

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.242 9  
6 July 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND  
FRENCH



Dual distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 14 May 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Pages

1. Future Programme of Work 4 - 11
2. Draft International Covenant on Human Rights and Measures of Implementation (item 3 of the agenda):
  - (b) Inclusion in the Covenant of provisions concerning economic, social and cultural rights:

Draft articles on the implementation of provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights (E/CN.4/570/Rev.2, E/CN.4/622, E/CN.4/623, E/CN.4/624, E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.5) (resumed from the 241st meeting)

11 - 20

Present:Chairman: Mr. KALLIA (Lebanon)Members:

Australia	Mr. WHITLAN
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. YU
Denmark	Mr. SÖRENSEN
Egypt	AZAI Bey
France	Mr. CASSIN
Greece	Mr. EUSTATHIADES
Guatemala	Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN
India	Mrs. KHETA
Pakistan	Mr. WJHEED
Sweden	Mrs. RÖSJEL
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. KOVLENKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KORUSOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Miss BOYLE
United States of America	Mrs. ROOSEVELT
Uruguay	Mr. CASULLO
Yugoslavia	Mr. JEVREJAVIĆ

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. PICHFORD
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BARNATE
World Health Organization	Miss HOWELL

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	Miss SENDER
World Federation of United Nations Associations	Mr. BALDWIN

Category B and Register

All Pakistan Women's Association	Mrs. WHEED
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	Mrs. CARTER
Catholic International Union for Social Service	Miss de ROMER Mrs. SCHRAMMER
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations	Mr. MOSKOWITZ
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. WARBURG
International Association of Penal Law	Mr. HUBBICHT
International Council of Women	Mrs. CARTER
International Federation of Business and Professional Women	Miss TOMLINSON
International Federation of University Women	Miss ROBB
International League for the Rights of Man	Mr. BALDWIN
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss de ROMER Miss RICHMOND
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations	Miss ROBB
World Jewish Congress	Mr. BIENENFELD Mr. RIEGNER

Secretariat:

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

## 1. FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN recalled the Commission's decision, taken at the 240th meeting, that the present meeting should open with a discussion on the future programme of work. In his view there were four possibilities open to the Commission. First, it might decide to complete as much as it could of the agenda before 19 May, and report to the Economic and Social Council on that basis, requesting the Council to decide what should be done about the items remaining undealt with; secondly, it might decide to defer consideration of the uncompleted items of the agenda until its next session; thirdly, it might request the Economic and Social Council to consider the possibility of convening another session of the Commission prior to the opening of the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris with a view to enabling it to complete its agenda; fourthly, it might decide to extend the present session beyond 19 May.

He was sure that the General Assembly had not realized the heavy burden it was imposing upon the Commission by adopting resolution 421 (V). It might, he felt, be advisable to decide to complete the work on the draft Covenant at the present session, and leave the question of the remaining items of the agenda to the Economic and Social Council. The Secretariat had informed him that should the Commission decide to meet for a few days after 19 May, suitable arrangements could be made for it to do so.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) doubted whether any useful purpose would be served by extending the session for a short period beyond the scheduled date of closure. Moreover, some members would find it difficult, if not impossible, to remain in Geneva after 19 May for personal reasons.

She would therefore propose that the Commission endeavour to complete by that date its work on the articles relating to the implementation of the provisions on economic, social and cultural rights, on the implementation of articles relating to part II of the draft Covenant, and on the provisions for the receipt and examination of petitions from individuals and organizations

about alleged violations of the Covenant. If, after finishing that task, the Commission still had time, it could take up any of the other items relating to the draft Covenant. She also felt that the Commission should report to the Economic and Social Council that it had not had time to re-consider the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant or to deal with any of the other items of its agenda. It would however have covered all the points essential to further consideration of the draft Covenant by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

Miss BOWLE (United Kingdom) thought the Commission should transmit to the Economic and Social Council that part of its work which had definitely been completed. Two sessions had already been devoted to the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant, so that it should not take long to complete final consideration of those articles and of the question of their implementation. In her view, therefore, that should be the first item on the future programme of work. In transmitting to the Economic and Social Council that completed section of the draft Covenant, the Commission could make clear to the General Assembly how heavy a task it had had to accomplish in the relatively short time at its disposal. It was essential that before the new articles on economic and social rights came before the Third Committee of the General Assembly they should be sent to governments for their comments. She wondered whether that could be done in time for the next session of the General Assembly, and whether it would be proper for the draft Covenant and the comments of governments to be placed before the General Assembly without having first been considered by the Economic and Social Council.

The United Kingdom delegation was not in favour of extending the present session beyond 19 May; to do so would hardly enable the Commission to dispose of all the items on its agenda. With regard to the suggestion that an extra session be held in the autumn, she doubted whether the comments of governments would be received in time to make that possible. It might be better to contemplate convening an additional session early in 1952, when the comments of governments would be available and there would be some prospect of completing the agenda.

AZHI Bey (Egypt) hoped that the Commission would be able to complete consideration of item 3 of the agenda. Point (d) of item 3 ("Study of a federal state article"), however, raised such a delicate question that it might well be transmitted, without previous examination by the Commission, via the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly. Point (c) (The territorial application of the Covenant) could be settled in a few minutes, since it merely involved including in the draft Covenant a text already drafted and approved by the General Assembly. It should then be possible to complete the study of items 3 (a), (b) and (c) at the present session. However, should the Commission find at the end of the week that two or three more days were required to complete the study of those three points, a brief extension of the session would have to be considered.

Mr. JAVRENOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) thought that the Commission should be guided entirely by the directives of the General Assembly. As, therefore, he could not see how it could do otherwise than complete the entire draft Covenant, including economic, social and cultural rights and measures of implementation, he would suggest that it should continue in session for so long as was necessary for that purpose. Should it prove impossible to complete the entire agenda even under those conditions, it should ask the Economic and Social Council to provide it with an opportunity of meeting again before the next session of the General Assembly.

Mr. CILSULLO (Uruguay) thought, like the United States representative, that a number of delegations would probably be unable to stay on in Geneva after 19 May. The Commission should accordingly complete its study of measures for the implementation both of economic, social and cultural rights and of the other rights; it should also complete the revision of the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant. It could then in its report to the Economic and Social Council, request permission to hold a special session before the next session of the General Assembly with a view to finishing off its agenda.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought the discussion premature, since no one knew what would have been achieved by the

end of the week. He believed that much could still be done, provided the work was properly organized. The Commission should therefore regard the present discussion as simply a preliminary exchange of views and should defer its final decision, which would more properly be taken towards the end of the session. The question of implementation could be dealt with quickly, unless some delegations sought to drag out its consideration for ulterior motives. The United States representative had suggested that the Commission should complete its examination of the question of the machinery for the receipt and examination of petitions from individuals and organizations, to which she appeared to attach importance. He considered that item to be much less important than many of the others on the agenda. With regard to the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the Commission should complete the revision of the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant, he felt that that part of the draft Covenant had been so well prepared that, even though some delegations wished to propose amendments to the articles in question, the work could be finished off relatively quickly. His delegation had urged earlier in the session that the question of the revision of the first eighteen articles of the Covenant should precede consideration of the question of their implementation, and he would again make that proposal formally, although he would not object to a rapid discussion of the question of implementation before the revision of those articles was undertaken.

In his view, the proper course for the Commission would be to decide not to take a final decision on the programme of work at the present stage, but to proceed with its agreed agenda as quickly as possible, taking up item 3(a) after disposing of the question of implementation, and then going on to the other proposals submitted. When all the work had been finished, the Commission could properly consider how it should proceed in respect of the remainder of the agenda. He felt that the question of the federal state clause should certainly be studied at the present session, and that it might ultimately prove worth while to extend the session for a few days.

Mr. YU (China) considered it desirable that whatever the Commission might decide to transmit to the General Assembly should be in completed form, for the General Assembly had clearly expected to receive a full draft Covenant.

Failure on the part of the Commission to satisfy those expectations might be regarded as a reflection on the wisdom of the General Assembly in assigning such a task to the Commission, and might handicap the General Assembly in its consideration of the matter. The Commission should, therefore, make every effort to complete the work on the draft Covenant and, if necessary, request the Economic and Social Council to make provision for another short session before the next session of the General Assembly, or, provided the rules of procedure did not prohibit it, to arrange for the Commission to give further consideration to the draft Covenant during the early part of the Assembly session itself.

Mr. WHITLAK (Australia) submitted that the question of extending the present session, even for a few days, depended upon the number of members who could stay on in Geneva after 19 May. It would, of course, be incorrect to extend the session unless practically all delegations could do so.

For the time being, he took the view that, after completing its work on the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights and of civil and political rights, and on the machinery for dealing with petitions from individuals and organizations, the Commission should take up item 3 (a) of the agenda. If there was any question of an extra session, it would seem wisest for the Commission to fix as its objective the submission of a full draft Covenant, together with the comments of governments, to the 1952 session of the General Assembly. He considered that in any event it should have an opportunity of completing its own work on the draft Covenant before the latter was sent to the General Assembly.

Mr. CASSIN (France) regretted that he would be obliged to leave Geneva on the date originally fixed for the closure of the session. He thought, however, that the Commission could claim to have done good work. The articles relating to economic, social and cultural rights had been given definite shape for the first time, and a partial study had been made of the measures of implementation. The completion of the study of those measures should have priority. As to the first eighteen articles, while his delegation had itself submitted few amendments to that part of the draft Covenant, it saw no objection to those articles



being reviewed, if time allowed. He would propose that the Commission's report on its seventh session be circulated to governments at the end of the week, so as to enable the Economic and Social Council to decide whether the work on the draft Covenant had progressed far enough. Should the Council decide that it had, the question would then arise of holding a special session of the Commission before the General Assembly met again. If, on the other hand, the Council considered that the Commission's work was not sufficiently far advanced, it might decide not to transmit the draft Covenant to the General Assembly until 1952.

Mrs. MEHTA (India) thought that it would be difficult, in view of the personal plans of some members of the Commission, to extend the present session, and that the Commission should try to finish its work on the measures for implementation, and then proceed with the revision of the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant. The articles on economic, social and cultural rights had been dealt with in the course of a single session, and left something to be desired. That being the case, and since they had in any event to be submitted to governments for their comments, they should be revised in the light of those comments before being transmitted to the General Assembly; otherwise, they might look rather slipshod.

Mr. SÖRENSEN (Denmark) was in favour of maintaining the programme of work agreed upon at the 202nd meeting, namely, that consideration of items 3 (b) and 3 (c) of the agenda should be followed by consideration of items 3 (a), 3 (d) and 3 (e). The session should close on 19 May, and it should be left to the Economic and Social Council to take a decision on those items of the agenda not disposed of. He suggested that the Commission should follow the procedure adopted at its sixth session, when it had decided to submit to the Economic and Social Council the draft Covenant together with summary records of the two sessions devoted to its preparation.

Mr. Bey (Egypt) thought that a distinction should be made between those items which had been on the Commission's agenda for one year or more and those placed on it more recently. It would be preferable for the Commission to adhere to its previous practice of giving priority to the study of new questions, so that, by the end of the session, the whole of its work might have reached more or less the same stage. It should therefore complete its study of the measures of implementation, commence consideration of questions relating to the procedure for petitions and then consider the question of the right of peoples to self-determination. If it then had any time left, it should consider, in turn, the first eighteen articles of the draft Covenant, the federal state article and, finally, the territorial application of the Covenant.

The CHAIRMAN said that so far as item 3 (e) of the agenda (territorial application) was concerned, he would rule that the text prepared by the General Assembly be incorporated in the Commission's draft of the Covenant. That would not, of course, prevent any member from making a statement on that item at the report stage.

If it was the Commission's wish, he would put to the vote the Egyptian suggestion that, after the Commission had completed its work on the measures for implementation, it should proceed with item 3 (c) of the agenda.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) proposed, as an amendment to the Egyptian suggestion, that item 3 (a) of the agenda should be taken once the measures for implementation had been dealt with.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking to a point of order, recalled that he had previously moved that the Commission should not take a final decision for the moment. Consequently, his motion should be voted upon first. He would formally propose that the Commission decide to defer further consideration of its future programme of work for two or three days, and to continue in the meantime with the programme adopted at the 202nd meeting.

The CHAIRMAN put the Soviet Union proposal to the vote.

The Soviet Union proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions.

Mr. YU (China) explaining his vote, stated that he had been unable to support the Soviet Union proposal because it had been moved too late. As the Commission had decided at the 240th meeting that the present meeting should start with a discussion on the future programme of work, the Soviet Union proposal should have been made at the beginning of the meeting.

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION  
(item 3 of the agenda):

b. Inclusion in the Covenant of provisions concerning economic, social and cultural rights:

Draft articles on the implementation of provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights (E/CN.4/570/Rev.2, E/CN.4/622, E/CN.4/623, E/CN.4/624, E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.5) (resumed from the 241st meeting).

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to resume its discussion of the draft articles on the implementation of provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights.

Mrs. ROSSZEL (Sweden) explained that the joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal (E/CN.4/622) was an attempt to fuse the Lebanese proposal (E/CN.4/570/Rev.2) with the International Labour Organisation's original suggestions (E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.5), and that one of its main objects was to establish the Economic and Social Council as the primary co-ordinating body, in accordance with the spirit underlying the Lebanese proposal. Any suggestion that the joint Pakistani/Swedish draft was a mere repetition of the International Labour Organisation's suggestions overlooked the fact that it included a number of points made in the Lebanese proposal. The Swedish Government was closely associated with the work of the International Labour Organisation, had submitted reports to the various specialized agencies, and gave careful study to the conclusions reached by the experts who examined such reports. Consequently, her delegation could not but view with misgiving any duplication of the experts' work by an organ the members of which would lack the special knowledge and

experience of the experts. It was with that consideration in mind that it supported the idea that the Economic and Social Council should act as the overall co-ordinating body, a suggestion which was entirely in accordance with article 58 of the United Nations Charter. Like the Chairman, she took the view that there was no gulf, either in principle or in practice, separating the specialized agencies and the United Nations. Her delegation would be only too pleased to take part in discussions, either formal or private, with a view to arriving at a common text representing a consensus of the views expressed during the discussion.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) favoured the joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal, although she felt that it might be wiser to omit the preamble, which developed certain controversial themes that would be inappropriate in the Covenant. The Lebanese proposal, despite the provisions of articles 2 and 4, was objectionable in that it would involve the creation of a new body entrusted with the task of reviewing the work of the specialized agencies. Again, she considered that the Covenant should not be used as a means of imposing obligations on the General Assembly in respect of the action it should take in the field of technical assistance.

While she appreciated the concept of equality among nations underlying the French proposal (E/CN.4/623), she felt that it failed to achieve its purpose, for it would have the effect of making General Assembly recommendations mandatory on States which signed the Covenant, but not on other Member States of the United Nations. Her delegation would therefore support the Pakistani/Swedish proposal.

Mr. VILLENZUELA (Chile) remarked that the arguments in favour of or against any of the three proposals relating to the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights arose out of the divergent views held by delegations with respect to the powers and mutual relations of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. States Members of the United Nations formed the majority of the membership of the specialized agencies. A dispute on the score of

competence was hardly conceivable between organizations which, while to all outward appearances having a separate existence, had, in effect, at least so far as States were concerned, an identical mission. It was not for the representatives of States to praise or criticise the specialized agencies, which owed their existence to those same States, whose tacit approval of their activities was adequately demonstrated by the fact of their collaborating with them and contributing to their funds. It was for public opinion to pass judgment on the work done by the specialized agencies.

Although all the representatives on the Commission were ardent champions of the United Nations and of the Charter, it might be pointed out that countries like Chile, which were members of the Pan-American system, (itself incorporated within the United Nations), refused to join other continental blocs or systems because they neither recognized, nor wished to recognize, any bloc other than the community of the United Nations. In their eyes, the specialized agencies derived their immense value from the fact that they made the work of the United Nations a practical possibility. Compared with the United Nations, the specialized agencies were like the trees in a wood. The whole forest must not be neglected out of excessive concern for the condition of one tree. His delegation would therefore defend, ardently and even fanatically, the functions, powers and responsibilities of the United Nations.

Of the various proposals before the Commission, his delegation would vote for that of Lebanon, though at the same time it appreciated the valuable ideas contained in the French proposal and the useful points made in the joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal.

The Commission, realizing that the discussion would be taken up again by the Economic and Social Council and later by the General Assembly itself, was faced with two alternative courses. Either it could entrust the preparation of a joint text to a working group composed of the authors of the three drafts before the Commission and a few other representatives, or alternatively it might, as had been done the previous year in similar circumstances, submit the three texts to the Economic and Social Council with the request that that body

resolve the difficulty which the Commission had itself been unable to overcome.

Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMINE (Guatemala) considered that the Lebanese proposal was perfectly right in emphasizing the jurisdiction vested in the United Nations. The disadvantage of that proposal was, however, that by seeking to set up yet another supervisory body, it implied a fresh burden on States. The joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal, while embodying excellent principles, did not provide for any intermediate body below the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. It appeared to him, therefore, that the French proposal was the best, because it recognized the competence of the Commission on Human Rights side by side with the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council.

He favoured the suggestion just put forward that the task of preparing a joint text capable of commanding general support be entrusted to a drafting committee composed of the authors of the proposals at present under examination and a few other representatives, including those of Chile and Denmark.

Mr. CIASULLO (Uruguay) considered the French proposal the best, because it recognized the pre-eminence of the Charter, the competence of the Commission on Human Rights and the necessity for co-ordinating action with that of the specialized agencies. At the same time, he approved some of the ideas expressed in the Lebanese proposal. He, too, considered that the Chilean representatives should be a member of any drafting group set up.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) asked whether the proposals submitted by the representative of Australia, Denmark and the United States of America set out in document E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.5, had been withdrawn.

Turning to the French proposal, she drew attention to the difficulty that would arise if the Covenant, as had been decided at the sixth session, was to come into force after ratification by twenty States. The latter would then be under the obligation to submit reports to the General Assembly, with the result that States which had not acceded to the Covenant, and would therefore not have incurred any obligations, would be able to voice their opinions and criticisms

of those reports. Consequently, States which assumed the obligations would be placed at a disadvantage.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to the United Kingdom representative, said that all the proposals submitted on implementation were still before the Commission.

Mr. YU (China) had listened with interest to the statements made by representatives who were clearly anxious to share in the work without stressing national considerations. He agreed with the Chairman who, speaking in his capacity as representative of Lebanon, had emphasized that the provisions of the Charter must be fully respected. In the case of the specialized agencies, the United Nations had delegated certain powers to those agencies in accordance with the Charter. It should therefore not be difficult to reconcile the Lebanese representative's attitude with that expressed by the representatives of the specialized agencies. But it would be improper to stipulate that States parties to the Covenant should submit reports to specialized agencies. In accordance with United Nations procedure, they were obliged to report to the General Assembly; indeed, no legal document could even contain a reference to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, even though it might be held that he represented the United Nations.

He (Mr. Yu) was prepared to support the proposal that a drafting group be set up to examine the three new drafts submitted on implementation, and to prepare an agreed text.

Turning to the Lebanese proposal, he expressed the view that the setting up of a special body to examine the reports to be submitted by the States parties to the Covenant would not only have procedural disadvantage, but might also lend support to the contention that economic, social and cultural rights formed an instrument quite separate from the rest of the Covenant.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) said that, in the Australian delegation's view, the specialized agencies were the competent organs in their respective spheres,

and that their responsibilities should neither be exaggerated nor minimized. Inter-relationships and functions had been adequately defined in the Charter and other instruments, such as the working agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, so that further elaboration was unnecessary.

He supported the proposal that a drafting group be set up, but did not wish for the time being to withdraw his own proposal (E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.5).

As to the committee envisaged in the Lebanese proposal, the discussion had made it abundantly clear that the Commission hesitated to adopt that solution. The Australian delegation, too, felt that existing bodies should be used to the fullest possible extent. He must, however, pay tribute to the constructive approach reflected in a proposal which had led to such full and interesting discussion in the Commission and which had so pertinently influenced the other texts before the Commission.

No reference to the Technical Assistance Board should be made in the articles relating to the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights. Such references would be more appropriately embodied in a resolution addressed to the Economic and Social Council, since it was earnestly to be hoped that the Technical Assistance Board would prove to be a temporary body, set up as it had been for the purpose of achieving within a reasonable space of time such equality between the various nations as would enable them all to implement economic, social and cultural rights. He would add that when he spoke of equality he did not mean uniformity.

He agreed with the point just made by the United Kingdom representative, and recalled that the French delegation had formerly advocated that the Covenant should come into force after ratification by two-thirds of the States Members of the United Nations. At its sixth session, however, the Commission had decided that ratification by twenty States would suffice. In the Australian Government's opinion, the original French proposal was preferable, and he would urge that it be reconsidered, since in order to be effective the Covenant would have to command the support of a considerable number of countries.



He would be prepared to accept the French proposal that supervision be made the responsibility of the Commission on Human Rights. As to the joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal, he doubted the necessity for prefacing the specific provisions relating to the submission of reports by so detailed a preamble. In general, the suggestions relating to reporting in all three proposals were acceptable to his delegation.

Finally, and with reference to the procedures contemplated, he would submit that Chapter X of the Charter, which covered the organization and procedures of the Economic and Social Council, was sufficiently full and flexible to serve as the most reliable guide in the task of putting a system of reporting on foot.

Mr. CASSIN (France) read out a new draft article, which, he thought, might serve as a preamble to the text to be adopted by the Commission:

"The general responsibility for the maintenance of peace, international security and the universal and effective observance of human rights rests with the United Nations. In particular, the Commission on Human Rights, which has been set up, in virtue of the Charter, under the Economic and Social Council, has been given as its primary task the submission of proposals, recommendations and reports on all questions concerning human rights.

"The specialized agencies, for their part, have been made normally responsible under their respective Constitutions and the terms of their agreements with the United Nations, for appropriate action at international level for promoting respect for the economic, social and cultural rights and liberties within their competence."

He had been surprised to see that his proposal had been interpreted in some quarters as imposing different obligations on signatories and non-signatories of the Covenant, whereas in point of fact the same obligations would devolve on all States members of the United Nations. He was quite prepared to be conciliatory, but he must point out that, side by side with the organ whose task it would be, so to speak, to censure those who failed to fulfil their obligations on the basis of complaints relating to non-observance of the provisions of the Covenant, there must be a constructive body to supervise the conduct of States

by studying individual reports. It should be clearly laid down that the latter function would be the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council, assisted by the Commission on Human Rights and, where necessary in the case of rights of a highly technical nature, by experts.

Mr. SØRENSEN (Denmark) said that since the Danish proposal (E/CN.4/SR.242/Add.5) had been submitted some time ago and was no longer in keeping with the trend of the discussion, he would withdraw it.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that she would maintain her proposal until she had had an opportunity of examining an agreed text.

Mrs. MEHTA (India) said that for her part she found it difficult to support any of the three proposals before the Commission, as there were some good points in each of them. It would, however, be possible to bring them together and harmonise them, as they all agreed that the final responsibility for implementation rested with the United Nations though each envisaged a different method of procedure. For instance, the joint Pakistani/Swedish proposal entrusted the specialized agencies with the responsibility of submitting reports to the Economic and Social Council, but gave no clear indication as to what the Council should do on receipt of those reports. Again, whereas the Lebanese proposal provided for a special committee to examine reports, the French proposal laid that responsibility on the Commission on Human Rights. She failed to see how the Commission could examine reports without the help of experts, who must either represent the appropriate specialized agencies or be appointed by the Commission itself. Although aware of the difficulties of its task, she supported the proposal that a drafting group be set up.

Mr. DUPONT-MILLETIN (Guatemala) suggested that the drafting group be composed of the representatives of the following countries: Chile, Denmark, France, Lebanon, Pakistan and Sweden. It should be instructed to draw up an agreed text on the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights.

Mr. YU (China) proposed that the representatives of Australia and the United States of America, who had also submitted proposals, should serve on the drafting group.

Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN (Guatemala) accepted the Chinese representative's amendment to his proposal.

Mr. WAHED (Pakistan) considered that the drafting group's terms of reference were not sufficiently clear. Before an agreed text could be drafted the Commission must surely first agree whether reports should be submitted to a special committee or to the Commission itself.

Mr. EGY (Egypt) recalled that at the time when he had originated the proposal that a drafting group be set up, he had suggested that it be entrusted with the "co-ordination of proposals".

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) agreed with the Pakistani representative that a preliminary decision must be taken by the Commission before the drafting group could prepare a text. Otherwise it would only be able to reduce the number of proposals from three to two.

Mr. YU (China) pointed out that the discussion had shown that representatives did not favour the idea of setting up a new organ. The drafting group must inevitably take the feeling of the meeting into account in doing its work. He believed that agreement on a text would be perfectly possible, provided the proposal that a special supervisory committee be set up was dropped.

Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN (Guatemala) considered that the drafting group should be instructed to draw up an agreed text, rather than to "co-ordinate" the three existing ones. It should try to arrive at a single text covering as many points as possible.

AZ-I Bey (Egypt) agreed that the functions of the drafting group were better defined by the formula suggested by the Guatemalan representative.

Mrs. ROOZVILT (United States of America) suggested that, in order to speed up the Commission's work, the drafting group might meet later that evening, and again the following morning before the Commission itself met.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that suggestion was equivalent to a motion for the adjournment of the meeting and said that the Commission must first take a decision on the Guatemalan proposal.

The Guatemalan proposal that a drafting group be set up, consisting of the representatives of Australia, Chile, Denmark, France, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sweden and the United States of America, was adopted by 12 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

Mr. CASSIN (France), supported by AZ-I Bey (Egypt), proposed that the drafting group should proceed forthwith to determine its procedure at a short preliminary meeting.

It was so agreed.

The United States motion that the meeting be adjourned was carried by 11 votes to none with 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.40 P.M.