

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.4/SR.202
24 April 1951 31

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual Distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SECOND MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 16 April 1951, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS:

	<u>Pages</u>
1. Opening of the session	4
2. Consideration of draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (E/CN.4/536)	4 - 7
3. Election of officers (item 1 of the provisional agenda)	7 - 12
4. Adoption of the agenda (item 2 of the provisional agenda) (E/CN.4/510/Rev.1)	12 - 18

Present:

Chairman: Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America)
later: Mr. MALIX (Lebanon)

Members:

Australia	Mr. WHITLAM
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. YU
Denmark	Mr. SORENSEN
Egypt	AZMI Bey
France	Mr. CASSIN
Greece	Mr. EUSTATHIADES
India	Mrs. MEHTA
Pakistan	Mr. WAHEED
Sweden	Mrs. ROSSEL
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. KOVALENKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROSOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Miss BOWIE
Yugoslavia	Mr. JEVREMOVIC

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. JENKS
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. SAEL
World Health Organization	Dr. DORVILLE

Also present:

Mr. WEYS representing the High Commissioner for Refugees

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	Miss SENDER
International Federation of Christian Trade Unions	Mr. EDGERMANN
World Federation of United Nations Associations	Miss WILSON

Category B and Register

Caritas Internationalis	Abbé HAAS
Catholic International Union for Social Service	Miss de ROMER
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations	Mr. MOSKOWITZ Mr. KARLIKOW
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. BERNSTEIN
International Federation of University Women	Miss DUBOIS
International League for the Rights of Man	Mr. de MADAY
International Union for Child Welfare	Mrs. SMALL
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss de ROMER Miss SHRODER
Pax Romana	Mr. HUBICHT
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	Miss LER
World Jewish Congress	Mr. BIELENFELD Mr. RIEGNER Mr. LIBAN
World Union for Progressive Judaism	Mr. WOYDA

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey	Representing the Secretary- General
Mr. Das	Secretary to the Commission

ENDING OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN declared open the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights.

She announced that the Soviet Union representative had asked to make a statement before the Commission passed to the first item on the provisional agenda, the election of officers.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (E/CN.4/536)

Kr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had repeatedly informed the United Nations that members of the Kuomintang Group were not legal representatives of the Chinese people, and should be excluded from United Nations organs. It was particularly inappropriate that the Commission whose task it was to ensure the observance of human rights should not include a legal representative of the Chinese people. An elementary right of the great Chinese nation was thus being violated. The Soviet Union Government fully supported the entirely just and legal demand of the Central People's Government, and considered that an invitation to participate in the work of the Commission at its seventh session should immediately be sent to it, the representative of the Kuomintang Group, who in fact represented no one, being at the same time excluded. Such action would further the Commission's work. He accordingly submitted the following draft resolution for adoption by the Commission:

"The Commission on Human Rights

RESOLVES:

To exclude the representative of the Kuomintang Group from membership of the Social Commission;

To invite the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to take part in the Commission's work."

Mr. YU (China) recalled that his Government's right to representation in United Nations organs had been repeatedly challenged by the Soviet Union bloc, but that the challenge had never been upheld. It was deplorable that Soviet Union representatives should have made that a routine procedure, thereby disrupting the harmonious atmosphere necessary to international gatherings, by consistently introducing an element of discord where co-operation was called for. He (Mr. Yu) had on two occasions during the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council contested at great length the arguments put forward by the Soviet Union representative in support of the proposal that representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government be excluded, and regretted that valuable time had been so wasted. He would therefore not now delay the Commission by recapitulating those arguments, but would confine himself to requesting the Chairman to accord the Soviet Union draft resolution the same treatment as that given to similar resolutions in the past, and rule it out of order on three counts. First, the issue had already been dealt with by the Economic and Social Council itself at its eleventh session; the Commission on Human Rights, being one of the Council's functional commissions, was not competent to take any decision on the question of Chinese representation. Secondly, the action of Soviet Union representatives in raising the matter time after time was in direct contradiction to the spirit of Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Charter. Finally, the regime which it was suggested should be represented on the Commission had been established as a fruit of Russian aggression. In that connexion he pointed out that his country's case against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was still in the hands of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly. Moreover, through the open military intervention in Korea on the part of the Peiping Communist regime, that regime had clearly and without a shadow of doubt committed an act of aggression. As the purpose of the United Nations was to check aggression and to condemn those guilty of it, it would be absurd to invite an aggressor to participate in the deliberations of any of its organs.

Mr. KOVALENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had on numerous occasions declared its inexorable opposition to the violation of the rights of the Chinese people which the denial of their legal

representation in United Nations organs constituted. Representatives of the illegal and bankrupt Kuomintang group were at present occupying the seat which properly belonged to the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. He therefore wholeheartedly endorsed the Soviet Union draft resolution, the more so as the Commission on Human Rights should take that opportunity of exercising one of the functions for which it had been set up, namely, the protection of elementary human rights.

The CHAIRMAN regretted that she was obliged to rule the Soviet Union draft resolution out of order, because the Commission was not the appropriate forum for the consideration of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations or in any of its organs. Functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council must be allowed to proceed with their work without being called upon to consider major political issues, such as which of the two claimants should represent China in the United Nations. The matter had been raised on numerous occasions in various bodies of the United Nations. It was still before the General Assembly which had recommended in its resolution 396 (V) that

"...whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations, and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question shall be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case;"

It had further recommended that:

"... the attitude adopted by the General Assembly or its Interim Committee concerning any such question should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the specialized agencies."

In the light of the aforementioned facts it would be unconstitutional for the Commission to examine the Soviet Union draft resolution.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was obliged to challenge the Chairman's ruling. He could not agree that the terms of General Assembly resolution 396 (V) or the other arguments put forward by Mr. Yu could prevent the Commission from examining the Soviet Union draft resolution. The Commission was composed of representatives of governments, and was therefore entirely competent to take the necessary steps to ensure that China, which had been elected one of its members, should be represented by a representative of its legal government.

He did not consider it necessary to deal in detail with the slanderous charges made by the representative of the Kuomintang group against the Government of the People's Republic of China. Soviet Union representatives in various United Nations bodies had more than once exposed the absurdity and slanderous nature of allegations that the Government of the People's Republic of China had committed aggression. The allegations just made in that connexion by the representative of the Kuomintang group were equally slanderous.

The CHAIRMAN, invoking rule 44 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, said that as her ruling that the Soviet Union draft resolution was out of order had been challenged, it must be put to the vote forthwith.

The Chairman's ruling was upheld by 8 votes to 3 with 3 abstentions.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the decision taken by the Commission was wrong and illegal, since the representative of the Kuomintang group could not represent China, because the real representative of that country was the representative of the People's Republic of China.

1. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (item 1 of the provisional agenda)

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States of America, recalled that she had already presided over the work of the Commission for four years. She had been and would continue to be deeply interested in its activity, but she believed that the office of chairman should be held in rotation and that one large nation alone should not continue to hold it to the exclusion of small nations. Thanking all members for their co-operation

in the work already achieved, and welcoming the new members of the Commission, she stated that she therefore wished to nominate as chairman in succession to herself Mr. Malik, representative of Lebanon.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) said that his delegation accepted with regret the decision of the representative of the United States of America not to stand again for the chairmanship of the Commission. He had deep satisfaction in supporting the candidature of the Lebanese representative, whose work had for long been identified with the United Nations campaign for the recognition of human rights.

It was no easy task to defend human rights at the present time. There were some who preached political dogmas and denied the possibility of any progress in the field of human rights, maintaining that the only progress feasible was the total and unreserved acceptance of the totalitarian doctrines they professed. Others evinced scepticism and pessimism, and were prepared to abandon the task on the pretext of the gravity of the present political situation. The United States representative had fought all her life against both dogmatists and sceptics. The support she had given to the aspirations of the peoples and her unceasing struggle against the crime of racial discrimination were common knowledge. It was with those facts in mind that his delegation had wished to pay tribute to the distinguished representative of the United States of America.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom), expressing her warm appreciation of the work done by Mrs. Roosevelt in her capacity as Chairman of the Commission, supported the nomination of Mr. Malik, under whose chairmanship the Commission could look forward to achieving fruitful results.

Mr. MEROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also supported the Chairman's proposal. He believed that Mr. Malik, with his great experience, could help the Commission to solve the vital problems before it.

Mrs. MEHTA (India), expressing her regret that Mrs. Roosevelt should be relinquishing the Chair after performing such valuable service during the past four years, warmly welcomed the nomination of Mr. Malik as her successor.

Mr. CASSIN (France) joined in the tribute paid to Mrs. Roosevelt for her work in the field of human rights, particularly since the establishment of the Nuclear Commission, of which she had also been Chairman.

The French delegation regretted Mrs. Roosevelt's decision, but respected the spirit in which it had been taken. In particular, he shared her view that it was preferable for the Chairman of the Commission not to be the representative of a large country.

He unreservedly supported the nomination of Mr. Malik, both because of his personal qualities, and as the representative of a country with an ancient tradition of civilization.

Mr. YU (China) said that his Government deeply regretted the Chairman's decision not to contemplate another term of office. The part she had played in the work of the Commission had become history. The Commission could best express its appreciation of her services by persevering in its efforts in the field in which she had laboured. He also warmly supported the nomination of Mr. Malik, knowing that under his leadership the Commission would continue to build on the foundations laid by the retiring Chairman.

Mr. JEVERKOVIC (Yugoslavia) associated himself with the regret expressed at Mrs. Roosevelt's relinquishment of the chair, and supported the nomination of Mr. Malik.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) warmly supported the nomination of Mr. Malik. He had served long enough on the Commission to have become fully aware of Mr. Malik's valuable contribution to its work, and of his outstanding ability and knowledge of United Nations affairs and procedure. He expressed the liveliest regret that Mrs. Roosevelt should have declined to continue as chairman, a decision which had been taken in a spirit of self-abnegation and

understanding. He thanked her for her gracious conduct of the Commission's deliberations, which had greatly contributed to the maintenance of a harmonious spirit.

Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that, although a new member of the Commission, he could state that his country was deeply conscious of the vital contribution made to the Commission's work by the retiring Chairman. He warmly supported the nomination of Mr. Malik.

AMRI Bey (Egypt) said he, too, would regretfully defer to Mrs. Roosevelt's decision not to continue as chairman of the Commission. He felt great satisfaction at the Commission's unanimous support of the nomination of Mr. Malik. The latter came from a country very near Egypt, and his work in the field of human rights was known and appreciated throughout the world. Accordingly, the Egyptian delegation unreservedly supported his nomination.

Mr. Malik (Lebanon) was unanimously elected Chairman and took the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN, expressing his gratitude for the confidence shown him, said that, although keenly aware of his own inadequacy, he would do his utmost to justify the trust placed in him. All members of the Commission who had served during Mrs. Roosevelt's term of office knew how much she had contributed to its work. As Rapporteur, he himself had had an unusual opportunity of working with her and of gaining valuable experience. He had heard with great regret of her decision to relinquish the chairmanship.

The Roosevelt family was intimately associated with the work of the United Nations in the field of human rights. The Four Freedoms had been formulated by President Roosevelt, and it had been due to his inspiration that the fight against fascism had been conceived in terms of the defence of human rights. The name of Mrs. Roosevelt had become closely associated with the subsequent attempts to protect and promote those rights. She had lent her unique authority and prestige to the Commission's work. He counted it a great personal honour to have served with her, and would be fortified in the task that lay before him by her continued presence, guidance and friendship.

At present, political issues tended to loom large and to overshadow economic and social questions and matters relating to human rights. Nevertheless, one of the precepts of Article 55 of the Charter should always be remembered, namely, that peaceful relations between nations were only possible on the basis of universal respect for human rights. Where deep political divergencies existed between States, the latter frequently accused each other of having in some way derogated from the dignity of man either by violation of basic economic and social rights, or by neglect and denial of spiritual and personal values. Work in the field of human rights was crucial to the whole work of the United Nations for peace, because to resolve political differences a common concept of the nature of man must be evolved. Unpropitious as the political situation was, the work of the Commission, although unexciting, was essential to the achievement of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. In that knowledge he had accepted the honour done to him, and appealed for the co-operation of all members in the arduous tasks that lay ahead.

The Commission had now to elect its two Vice-Chairmen. In his capacity as Chairman, and also as representative of Lebanon, he would like to nominate as First Vice-Chairman Mr. Cassin, who had been so intimately connected with the Commission's labours.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), Mrs. RAJES (India), and Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) seconded the Chairman's nomination.

Mr. Cassin (France) was unanimously elected First Vice-Chairman.

Mr. CASSIN (France) thanked the Commission for the confidence it had shown in him; he paid tribute to the representative of India, and proposed her nomination for the office of Second Vice-Chairman.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), and the CHAIRMAN seconded the French representative's proposal.

Mrs. Mehta (India) was unanimously elected Second Vice-Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the office of Rapporteur.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) proposed Mr. Whitlam (Australia)

The CHAIRMAN and Mr. CASSIN (France) seconded the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. Whitlam (Australia) was unanimously elected Rapporteur.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) thanked the Commission for the confidence shown in him.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (item 2 of the provisional agenda) (E/CN.4/510/Rev.1).

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the items listed in the provisional agenda.

Mr. CASSIN (France) wished to ask the Secretariat to arrange for distribution in French of documents essential to the Commission's work. He observed that he had not received the French texts of documents E/CN.4/304/Add.3, E/CN.4/514 and E/CN.4/529. Those were essential documents, and his and other french-speaking delegations would be unable to take their due part in the Commission's work if they lacked the French versions.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed the importance of prompt translation of all basic documents into Russian in accordance with the relevant rules of procedure concerning the official languages. In order to work efficiently it was essential for his and certain other delegations to have the great majority of official documents in Russian translation.

Mr. JEVRENOVIC (Yugoslavia) supported the French representative. The Commission had to deal with extremely important matters, and he would be virtually unable to work unless he had the requisite documents in French.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the Secretariat and had been informed that the gaps in the documentation referred to were due to the fact that the Headquarters Secretariat had been working under great pressure. The Secretariat wished to offer its apologies, with the assurance that the matter would be corrected in the near future.

He recalled that in the past the procedure had been to adopt the agenda as a whole and then, if necessary, to consider the order in which the various items should be taken. That procedure was not always necessary, and the Commission could, if it so desired, leave the order of the items to the discretion of the Chairman in consultation with the Secretariat. However, the Commission was at all times master of its own procedure, and could review later any decision taken at the present stage.

The provisional agenda (E/CN.4/510/Rev.1) was unanimously adopted.

Mr. CASSIN (France) emphasised the difference in relative importance of the various questions listed under item 3 of the Commission's agenda. He suggested that the first step should be to consider what method of work should be adopted. In his opinion, it would be advisable for the Commission to set up a working party to enable it to examine conjointly items 3 (b) and 3 (c) forthwith. In any event, the Commission should not decide automatically to take the questions on the agenda in the order in which they were listed.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Commission should follow the numerical order of the items as listed in the provisional agenda; it would thus be able to prepare for consideration of the various items in sequence. The French representative had spoken about the order of the headings under item 3, and he (Mr. Morosov) supported the suggestion that the Commission should first take up item 3 (b). The first eighteen articles of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights, which covered a vast number of such rights, had been extensively discussed in the recent past and, although his delegation had certain observations to make concerning the merits of those articles and the desirability of adding to them, it could justly be asserted that that part of the draft Covenant was more or less complete. On the other hand, it was regrettable that economic and social rights, as well as rights in the cultural sphere, had not been satisfactorily dealt with in the previous three years; those rights opened up fresh territory for consideration, and it was high time that the Commission drafted specific articles on human rights in those three spheres.

Another argument for considering item 3 (b) first was that it related to fundamental rights, the inclusion of which in the draft Covenant would facilitate the implementation of other rights; a great number of important issues would arise when the Commission came to consider human rights.

During the earlier discussions on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the draft International Covenant his delegation had emphasized the unsatisfactory nature of the existing draft of the Covenant and the inadequacy of the provisions bearing on economic, social and cultural rights. For those reasons he urged the Commission to study the question of those rights at an early stage, for they constituted one of the most vital of the session's tasks.

After item 3 (b) the Commission should take up item 3 (a) and consider the advisability of adding further provisions to the draft Covenant. The General Assembly itself had considered the existing provisions to be inadequate. Subsequently, items 3 (d), 3 (a) and 3 (c) should be studied, in that order.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that, as she understood it, the French representative had proposed the establishment of working groups to work simultaneously on various matters. Her experience prompted her to suggest that, at least at the outset, the Commission should consider its work in plenary meeting. Sometimes work done in sub-committees or other subsidiary bodies had to be re-done in plenary, which meant a waste of time. She hoped therefore that the Commission would start on the lines she had indicated; at a later stage it might, if necessary, decide that some aspects could be profitably studied in sub-committees.

She agreed that item 3 (a) could be left on one side for a certain time, but disagreed with the Soviet Union representative that item 3 (c) should be the last of the sub-items to be considered under item 3. On the contrary, she felt that item 3 (c) might almost be taken up first, and followed by item 3 (b), for both items dealt with very important issues. Item 3 (c) and Articles 19 to 21 of the draft Covenant could be taken up simultaneously, and members could, at the same time, introduce whatever new suggestions they thought fit. Whereas it might be asserted that it was difficult to say what could be done in the way of

implementation until the terms of the Covenant were known, it might also be replied that it was difficult to specify what should be included in the Covenant until the measures for implementing its provisions were known. Thus it might expedite the work if the Commission were first to take up item 3 (c), then items 3 (b) and 3 (a).

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the United States and Soviet Union delegations apparently agreed that item 3 (a) should not be taken first. Such agreement augured well for the future work of the Commission. The Soviet Union representative wished item 3 (b) to be studied first; the United States member was not opposed to that, but suggested that the Commission should consider the possibility of first taking up item 3 (c).

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) thought that in view of the complexity of the questions which the Commission had to consider, and of the short time at its disposal, it would be well to consider item 3 (b) first, as the Soviet Union representative had proposed. Like the United States representative, he recognized that item 3 (c) also was important; he felt, therefore, that it should be taken immediately after item 3 (b).

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the constructive compromise suggested by the Chilean member. He hoped that the Soviet Union and United States delegations would be able to agree to start with item 3 (b) and then go on to item 3 (c).

Mr. CASSIN (France), like the United States representative, felt that it would be advisable first to have a short general discussion on all the subsections of item 3. He proposed that the Commission should start with item 3 (b), refer to a working party any concrete proposals made in connexion therewith, and then proceed to item 3 (c).

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) agreed that items 3 (b) and 3 (c) were very important. It would therefore be difficult for some members to sit in a working group dealing with item 3 (b) while item 3 (c), which was of equal concern to them, was being discussed at plenary meetings.

With regard to item 3 (c), she recalled that the matter of implementation had always been a major consideration, but had not received all the attention it deserved at the end of the sixth session. At an early stage it had been felt that it was essential first to know what provisions should be included in the draft Covenant before their implementation could be considered, but now that the Commission had drafted the main body of the convention it was important to know what measure of implementation was possible. She felt that item 3 (c) should be the first point to be dealt with in plenary session, to be followed by items 3 (b), 3 (a), 3 (e) and 3 (d).

Mr. SØRENSEN (Denmark) supported the United Kingdom representative. The Danish delegation consisted of only one member, and it was therefore impracticable, so far as it was concerned, for the Commission and sub-committees to sit simultaneously, although it might be possible to arrange the programme of work in such a way as to avoid that. But in view of the advantage to be gained by delegating work to subsidiary groups, two or more of which could meet at the same time, he would advocate a general discussion of items 3 (b) and 3 (c) at plenary meetings, in the course of which particular aspects could be referred to working groups, in which they could receive adequate consideration.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was pleased to note that there seemed to be some measure of agreement between the United States and his own delegation on item 3 (b); at least the United States delegation did not object to that item 3 being considered first. He was prepared to meet the other delegations halfway, and would therefore amend his proposal. His new suggestion was that the sub-sections of item 3 should be considered in the following order: 3 (b), 3 (a), 3 (c), 3 (d) and 3 (e). He was suggesting that item 3 (a) should be taken up after item 3 (b) because, as the United States representative had remarked, it was impossible to discuss how certain measures were to be implemented without first knowing what those measures were. It was in the same light that he interpreted the suggestion of the United Kingdom member regarding the change in the order of items. The general feeling seemed to be

that it was imperative first to discuss item 3 (b), followed by item 3 (a); it was necessary to begin by formulating the basis of the Covenant and then to consider measures for its implementation.

AZHI Bey (Egypt) drew attention to the special nature of the question covered by item 3 (e). It concerned a General Assembly resolution which contained a text, not an instruction. That fact would no doubt make it easier for the Commission to examine the question.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) pointed out, to dispel a slight misunderstanding, that she had not adduced as a valid argument that the Commission could not first discuss measures for implementation. It was her feeling - and one shared by the United Kingdom representative - that, in the light of previous discussions, it was better to consider the matter of implementation first. She agreed that item 3 (b) was very important, but stressed that item 3 (c) was equally so, because the Commission had to know to what extent actual implementation of the terms of the draft Covenant would be possible. She had not at first pressed for consideration of item 3 (c) before item 3 (b), although she believed that to be the best procedure, because she had wished to hear the views of the other members. She did not consider item 3 (b) to be any more important than item 3 (c), and the French and United Kingdom representatives had advocated the discussion of item 3 (c) before item 3 (b).

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) said that the Commission was not concerned with deciding whether item 3 (b) was more important than item 3 (c) or vice versa, but with choosing the most logical order of work.

The Commission, he felt, could hardly consider the question of implementation before it had decided whether economic, social and cultural rights were to be included in the Covenant, and would therefore also have to be implemented. It was true that some delegations were of the opinion that it would be possible to work out a uniform method of implementation applicable to all classes of rights; but there were others which did not share that view, and he was therefore of the opinion that item 3 (b) should be taken first.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) said that he had originally been in favour of taking the items in the order in which they were listed in the agenda, all the items of which were important and inter-related. He was anxious to see the completion of at least some part of the Commission's work. At previous sessions the Commission had discussed what might constitute the first part of its work, and he hoped that it would be possible to complete that part.

After listening to the various arguments, he was in favour of the order advocated by the Soviet Union representative, as he considered it to be the most logical. Item 3 (b) raised questions of basic importance requiring settlement. By taking up item 3 (b) first, the Commission would reach agreement on the substance of the draft International Covenant. Item 3 (b) should be followed by the consideration of item 3 (a), and then of the other items as indicated by the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. CASSIN (France) withdrew his proposal, as he considered that the United States proposal was the most logical. Should the latter be rejected, however, he would support the United Kingdom proposal.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) proposed that item 3 (c) be discussed first, followed by item 3 (b). After discussing those items, the Commission could, if necessary, refer to working groups certain issues arising out of the discussion. Item 3 (a) should follow item 3 (b).

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal that item 3 (b) be considered first.

The proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 4 with no abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the proposal that item 3 (c) should be considered immediately after item 3 (b).

The proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 6.

It was finally agreed that the various sub-sections of item 3 should be taken in the following order: 3 (b), 3 (c), 3 (a), 3 (d) and 3 (e).

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.