

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.4/SR.262
7 May 1952
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT MASTER

12 MAY 1952

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Eighth Session

	/	/	
--	---	---	--

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 22 April 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (A/L.142, A/L.146, A/2112, E/CN.4/557, E/CN.4/516, E/CN.4/649, E/CN.4/562, E/CN.4/66); E/CN.4/L.26, E/CN.4/L.32) (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CARIGNAN	(France)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. WHITLAN	(Australia)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. NIROT	Belgium
	Mr. VENEZUELA	Chile
	Mr. CHENG FAONAN	China
	AZIZI Bey	Cyprus
	Mr. JUVIGNY	France
	Mr. KAROU	Greece
	Mrs. KEMIA	India

Members: (continued)

Mr. ALJOUH	Lebanon
Mr. WAMEED	Pakistan
Mr. BURATYNSKI	Poland
Mr. WESTERBERG	Sweden
Mr. KOVALENKO	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mr. MARCOZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. BOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. POAGHELT	United States of America
Mr. BRACCO	Uruguay
Mr. JAVREKOVIC	Yugoslavia

Representative of a specialized agency:

Mr. MORELLET	International Labour Organization (ILO)
--------------	--

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

Mr. LEARY	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
-----------	--

Category B:

Miss SCHAEFER	International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues
Miss PHILLIPS	Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations
Mr. RONALD G.) Mrs. FOLSTEIN)	World Union for Progressive Judaism

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY	Director, Human Rights Division
Mr. DAS) Miss MITCHELL)	Secretaries of the Commission

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL RESPECT FOR THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES (A/L.102, A/L.106, A/2112, E/CN.4/657, E/CN.4/516, E/CN.4/649, E/CN.4/662, E/CN.4/663, E/CN.4/L.26, E/CN.4/L.32) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN called for a continuation of the discussion. So far there were two texts before the Commission: the Indian draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.26) and the United States draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.32).

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) remarked that the United States draft resolution was self-explanatory and required no comment.

Mrs. MEETA (India) said that she had prepared a revised text (E/CN.4/L.25/Rv.1) of her draft resolution, which would be circulated shortly. She read out the operative part of that draft resolution. In reply to a question by Mr. NISOT (Belgium) she said that her text did not apply to national minorities within an independent State, because such minorities' rights were protected under the provisions on minorities to be included in the covenant. They would have their political rights as other citizens but would not have a right to carve out a state for themselves.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) drew attention to the fact that the Indian draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.26) was in the form of a resolution of the Commission on Human Rights, whereas the United States proposal (E/CN.4/L.32) was phrased as a draft General Assembly resolution. He thought the Commission should decide which of those two forms its recommendations should take.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) said that General Assembly resolution 545 (VI) merely requested the Commission to "prepare recommendations"; the form was therefore for the Commission to choose.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) agreed with the Greek representative.

He recalled that the General Assembly's intention had been that the Commission should prepare recommendations on the ways and means by which respect for the self-determination of peoples could be ensured by the General Assembly,

/and not

and not merely recommendations to be made by the General Assembly to Member States. Those ways and means might quite reasonably include the establishment of special organs or other practical measures to be taken by the General Assembly itself. He hoped that the sponsors of proposals would keep that point in mind and would not confine themselves to drafting recommendations addressed to States.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) agreed with Mr. Arkoulis's interpretation. The Commission must, however, proceed step by step; preparing recommendations to States was the first and most important step.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) felt that the Commission could not usefully continue the discussion until the revised Indian draft resolution had been circulated. He therefore suggested that the meeting should adjourn.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) was opposed to adjournment as time-wasting. The Commission could, while waiting for the necessary document, proceed to discuss the next item on its agenda.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) disagreed with the proposal of the United States representative, as it was impossible to drop one item on the agenda halfway through the discussion and take up another. He then moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.