to the General Assembly at its seventh session must be taken into account. The covenant would not merely sanction existing rights but would be a source of new rights. He was convinced that it would result in extending those rights to peoples who did not so far enjoy them.

27. But, being in agreement with the Sixth Committee's decision concerning reservations to multilateral conventions, he bore in mind the need for promoting the universality of the covenant on human rights, which might perhaps take its place along with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter itself. The question of the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations to the covenant therefore deserved careful consideration, and provisions relating to the examination of reservations should be included in the covenant.

28. He hoped that the General Assembly would have an opportunity of discussing the matter again.

29. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) said that, as the delegation of Czechoslovakia had already indicated at the 404th meeting, it considered that no useful purpose would be served by discussing the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations, because such a discussion at the current time would be purely academic. In view of the Committee's heavy agenda it would be preferable to adjourn the debate on the matter, on the understanding that the Commission on Human Rights or some other organ of the United Nations should and could take a decision on it.

30. His delegation was convinced that it would be the duty of every State signatory to the covenant to give effect to the fundamental human rights. No reservations it formulated could be permitted to relieve it of that duty. On the other hand, the principle of the national sovereignty of States conferred the right to formulate reservations to any international convention. It was not, therefore, the function of an international body to rule on the admissibility of reservations, nor could a purely fortuitous majority be allowed to restrict the sovereign right of States to formulate such reservations. The Czechoslovak delegation had already upheld that point of view in the Sixth Committee[1] and had therefore voted against the Guatemalan draft resolution.

31. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that the Committee should do its best to speed up its work without any loss of efficiency. One effective way of doing that would be to prohibit explanations of vote by delegations which had spoken during the general debate and again during the discussion of the proposal put to the vote. There was no need for a delegation which had taken a definite line in the general debate, and had followed the same line in restating its views during the discussion of specific proposals, to explain its vote at a later stage, except perhaps where it had abstained for reasons not made clear in its statements.

32. He accordingly proposed that the Chairman should exercise her discretion under rule 127 of the rules of procedure, under which "the Chairman may permit members to explain their votes", not to grant such permission to delegations which had spoken twice during the discussion and had taken a definite line.

33. The CHAIRMAN considered that the proposal of the representative of Haiti was sound, and said that she would in future use her discretion under rule 127 of the rules of procedure.

34. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the proposal of the representative of Haiti was unacceptable and that the Chairman could not interpret rule 127 as she suggested.

35. The representative of Czechoslovakia had all the more right to explain his vote because he had not spoken when the draft resolution submitted by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.190/Rev.1) was being discussed. In any event the Chairman of a Committee could not decide whether or not a delegation could explain its

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Sixth Committee,* 274th meeting.

vote. The Chairman was only entitled to restrict the duration of such explanations.

36. All delegations had the absolute right to explain their votes, if only to enlighten world public opinion. That was the reason why rule 127 specified that the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment should not be permitted to explain his vote on it.

37. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the terms of rule 127 were perfectly plain: "The Chairman may permit...", which meant that the Chairman had discretion. The proposal of the representative of Haiti appeared to respect rule 127 in letter and spirit, though it perhaps exceeded the actual terms of that rule, which did not distinguish between delegations that had already spoken several times and others.

38. Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) stated that his delegation had the greatest confidence in the Chairman of the Committee, but considered that the adoption of the proposal of the representative of Haiti might cause difficulty. In practice a delegation might be led to change its attitude by the adoption or rejection of certain amendments; it should therefore be able to explain why its vote did not agree with the attitude it appeared to have taken in the debate. The right to explain votes should therefore not be restricted, as the representative of Haiti had proposed.

39. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) considered that the terms of rule 127 were clear, provided that no words were isolated from their context: the Chairman only had discretion to permit members to explain their votes, either before or after the voting. If that interpretation were disputed, the opinion of the Legal Department of the Secretariat should be sought. In view of the Chairman's ruling he considered that such a legal opinion was necessary.

40. The CHAIRMAN considered that the objections raised constituted an appeal against her ruling. She therefore asked the Committee to decide whether there existed an absolute right, not subject to restriction in any case, to explain votes.

41. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) hoped that all members of the Third Committee were determined to respect scrupulously the terms of the rules of procedure, and the extremely dangerous precedent of preventing certain delegations from explaining their votes would not be established. The rules of procedure were categorical, and neither the Chairman nor the Committee had the right to change them in any way.

42. The CHAIRMAN maintained her ruling and asked whether an appeal was to be made against it in accordance with rule 112 of the rules of procedure.

43. Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) appealed against the Chairman's decision, as it would prohibit explanation of the votes of delegations who had already spoken twice during a debate. It would be preferable to apply strictly the terms of rule 128 of the procedure, which specified the powers of the Chairman in the matter.

44. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) invoked rule 120 of the rules of procedure regarding decisions on competence. He maintained that the Committee was not competent to decide the question before it, as to do so would be to change rule 127 of the rules procedure.

45. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the motion of non-competence submitted by the representative of the USSR in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

*The motion was rejected by 19 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.*

46. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the appeal against her ruling.

*The Chairman's ruling was upheld by 18 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.*

47. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) asked why the Committee had not been allowed to hear a representative of the Legal Department of the Secretariat, as he had requested, before passing judgment on a decision which interpreted rule 127 of the rules of procedure in a highly questionable manner.

48. The CHAIRMAN replied that her interpretation of rule 127 was perfectly correct and had in fact been approved by a majority of the Committee in the vote just taken.

49. If there was no objection, however, she saw no reason why a representative of the Legal Department of the Secretariat should not be heard.

50. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) opposed such a hearing.

51. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) moved the closure of the debate.

52. Mr. CASSIN (France) and Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) opposed the closure of the debate.

*The motion was adopted by 26 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.*

### Draft resolutions concerning measures of implementation of the covenant.

53. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) proposed that the Committee should proceed to consider the revised joint draft resolution submitted by Guatemala, Haiti and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2), concerning measures of implementation of the covenant.

*It was so agreed.*

54. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the study of the joint draft resolution involved consideration of the other documents on the subject, namely the revised draft resolution submitted by Syria (A/C.3/L.191/Rev.2), the draft resolution submitted by Israel (A/C.3/L.193) and the revised draft resolution submitted by Guatemala and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.196/Rev.2), which contained various contradictory proposals. He feared that the discussion might be unduly prolonged and the Committee might be involved in a mass of details. He thought it

chiefly important to know what the covenant was to contain. He therefore suggested that the Committee should decide to refer all those proposals to the Commission on Human Rights through the Economic and Social Council, which would submit a general digest of them to the General Assembly at its seventh session.

55. Mr. GARIBALDI (Uruguay) categorically opposed the suggestion made by the representative of the USSR. The Committee should study the measures of implementation, which it was essential to specify in the covenant. It was therefore bound to study the proposals before it and instruct the Commission on Human Rights to incorporate in the draft covenant provision for such measures of implementation as it saw fit.

56. Mr. ROY (Haiti) also categorically opposed the suggestion of the representative of the USSR. The Economic and Social Council had decided in 1950 (Council resolution 303 I (XI)) that it could do nothing in the matter without instructions from the General Assembly. No one could seriously contemplate that the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should refer the matter backwards and forwards indefinitely. He therefore considered that the Third Committee should study the problem and give the Commission on Human Rights all necessary guidance.

57. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) said that his delegation had always supported the principle of including in the covenant the right of States, groups and individuals to petition, and had submitted to the Commission on Human Rights a formal proposal to that effect. Other delegations, especially those of Australia, France and India,[2] had supported that principle. The Commission on Human Rights had always been divided on the question, and the Guatemalan delegation had therefore thought it necessary for the General Assembly to give definite directives to the Commission. That was the aim of the draft resolution which it had submitted together with the delegations of Haiti and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2).

58. Article 52 of the draft covenant drawn up by the Commission on Human Rights (E/1992) restricted the right of petition to States and provided for direct action between States in the event of failure to apply the covenant. That procedure would not only endanger good relations between States but for several reasons would not really protect human rights.

59. First, it invited States to interfere in the domestic affairs of other States. Any State which received a notification drafted according to article 52 of the draft covenant would be offended, and the relations between the two States would be impaired.

60. Secondly, under article 52, States would have the power to ensure that their citizens residing abroad enjoyed human rights. For that purpose it was unnecessary to resort to an international covenant on human rights, as States could use diplomatic channels. The suggested wording would enable aliens to ask for the support of their native country in submitting petitions, while the nationals of a country would have difficulty in securing governmental assistance in submitting a petition against their own government. Stateless persons would be in a similar position to that of nationals.

61. Thirdly, States would regard with apprehension any action by a State in a country other than its own, and such action would be contrary to the covenant.

62. Fourthly, the wording of article 52 of the draft covenant disregarded the United Nations.

63. Those were the reasons which had prompted the Guatemalan delegation to submit, jointly with the Haitian and Uruguayan delegations, a draft resolution which recognized the right of States parties to the covenant, non-governmental organizations, groups and individuals to petition and gave the organ to be set up the right to take action on a grave and well-founded charge.

64. A crucial moment had been reached in the fight started several centuries previously on behalf of human rights. In history it had nearly always been individuals or groups of individuals who had had to claim the recognition of their fundamental rights, which they had generally obtained only after stubborn combats and revolutions. In that way Magna Carta had been drawn up in England, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in France, and the Bill of Rights in the United States of America.

65. The recognition of the right of individuals and groups of individuals to petition was one of the few safeguards which might ensure the protection of human rights in countries with a totalitarian régime, for in those countries national institutions and the organization of justice were corrupt. Care should be taken, however, in the interests of United Nations prestige, to ensure that the international protection system was not used for political ends.

66. A certain number of writers and jurists had emphasized the importance of the right of individuals to appear before international tribunals. Mr. Jonathan Daniels, a member of the United States delegation on the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, had stated that the right of individuals and of organizations to petition should be recognized.[3] The Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press had expressed a similar opinion.[4] In addition, the Trusteeship Council recognized the right of the inhabitants of Trust Territories to petition.

67. Several delegations had shown an increasing willingness to admit the right of petition by individuals and groups. The United States delegation, which had at first been non-committal, had come to recognize that right, and had so indicated in the draft protocol it had submitted to the Commission on Human Rights at its seventh session (E/1992, annex V). In an advisory opinion given in 1928 the Permanent Court of Interna-

[2] See documents E/CN.4/AC.1/27, E/CN.4/82/Add.10/Rev. 1 and E/CN.4/276.

[3] See document E/CN.4/Sub.2/66 and E/CN.4/Sub.2/SR.35.

[4] See document E/CN.4/Sub.1/SR.59.

tional Justice had stated that nothing in international law precluded individuals from the direct acquisition of rights under a treaty, if that were the intention of the signatories.[5] In its advisory opinion of 1949 on reparations the International Court of Justice had ruled that the United Nations was competent to lodge complaints against States.[6] Although the Statute of the Court did not admit the right of individuals to be parties in cases before it, the individual was, under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations, the direct beneficiary of international co-operation.

68. Under contemporary international law an individual was no longer required to use the State as an intermediary in order to institute proceedings on the international level. The agreement concluded over forty years earlier for the establishment of the Central American Court of Justice[7] had recognized the right of individuals to address petitions to the signatory governments.

69. The system for the protection of minorities applied by the League of Nations had recognized the right of individuals to submit petitions against their own governments. The convention relating to the protection of Upper Silesian minorities, concluded in 1922, had also recognized the right of nationals of a State to petition against their own government, and had provided that individuals might have direct access to regional administrative and judicial organs of an international character. The International Labour Organisation likewise recognized the right of governments and of workers' and employers' organizations to lodge complaints relating to breaches of trade-union rights.

70. That development could not be halted. The United Nations must accept the new ideas of the time and enshrine them in the articles of the draft covenant. If it did not do so, it would be failing in its historic mission.

71. Objection had been made that recognition of the right of petition by individuals or groups of individuals would lead to the submission of cases on a scale which would make the international system for the protection of human rights impossible to operate effectively. That objection had some substance but was not conclusive. The difficulty could be overcome by laying down procedure for the submission of petition. In the Commission on Human Rights in 1949 Guatemala had put forward proposals providing for the establishment of a screening committee for that purpose.[8] The draft protocol submitted by the United States of America also contained useful suggestions on the same lines (E/1992, annex V).

72. The whole question should be thoroughly investigated by the Commission on Human Rights. To that end the delegation of Guatemala, together with the delegations of Haiti and Uruguay, were asking that the General Assembly should issue general directives to the Commission on Human Rights through the Economic and Social Council.

73. The creation of an attorney-general of the United Nations, as was proposed in another draft resolution (A/C.3/196/Rev.2), would allay the unfounded fears which had been expressed and would assign to the United Nations its proper function in the protection of human rights. The delegation of Guatemala was convinced that, if the proposals contained in the joint draft resolutions (A/C.3/195/Rev.2 and A/C.3/196/Rev.2) were adopted, the sixth session of the General Assembly would be an historic session, since it would represent a decisive stage in the thousand-year struggle for human rights.

74. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) asked whether the text of the proposal made by the USSR representative could be circulated.

75. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would have liked to hear the reactions of members of the Committee to his suggestions. He would submit them formally in writing at the next meeting, or later if that seemed preferable.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

[5] See *Jurisdiction of the Courts of Danzig, Collection of Advisory Opinions of the Permanent Court of International Justice,* Series B-No. 15, March 3, 1928.

[6] See *Reparation for injuries suffered in the service of the United Nations, Advisory Opinion : I.C.J. Reports 1949,* p. 174 (page 187).

[7] Established 20 December 1907.

[8] See documents E/CN.4/293 and E/CN.4/SR.115.

Printed in France SPI—93250—February 1952—3,350

*United Nations*

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*SIXTH SESSION*

*Official Records*

**THIRD COMMITTEE 406th**

***MEETING***

***Saturday, 26 January 1952, at 3.30 p.m.***

***Palais de Chaillot, Paris***

CONTENTS



*Chairman :* Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

## Programme of work of the Committee

1. The CHAIRMAN said that she had consulted the President of the General Assembly on the length of meetings necessary to enable the Committee to end its work in due time, and had concluded that the agenda could be exhausted if the Committee met from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 7.30 p.m., holding one night meeting on 30 January 1952 and one further night meeting if necessary. When there were night meetings, the afternoon meeting would be adjourned at 6 p.m.

2. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that the meetings should last from 10.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. and that only one night meeting should be held in the following week.

*The proposal was adopted by 17 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.*

3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Secretary of the Committee to reply to a question asked by the representative of Haiti at the previous meeting.

4. Mr. STEINIG (Secretary of the Committee) said that there would be no difference in the time spent if the Joint Second and Third Committee met after the Third Committee had exhausted its agenda or if the Third Committee interrupted its debates. It might, however, be found preferable to avoid such interruption, particularly as the Joint Second and Third Committee might have to meet with the First Committee to discuss a communication from the President of the General Assembly regarding the holding of a special session of the General Assembly to discuss a possible truce in Korea.[1]

5. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that Mr. Steinig's argument could work equally both ways, but he would not press his point.

[1] See documents A/C.1/714 (A/C.2&3/105) and A/C.1/713 (A/C.2&3/104).

## 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.191/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.193, A/C.3/L.195, A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.196/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.229) *(continued)*

[Item 29]*

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COVENANT (*continued*)

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to discuss the revised joint draft resolution submitted by Guatemala, Haiti and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2) relating to measures of implementation of the international covenant on human rights.

7. Mr. CASSIN (France) thought that the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.195/Rev.2) fell into distinct parts. The first part raised the right of individuals, groups and non-governmental organizations to submit petitions, a right which his delegation had in 1948 unreservedly supported.[2] In the light of arguments adduced since then, he had come to doubt whether that right could be implemented immediately ; but he thought it important, nevertheless, that the covenant should be so worded as to allow a suitable clause to be inserted later. As the text of the covenant would afterwards be subject to amendment only by the States signatory to it, it was important at the current stage to put no formal obstacles in the way of later acceptance of a suitable clause by other States which believed that the right of individuals to petition should be guaranteed.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

[2] See document E/CN.4/82/Add.10/Rev.1.