

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.149
17 April 1950

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Thursday, 6 April 1950, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft international covenant on human rights
(annexes I and II of the report of the fifth session of the Commission
on Human Rights, document E/1371 (continued):

Article 8 (E/CN.4/365, E/CN.4/353/Add.10, E/CN.4/388, E/CN.4/391,
E/CN.4/404, E/CN.4/408) (continued)

Article 5 (E/CN.4/387, E/CN.4/393, E/CN.4/398) (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. ROOSEVELT	United States of America
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. WHITLAM	Australia
	Mr. STEYAERT	Belgium
	Mr. VALENZUELA	Chile
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. SORENSEN	Denmark
	Mr. RAMADAN	Egypt
	Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU Mr. ORDONNEAU }	France

Members: (continued)

Mr. KYROU	Greece
Mrs. MEHTA	India
Mr. MALIK	Lebanon
Mr. GARCIA	Philippines
Miss BOWIE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. ORIBE	Uruguay
Mr. JEVREMOVIC	Yugoslavia

Also present:

Mrs. CASTILLO LEDON	Commission on the Status of Women
---------------------	-----------------------------------

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. EVANS	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. WEIS	International Refugee Organization (IRO)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A: Miss SENDER International Federation of Free Trade Unions (IFFTU)

Category B:

Mr. BERNSTEIN	Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Mr. HUNTINGTON	Friends World Committee for Consultation
Miss BENDER	International Co-operative Women's Guild
Mrs. PARSONS Mrs. BARREY }	International Council of Women
Miss DINGMAN	International Union for Child Welfare
Miss SCHAEFER	International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues
Mrs. FREEMAN	Liaison Committee for Women's International Organizations
Mr. PERLZWEIG	World Jewish Congress

/Secretariat;

<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. LAUGIER	Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs
	Mr. HUMPHREY	Director of the Division of Human Rights
	Mr. SCHWELB	Assistant Director of the Division of Human Rights
	Mr. LIN MOUSHENG } Mr. DAS }	Secretaries of the Commission

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS (ANNEXES I AND II OF THE REPORT OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, DOCUMENT E/1371) (continued)

Article 8 (E/CN.4/365, E/CN.4/353/Add.10, E/CN.4/388, E/CN.4/391, E/CN.4/404, E/CN.4/408) (continued)

1. Mr. WHITIAM (Australia) suggested that the word "service" should be inserted after "recognized" in the English text of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 4.
2. Speaking as the representative of the United States of America, the CHAIRMAN accepted that amendment, as did Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom).
3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of France had requested that the vote on sub-paragraph (b) should be postponed to 13 April. She therefore proposed that the vote on the article as a whole should be postponed until that date.

It was so decided.

Article 5 (E/CN.4/387, E/CN.4/393, E/CN.4/398) (continued)

4. Mr. CHANG (China) observed that the Philippine proposal advocated the deletion of the original text of the first paragraph. There were, however, several other amendments affecting the text of that paragraph before the Commission, and it would hardly be possible to vote on its deletion before knowing just what was to be deleted.
5. Mr. SCHWELB (Secretariat) said that the Secretary-General's memorandum concerning the order in which the amendments should be voted on (E/CN.4/397) had been drawn up on the basis of the provisions of the new rule 60 of the rules of procedure. After consultation with the Legal Department, it had been
/decided

decided that each article would be regarded as a proposal in the sense in which that word was understood in rule 60. Consequently, a proposal envisaging the deletion of a part of the text of an article was an amendment and the Secretariat had therefore regarded the Philippine proposal as the furthest removed from the original text.

6. Mr. KYROU (Greece) suggested that all the other amendments to paragraph 1 should be put to the vote and the Philippine proposal voted on last.

7. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Secretariat proposal on the procedure to be followed was not a "ruling of the Chair" given by her, but that it seemed to be a logical interpretation of the rules of procedure. She would, however, follow the opinion of the Commission.

8. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) who supported the proposal made by the Greek representative, formally proposed that a vote should be taken on the Philippine proposal only after all the other amendments concerning paragraph 1 had been voted on.

It was so decided by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

9. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) said that his proposal should be considered as a whole. If the Commission decided to vote on it piecemeal, he would have no objections. But he pointed out that if certain paragraphs of his proposal were not adopted, he might be forced to vote against his own text.

10. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) preferred the original text of paragraph 1 to that proposed by Lebanon (E/CN.4/398). In view of the outstanding importance of preparing a draft covenant likely to receive the largest possible number of signatures, it was obvious that the adjective "sacred" should not be introduced into a legal text. That word had a metaphysical meaning that certain States Members might very well not be in a position to accept. Moreover, the introduction of the words "from the moment of conception" gave rise to other legal problems which would consequently require prolonged consultation and compel the Commission to mention a certain number of exceptions as, for example, legal abortion.

11. The Commission was trying to ensure that human rights would be respected. The rights of the unborn human being were not universally recognized. On the other hand, it was recognized everywhere that those rights began ^{with} physical birth.

12. Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) was not satisfied with the original text. She supported paragraph 2 of the Lebanese text which had the advantage of being drafted in a positive manner. She could not, however, agree with paragraph 1 of that text which raised a great many legal, medical and moral problems.
13. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States of America, stated that she would also vote against paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text.
14. Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative. While he respected paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text as a declaration of religious faith, he felt that such a formula should not be included in a legal document.
15. Mr. SORENSFEN (Denmark) asked that the two sentences of paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text should be voted on separately.
16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase "human life is sacred" (first part of paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text).
That part of the Lebanese text was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.
17. The CHAIRMAN considered that it was useless to put to the vote the remainder of paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text.
18. Mr. CHANG (China) pointed out that paragraph 2 of the Lebanese text could very well be added to the original text of paragraph 1 instead of replacing it.
19. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) said the Chinese proposal was perfectly acceptable
20. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) noted that the first part of the French amendment had been rejected simultaneously with paragraph 1 of the Lebanese text. On the other hand, the second part of that amendment was the same as paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the original text.

21. After a lengthy procedural discussion, Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that the various amendments to paragraph 1 of article 5 should be put to the vote in the following order:

- Paragraph 2 of the Lebanese text (E/CN.4/398), provisionally considered as an addition to the original text of paragraph 1
- The United States and Chilean amendment
- The United Kingdom amendment
- The Indian amendment
- The original text of paragraph 1

It was so decided.

Paragraph 2 of the Lebanese text was adopted by 7 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The United States and Chilean amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The United Kingdom amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The Indian amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The original text of paragraph 1 was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

22. The CHAIRMAN felt that, in the circumstances, paragraph 2 of the Lebanese text, which had just been provisionally adopted as an addition to the original text of paragraph 1, became the sole text of paragraph 1 as a result of the rejection of the original text of that paragraph.

23. She therefore suggested that the Commission should vote on paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment as paragraph 1 of article 5.

24. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) asked that a vote should be taken by roll-call.

25. Mr. SORENSEN (Denmark) did not see the necessity for a new vote on the text. It had already been decided that should paragraph 1 of the original text be rejected, it would be replaced by paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment.

26. Mr. SCHWELB (Secretariat) read rule 60 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions according to which if several amendments were moved to a proposal the Commission should first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on, until all amendments had been

/put

put to the vote. Then a vote would be taken on the proposal as a whole, as amended. Therefore a vote should be taken on paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment, as paragraph 1 of article 5.

27. Mr. KYROU (Greece) agreed with the Secretariat's view, but pointed out that it was customary to vote on the remaining part of the original text. He had abstained from taking part in the first vote on paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment as an addition to paragraph 1 of the original text, but he would vote in favour of that amendment as a text replacing the said paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Australia, Chile, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Lebanon, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: United States of America, Uruguay.

Paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment was adopted as a substitute text for paragraph 1 of article 5, by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to vote on paragraph 2 of the original text. Paragraph 3 of the Lebanese proposal was an amendment to that text.

29. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) asked whether the Lebanese representative would be willing to delete the words "independent and competent" at the end of his text. While it was in order for those words to appear in the text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they should not be included in the covenant.

30. Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) supported the proposal made by the Egyptian representative.

31. Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) wished to add the words "by the State" after the word "effected".

32. Mrs. MEHTA (India) recalled that the proposal had already been the object of several amendments put forward by Egypt, the Philippines, Lebanon and the United States of America.

33. Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) asked the Lebanese representative whether he would be prepared to add the words "for the most serious crimes" after the words "and then" in the second line of paragraph 3 of his text.

34. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) pointed out that there were already three amendments to his text: those of the United Kingdom, Egypt and Uruguay. He accepted the United Kingdom amendment. He could not accept the Egyptian amendment to delete the words "independent and competent". Draft article 13 already stipulated that "every one is entitled to a...hearing, by an independent and impartial tribunal" and in the past the Commission had insisted that those words should be included in the draft covenant. Hence there was no reason to delete them from article 5. The principle of the Uruguayan amendment seemed acceptable to him but he would prefer to see the proposed words introduced elsewhere, for example, at the end of the paragraph.

35. Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) could not accept the Uruguayan amendment. The concept of most serious crimes differed from one country to another and it would require a clear definition.

36. Mrs. MEHTA (India) said that as the amended text of the Lebanese draft was acceptable to her, she withdrew her own amendment. She partly accepted the Egyptian amendment (E/CN.4/384) ^{added a phrase} which / to the end of paragraph 2. The part she accepted was: "the death penalty may not be imposed on offenders under 17 years of age."

37. Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) understood the United Kingdom representative's position but pointed out that the formula criticized appeared in the original draft which was the basis of the current discussion and that it had been the subject of a long debate. The retention of that provision would permit the Uruguayan delegation to vote in favour of the text.

38. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) said that if paragraph 3 of the Lebanese amendment were to be substituted for paragraph 2 of the original text of article 5, his delegation would vote against it.

39. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) asked the representative of Lebanon whether he would agree to delete the word "independent" at the end of paragraph 3 of his amendment while maintaining the word "competent".
40. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) recalled once more that the same word was to be found in the text of draft article 13, which the Commission had accepted. In the circumstances, there was no reason to delete it from article 5. All possible precautions should be taken against arbitrary action.
41. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) saw no objections to maintaining the word "independent" but he would then like to know who would decide on the independent nature of the court and under what conditions the court should be set up.
42. Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) fully endorsed the Egyptian representative's observation. How should an independent court be set up? By whom should its members be paid? Of course, Mr. Whitlam fully approved the intentions of the Lebanese representative, but he thought that it would be difficult to assess the independence of a court. Moreover, why would the Commission qualify the court only in certain articles of the covenant? If it was intended to qualify the court, that should be done whenever the court was mentioned.
43. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States of America, supported the Egyptian proposal to delete the adjectives qualifying the tribunal, which already appeared in article 13.
44. Mr. CHANG (China) thought that the word "competent" would suffice for competent tribunal meant independent tribunal. Moreover, "intentional" was the key word of the paragraph. It was closely related to the interpretation of the exceptions listed in paragraph 4 of the Lebanese amendment. Therefore, Mr. Chang asked that a separate vote should be taken on that word.
45. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) explained that he understood the word "independent" to mean "politically independent" and pointed out that the representative of Australia had voted the previous year in favour of the introduction of that word in article 13. He would, however, agree to delete the word in article 5, provided that the representatives of Australia and Egypt did not oppose its retention in article 13 when that article was discussed.

46. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States of America, put forward her delegation's amendment (E/CN.4/393) to incorporate in paragraph 2 the essential elements of paragraph 3 of the original text and to combine those two paragraphs in a single paragraph. The words "the most serious crimes" was particularly important because it was necessary to restrict the application of the death penalty to those crimes only. Therefore, Mrs. Roosevelt supported the Uruguayan proposal. With regard to the word "independent" she was not opposed to its introduction in article 5, but, by separating the qualifying adjectives used in article 13, they were made to lose some of their force. It seemed that it would be sufficient to use the adjective "competent" in article 5.

47. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) accepted that suggestion on condition that the adjective "independent" was maintained in article 13.

48. Mr. CHANG (China) asked whether the United States amendment applied to paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 of article 5.

49. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States of America, replied that the amendment in question was intended to combine those two paragraphs and, in fact, to take the place of paragraph 3.

50. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) said he favoured the suppression of the word "independent", as in some countries the judiciary was independent of the governmental authorities, although the judges of the courts were paid by the State.

51. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) preferred the original text of paragraph 2, but would accept the text proposed by the United States. He wished, however, to make his contribution to the discussion on qualifying adjectives to be applied to the court. Those adjectives seemed to him to be superfluous both in article 5 and in article 13. The aim of the Commission was to perfect the legal instrument which the covenant was destined to become. It was, therefore, natural that the Commission should not stick blindly to its previous decisions. Moreover, the question was a matter of substance. A distinction must be made between the

/philosophical

philosophical and the legal outlook. The Commission was preparing a legal instrument and should therefore consider the matter from a legal angle. The idea of the independence of the judiciary was already clearly defined and it was not a legal document which would compel States to set up impartial and independent courts.

52. With regard to the United Kingdom proposal to add the words "by the State" after the words "intentional deprivation" in paragraph 2 of the Lebanese amendment, Mr. Valenzuela pointed out that, if that phrase were accepted, the concept of the independence of a court might be interpreted solely in terms of the State. No doubt what the United Kingdom representative wanted was that the State should be able to invoke some exceptions permitting it to impose the death penalty.

53. The Chilean delegation supported the United States amendment (E/CN.4/393).

54. With regard to the qualifying adjectives to be applied to the court, Mr. Valenzuela was, as he had said before, in favour of suppressing them in article 5 and maintaining them in article 13.

55. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt), referring to article 13, pointed out that the law should be, by its very nature, just and impartial, and that, consequently, that principle made the qualifying adjectives included in the Lebanese amendment unnecessary.

56. Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) felt that if the word "court" were qualified in some articles and not in others, confusion might arise. He asked whether Mr. Malik would agree to omit the qualifying words "competent" and "independent" in article 5, subject to reconsideration of the question in connexion with the discussion of article 13.

57. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) was prepared to make that concession, provided that the words "independent" and "impartial" were retained in article 13. He hoped that when that article was discussed the representative of Australia would not request the deletion of those qualifying words.

58. Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that in considering the proposed amendments to paragraph 3 of article 5, the Commission must not forget that the original text contained a very important reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In point of fact, that text stipulated that the courts were empowered to impose a death sentence only in accordance with laws "not contrary to the principles expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights". Thus a further guarantee was given that no one would be condemned to death by reason of his democratic beliefs.

59. The amendments put forward by the United States and Lebanese delegations did not mention the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Therefore, Mr. Jevremovic would not support those amendments, but would vote in favour of the original text, which contained the strongest guarantees.

60. Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) agreed with Mr. Jevremovic that it was essential that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be mentioned in the text.

61. The representative of the United Kingdom had drawn the Commission's attention to the difficulties which would result from the insertion, in paragraph 2, of the phrase "the most serious crimes". In omitting any mention of the Universal Declaration, the Commission would open the door to the most arbitrary interpretation of that phrase. If, therefore, it was desired to combine paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 5, some reference to the Declaration must be re-introduced into the text.

62. Reverting to the proposed French amendment to paragraph 1, the first part of which had been rejected (E/CN.4/365, page 24), Mr. Leroy-Beaulieu stated that the second part of that text could be inserted between paragraphs 1 and 2. He thought, in fact, that the exceptions listed therein were of a more general nature than those proposed by certain other representatives. Furthermore, the French text referred to the enforcement measures authorized by the Charter, whereas the Lebanese and United States amendments entirely ignored that important point.

63. Finally, the French amendment, which spoke only of "self-défence", avoided mention of certain defence measures, provided for in the Lebanese text, the mere mention of which might be disagreeable to countries which had suffered from occupation. In point of fact, the exceptions listed by Mr. Malik left the way open to frequent abuses of all kinds under totalitarian regimes.

/64. In conclusion

64. In conclusion, the representative of France requested the Commission, first, to reconsider the second part of his delegation's proposed amendment to paragraph 1, and secondly, to retain the words embodying a reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or to prepare a new text containing such a reference.

65. In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) withdrew the amendment which he had submitted jointly with the representative of India.

66. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether or not paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 5 should be combined. Various amendments to paragraph 3 had been submitted, and it was difficult to take a decision in that connexion until the question of principle had first been settled.

It was decided, by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, to combine paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 5 in one paragraph.

67. Explaining his vote, Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) stated that he was not opposed in principle to the fusion of the two paragraphs. He had, however, voted against the proposal because the texts submitted by the United States and Lebanese delegations did not mention the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

68. The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the Egyptian amendment proposing the insertion in paragraph 2 of the following clause: "Offenders under the age of 17 years shall not be sentenced to death or to imprisonment with hard labour for life."

69. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) explained that his amendment was based upon the importance of returning children under the age of 17 years to a useful life in society, rather than punishing them, since such children could still be corrected and re-educated. In preparing his text, Mr. Ramadan had taken into consideration certain legislative systems which took account of that aspect of the problem.

70. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) was prepared to support the Egyptian proposal provided that Mr. Ramadan agreed to replace the words "under the age of 17 years" by the phrase "who have not reached their majority". In that way the text could be adapted to the legislative systems of the different States, since the age of majority varied from one country to another.

/71. Mr. RAMADAN

71. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) could not accept that amendment; there was no uniform criterion for determining the age of majority and his proposal would therefore become meaningless.

72. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) agreed with the representative of Egypt. He pointed out that in France, for example, the age of majority was 21, whereas the death penalty could be imposed on persons over 18 years of age.

73. The Egyptian proposal attempted to fix the age limit under which sentence of death could not be pronounced. If any State wished to fix a higher limit it was fully entitled to do so. The main concern was that it should not fix the limit below a certain age. He was therefore ready to support the Egyptian proposal to fix the limit at 17 years.

74. Mr. KYROU (Greece) admitted the validity of the arguments put forward by the representatives of France and Egypt, but pointed out that the age limit for criminal responsibility varied from one legal system to another. It would therefore be difficult for a number of States to accept the age limit suggested by Mr. Ramadan.

75. Mr. Kyrou drew the Egyptian representative's attention to the phrase "the most serious crimes"; he felt that it covered subjective as well as objective criteria. In passing sentence on a minor, any court would obviously take the offender's age into account as an attenuating circumstance.

76. He asked Mr. Ramadan whether he would not agree to withdraw his amendment in the light of that explanation.

77. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) replied that the main purpose of his amendment was to ensure the readaptation and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. He was consequently unable to withdraw it.

78. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the United States, said that she would vote against the Egyptian amendment. She could not accept the formula proposed by Mr. Valenzuelo either, as the expression "who have not reached their majority" was too vague.

79. Mr. ORIBE (Uruguay) pointed out that the death penalty did not exist in his country and that so far as he was concerned the problem did not therefore arise. Nevertheless, he would support the Egyptian representative's proposal, for he considered it essential to restrict the cases in which the death penalty could be applied and also to ensure that juvenile offenders should have every opportunity of re-education; the legislation in Uruguay made very full provision for such opportunities.

80. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) supported the Egyptian proposal but wondered whether, in order to be sentenced, the offender must have attained the age of 17 years at the time the crime was committed or at the time he appeared before the court.

81. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) replied that it was obviously the offender's age at the time he committed the crime that was important, as several years might elapse between the commission of the crime and the prosecution of the criminal.

82. Mr. CHANG (China) reminded the Committee that it was working on a draft covenant capable of being accepted by all States and not on detailed conventions bearing on the various matters covered by each article.

83. He admitted that there was some foundation for the Egyptian representative's arguments and thought that he was quite right from the humane point of view. Nevertheless it would be somewhat inadvisable to overload the articles of the draft covenant with details which might make the document as a whole rather unbalanced.

84. The covenant should constitute a logical whole and only when it had been approved by Governments would the Commission be in a position to draw up a certain number of detailed conventions and to request the Secretariat to provide it with reports on the various legal systems.

85. Mr. Chang recalled that that was the reason why he had voted against the detailed provisions which it had been sought to introduce into article 8 and stated that he would do the same for article 5.

86. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the representative of China.

87. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) stated that if Mr. Ramadan's proposal was put to the vote he would abstain.

88. He thought that, in the form in which it had been adopted at the beginning of the meeting, article 5, paragraph 1, took sufficient account of the concept which the representative of Egypt was attempting to introduce into that article. He hoped that all the signatory States would respect the obligation which they assumed under that paragraph and that, in their respective legal systems, they would also take into account the particular rights of children.

89. In these circumstances, the Commission might perhaps refrain from introducing into the draft covenant the provisions suggested by the representative of Egypt, and Mr. Malik asked his Egyptian colleague to withdraw his text.

90. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) thanked those representatives who had supported his proposal.

91. He did not think that paragraph 1, in the form adopted at the beginning of the meeting, really took into account the concept which he had wished to introduce into the text of article 5. Nevertheless, he was ready to withdraw his proposal if that would facilitate the adoption of article 5, on condition that the discussion with regard to his amendment was fully reported in the summary record.

92. In conclusion, the representative of Egypt briefly explained the two other amendments contained in document E/CN.4/384.

93. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Commission to arrange for an unofficial exchange of views before the next meeting so as to reach agreement on those paragraphs of article 5 which had not yet been adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.