



Tuesday, 5 February 1957,  
 at 3.15 p.m.

New York

**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 60:

Interim measures, pending entry into force of the  
 Covenants on Human Rights, to be taken with respect  
 to violations of the human rights set forth in the  
 Charter of the United Nations and the Universal  
 Declaration of Human Rights (*concluded*) ..... 361

**Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).**

**AGENDA ITEM 60**

**Interim measures, pending entry into force of the  
 Covenants on Human Rights, to be taken with  
 respect to violations of the human rights set  
 forth in the Charter of the United Nations and  
 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
 (A/3187 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1, A/  
 C.3/L.594) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) said that in exercising  
 his right of reply he would elaborate on certain points  
 mentioned in his earlier intervention (750th meeting).

2. He had not traced any relationship between the  
 problem of individual complaints and that of complaints  
 made by one State against another. He had merely  
 noted that any discussion of the question of complaints  
 by one State against another would inevitably invite  
 debate on individual complaints; that point was proved  
 by the Urugayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595) and by  
 the statements of some representatives, in particular, the  
 representative of Greece, who had himself said that he  
 did not exclude individual petitions.

3. His reference to the physical difficulties which the  
 Commission on Human Rights would encounter had  
 been purely incidental and intended mainly to stress a  
 practical point. The object of the Greek delegation was  
 to enable the United Nations to act promptly in case  
 of a serious violation. The Commission met only once  
 a year. The question what would happen in the interval  
 between two sessions was left unanswered by the Greek  
 draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), however much  
 thought had gone into its preparation.

4. He could not accept the Greek delegation's in-  
 terpretation (752nd meeting) of the words "new facts";  
 he had not said that there were no violations of human  
 rights, nor had he speculated whether there were more  
 or fewer such violations than in the past. His real  
 point had been that, inasmuch as in the matter of  
 complaints the General Assembly, the Economic and  
 Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights  
 had done little more than provide for general super-  
 vision in the draft Covenants, political thinking had  
 probably not advanced to the stage at which a fresh  
 debate on the question could produce tangible results  
 and States would hardly be inclined to take the big  
 step forward of consenting to general machinery for  
 dealing with complaints through the Commission.

Page

5. In his references to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the  
 United Nations Charter, he had not asserted that  
 France contested, in general and absolutely, the com-  
 petence of the United Nations. He had merely said  
 that the original proposal of Greece (A/C.3/L.592)  
 would certainly encounter opposition by reason of the  
 terms of Article 2, paragraph 7; and in fact, a number  
 of representatives had raised the question of domestic  
 jurisdiction directly or indirectly. The Greek delega-  
 tion, referring to his functions as member of the  
 Conseil d'Etat, had claimed to discern a conflict between  
 those functions and his attitude under the instructions  
 from his Government. Yet, what he had written as an  
 independent jurist in an article on the subject of the  
 draft International Covenant on Economic, Social and  
 Cultural Rights (*Droit social*, 18th year, No. 6, June  
 1955, p. 356) would be found not to be very different  
 from what he had said in his capacity as representative  
 of France. He would not inquire whether that dis-  
 tinguished jurist, the representative of Greece, was  
 deeply convinced of the relevance and soundness of the  
 draft he had submitted on behalf of the Greek Govern-  
 ment.

6. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Re-  
 public) said he would not be able to vote for para-  
 graphs 2 and 3 of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/  
 L.592/Rev.1), nor for the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/  
 L.597), for he opposed anything which might delay the  
 completion of the Covenants and result in the estab-  
 lishment of a system duplicating that provided for in  
 those two instruments.

7. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said he hoped  
 that the French representative, who had stressed the  
 need for the Covenants, would vote in favour of para-  
 graph 1 of the Greek draft resolution.

8. With regard to the last point raised by his French  
 colleague, he said that the position which he (Mr.  
 Eustathiades) was supporting was fully in accord with  
 his own beliefs, as could be seen by referring to the  
*Recueil des cours de La Haye*, volume 84 (1953).

9. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) introduced the amendment  
 proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.597). The idea  
 behind it was not new: it had been presented earlier  
 in somewhat different forms by the representatives of  
 the Dominican Republic and the Soviet Union (751st  
 meeting). A number of delegations, including his own,  
 while recognizing the importance of the question raised  
 by the Greek delegation, had not been wholly satisfied  
 by the turn the debate had taken. Furthermore, owing  
 to a series of changes, the Greek draft resolution had  
 lost its original unity of thought. The revision of the  
 draft affected both procedural and substantive points,  
 and the final result was ill-balanced. Besides, the re-  
 quests addressed to the Commission on Human Rights  
 and the Secretary-General in paragraphs 2 and 3 were  
 rather vague.

10. The Syrian amendment was strictly procedural;  
 it was therefore compatible with paragraph 1 of the

revised text and retained the unity of thought of the proposal. It recognized implicitly that consideration of the Greek draft resolution could not lead to a satisfactory solution at that stage and it did not prejudice subsequent consideration of the question when conditions were more favourable. The Committee should not object to the idea of the question of interim measures being considered at a later stage by the appropriate bodies of the United Nations.

11. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that the Syrian amendment raised certain difficulties for his delegation. He asked, first, what was meant by the word "examination". The Syrian text (A/C.3/L.597) might be construed as authorizing the Commission on Human Rights to examine the substance of the question, which would be in contradiction with resolution 75 (V) of the Economic and Social Council. He asked when the Commission would undertake the "examination", how much time it would spend on it and, having completed it, what it would do. If it was to submit a report, the amendment should say so expressly.

12. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the suggestion he had made at a previous meeting (751st meeting) differed from the Syrian amendment. He had simply suggested that no decision should be made with respect to substance and that the official records of the proceedings should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights. The Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.597) retained the original idea of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592) in that it asked the Commission to examine the documents, in other words, to examine the question itself, which would thus be placed on its agenda. He would therefore have to vote against the Syrian amendment.

13. Mr. TOWNSEND EZCURRA (Peru) said that for the sake of consistency with the French and English texts, the word "*determinar*" in the Spanish text of paragraph 1 (b) of the Greek draft resolution should be replaced by the word "*discutir*".

14. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.597) would have a better chance of acceptance if the words "for examination" were deleted. If the Syrian delegation did not agree to delete them he would ask that they be voted on separately.

15. Mr. MUFTI (Syria), replying to a remark by the Philippine representative, said that he had intentionally not included any instruction in his procedural proposal. He was sorry to have misconstrued the observations made by the USSR representative at a previous meeting. Actually, the Syrian amendment contained no decision on substance and merely called for the transmission of the relevant documents to the Commission on Human Rights. The USSR representative had not objected to the question raised by the Greek delegation being discussed at a later session: that was precisely the opportunity which the Syrian amendment offered.

16. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) regretted that she would be unable to vote for the Syrian amendment. As a member of the Commission on Human Rights, the Iraqi delegation was uncertain what exactly the Commission would be asked to do. Being greatly concerned with the question of violations of human rights, the Syrian delegation probably expected the Commission to deal with the substance of a question which the Third Committee had preferred not to study in detail. The Syrian amendment did not seem necessary. The

debate had not been valueless, for it had furnished an opportunity for a searching inquiry into the vital question of human rights and the Covenants.

17. In reply to a question from Mr. CHENG (China), Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that if the Syrian amendment was adopted as it stood, the question of the measures to be taken pending the entry into force of the Covenants would be placed on the provisional agenda of the next session of the Commission on Human Rights. If, however, the words "for examination" were omitted, the Secretary-General would probably interpret the resolution to mean that, in the view of the General Assembly, the question should not be included in the Commission's agenda.

18. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the mere deletion from the Syrian amendment of the words "for examination", as proposed by the Saudi Arabian representative, might create some confusion. For example, the Secretary-General's view might differ from Mr. Humphrey's. In any event, the Committee should decide there and then whether it wished to transmit the documents in question to the Commission on Human Rights for examination or merely for information. For the reasons he had given earlier, he would prefer them to be transmitted for information and he suggested that the words "for examination" in the Syrian amendment should be amended accordingly; he added, however, that he was not making a formal proposal. He said he would vote in favour of the preamble and of operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1).

19. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) noted with pleasure that in the Syrian amendment her suggestion had been taken into account. Nevertheless, her delegation had in fact suggested, without however making a formal proposal, that the official records should be transmitted to the Commission for information only. The Commission would still remain free to place the question of interim measures on its agenda, if it so desired, and if the Greek or any other delegation made a proposal to that effect. She added that she would support the Syrian amendment if the words "for examination" were replaced by the words "for information". Otherwise, she would vote against the words "for examination".

20. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) said that the expression "for examination", proposed in the Syrian amendment, should be retained. There would be little purpose in transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights documents with which it would be acquainted in any event. The least that could be done was to request the Commission to study the question.

21. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that he could not accept the Saudi Arabian representative's proposal, but would not object to the words "for examination" being put to the vote separately.

22. Mrs. LORD (United States of America) agreed with the proposal that the official records relating to agenda item 60 should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights. Those documents might prove of great help to the Commission when it dealt with other questions on its agenda. The United States delegation would abstain from voting on operative paragraph 1 of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). It would support the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.597), but would vote against the words "for examination" for the reasons stated by the representa-

tive of the Dominican Republic. If the Syrian amendment was adopted, with or without the words "for examination", her delegation would vote in favour of the text as a whole.

23. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said that he would support the Syrian amendment, which offered the best immediate solution of the problem raised by the Greek delegation. In his view, the words "for examination" should be retained, as they would allow the Commission on Human Rights to study the substance of the question if it considered such a course appropriate.

24. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) accepted the Syrian amendment.

25. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that, although he approved its underlying idea, he would be unable to vote in favour of the Syrian amendment. In his view, there was no reason for transmitting the official records to the Commission on Human Rights for examination. He was not clear what the "other documents" mentioned in the Syrian text were. Furthermore, the word "important", in the paragraph proposed by Syria, seemed out of place in a procedural proposal. Lastly, the text of the amendment did not correspond with the title, as the word "interim", which appeared in the heading, had been omitted in the paragraph itself.

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by Greece (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). He pointed out that paragraphs 2 and 3 of that document had been replaced by the text of the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.597).

27. He put to the vote the proposal made orally by Sweden (750th meeting) that the words "if possible" should be inserted in operative paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution, after the words "at that session".

*The proposal was approved by 27 votes to 22, with 15 abstentions.*

28. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) asked for a separate vote on sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 1. He also requested that the vote on sub-paragraph (a), as amended, should be taken by roll-call.

29. The CHAIRMAN put operative paragraph 1 (a) as amended to the vote.

*The vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden.

*Operative paragraph 1 (a) as amended, was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.*

30. The CHAIRMAN put operative paragraph 1 (b) to the vote.

*Operative paragraph 1 (b) was adopted by 28 votes to 3, with 32 abstentions.*

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "for examination", in paragraph 2.

*At the request of the representative of Greece, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Burma, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Morocco.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Albania, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

*Abstaining:* Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, Pakistan.

*The words "for examination" were rejected by 30 votes to 24, with 11 abstentions.*

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2, as amended.

*At the request of the representative of the Dominican Republic, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania.

*Against:* Uruguay.

*Abstaining:* Sweden, Turkey, Venezuela, Yemen, Australia, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan.

*Operative paragraph 2, as amended, was approved by 43 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.*

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised draft resolution as amended, as a whole.

*The revised draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

34. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that the title of the draft resolution contained the words "interim measures", while the operative part used the more general expression "measures to be taken with respect of violations of human rights". The heading of the draft resolution consequently did not correspond with its contents. The Committee could remedy that

inconsistency, by one of two methods: either it could request the Rapporteur to state in his report that the Third Committee recommended the title "Measures to be taken with respect to violations of human rights", or it could change the heading of the draft resolution forthwith, by an express amendment. The Afghan delegation would prefer the second method.

35. The suggested change was not without precedent. In 1950, at the General Assembly's fifth session, agenda item 67 had been entitled "Complaint of failure on the part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory"; nevertheless, the title of the resolution finally adopted after due debate had been worded "Measures for the peaceful solution of the problem of prisoners of war".<sup>1</sup>

36. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the analogy between the case under consideration and the one mentioned by the Afghan representative was misleading and that there was no reason for changing the title of the draft resolution just adopted. Regardless of the actual wording of the text, the discussion had revolved around the question of interim measures to be taken pending entry into force of the Covenants. The fact that the Committee had decided not to deal with substance was a wholly different matter. Any change of title would distort the significance of the resolution. Furthermore, the suggestion seemed inopportune, as many delegations had voted with due regard for the title of the resolution.

37. He added that the USSR delegation had voted in favour of the Syrian amendment and for the text as a whole.

38. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) disagreed with the Afghan representative. The title admittedly did not correspond to the text of the draft resolution; the reason was that the Committee had been unable to find a satisfactory solution for the basic problem raised by Greece. The problem persisted, and it was to be hoped that at a later stage the Committee would adopt a text closer to the title of agenda item 60. For the time being, the discrepancy between the problem to be resolved and the action proposed reflected reality.

39. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) said that the draft resolution just adopted expressed the majority's opinion on the item under discussion. There was thus no valid reason for changing its title.

40. Mr. TALAAT (Egypt) said it would be neither wise nor logical to adopt the Afghan suggestion, as the delegations had taken the title of the draft resolution into account when voting. It was on that assumption that his own delegation had based its vote. His delegation's vote against the words "for examination" was based on a totally different reason from that for which the majority of representatives had voted against those words.

41. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said it would be wrong to change the title of agenda item 60 without first consulting the Greek representative. In any case, under rule 22 of the rules of procedure, items on the agenda could be amended only by a majority decision of the General Assembly.

42. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the circumstances in which the Afghan delegation had proposed the amendment of the title of agenda item 67 at the fifth session had been very different from those prevailing in the case under consideration. The object of the proposal at the fifth session had been to work out a compromise and, as far as possible, to divorce the question of prisoners of war from political considerations.

43. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that he could not have made his suggestion before knowing the terms of the draft resolution, and therefore he could not be said to have made it too late. In his view, the circumstances were very similar to those in which the Third Committee had found itself at the fifth session of the General Assembly, in 1950, when the Afghan delegation had proposed an amendment to the title of a draft resolution on item 67 of the agenda of the fifth session.

44. The Committee should decide whether an alteration of the title was desirable.

45. After a brief exchange of views with the CHAIRMAN and Mr. MUFTI (Syria), Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that he would not press his suggestion to a vote.

46. Miss MAÑAS (Cuba) explained that her delegation had abstained because it considered that the Greek draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was not homogeneous and because it considered that the adoption of the provision contained in paragraph 1 was premature.

47. Her delegation had voted against the words "for examination" contained in the Syrian text which the Greek delegation had accepted. Even if the Committee had not adopted the draft resolution, those members who were also represented in the Commission on Human Rights would have been able to inform the Commission of the debate on agenda item 60.

48. She added, in conclusion, that the study of the draft Covenants should be completed with the least possible delay.

49. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said that the interest displayed by many delegations in the defence of human rights was reassuring. Throughout its history, Belgium had given repeated proof of its attachment to the cause of human rights, which was not only a lofty aspiration, but above all a living reality. That attitude had been demonstrated afresh by the recent accession of Belgium to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms prepared under the auspices of the Council of Europe.

50. The original wording of paragraph 1 (a) of the Greek draft resolution had been very optimistic but hardly satisfactory, for it might have been used as a pretext for giving priority to a study of the draft Covenants and obstructing the examination of questions which the General Committee might refer to the Third Committee. Moreover, the sub-paragraph made no provision for any speeding up of the Committee's work, a point frequently raised during the debate. He had therefore welcomed the Swedish amendment as being more realistic. In view of that amendment, he had been able to vote for paragraph 1 (a) as a whole. He had also voted for paragraph 1 (b).

51. Commenting on the words "for examination" in the Syrian amendment and on paragraph 2 of the Greek

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Third Committee*, 342nd meeting; *ibid.*, *Plenary Meetings*, 325th meeting, and *ibid.*, *Annexes*, agenda item 67, document A/1690, para. 7 (b).



draft resolution, he said that the provisions of the paragraph clearly called for interim measures, though in a veiled manner and with different degrees of emphasis, and consequently their object was the implementation of the Covenants, or of part of the Covenants, before the ratification of the latter. He felt bound to point out that such measures would have the gravest repercussions on the efforts of the United Nations to secure universal protection and observance of human rights. The most important business of the United Nations in the field of human rights was the preparation of the Covenants. Those instruments were needed because the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had the force of a recommendation only; it was not binding on States, any one of which was free to dispute the validity of its articles. Only the Covenants, being in the form of conventions, could end that uncertainty by imposing indisputable legal obligations on States. Governments had to have confidence in the future of the Covenants, if they were to continue the study of those instruments, and anything capable of shaking their confidence should be avoided. The Greek proposal and the Syrian amendment tended, however, to undermine that confidence and, ultimately, to transform the question of the protection of human rights into a subject of international discord. There would be no limit to the charges that could be brought, since in the absence of the Covenants, there would be no provisions governing their admissibility. The atmosphere would become such that States would cease to promote action for the protection of human rights. The preparation of the Covenants would be affected and might become altogether impossible as a result. In the circumstances, his delegation had been compelled to vote against the words "for examination" in the Syrian amendment and to abstain in the vote on the whole of paragraph 2, which reproduced the text of the Syrian amendment.

52. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that after hearing the Syrian representative's explanations concerning the meaning of the words "for examination", he had been able to vote in favour of that expression.

53. Mr. CHAUDHURI (Pakistan) regretted that the Committee had not adopted a more constructive draft resolution. In its final version, the text no longer dealt with interim measures designed to prevent violations of human rights; the procedure it proposed was clearly inadequate, since it did not provide for any effective protection of human rights. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained.

54. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) said he had voted against the Swedish amendment to paragraph 1 (a); he had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, because it left the Committee free to reconsider the question of interim measures pending the entry into force of the Covenants.

55. It was unfortunate that under paragraph 2 of the draft resolution as adopted, which reproduced the text of the Syrian amendment, the Assembly would be doing nothing more than transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights the documents relating to the debates on agenda item 60. The Committee had even expressly

decided by a vote that the Commission would not be under any duty to carry out any specific study. In effect, therefore, the Commission—whose agenda was in any case very heavy—had been given full discretion to proceed as it chose.

56. The Committee had done regrettably little in a matter in which the obligations of States were laid down in Articles 2, 13 and 62 of the United Nations Charter. If the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms was to be guaranteed, any injured party should have the right to apply to an international authority. That was a central theme of Brunet's writings, and the idea on which the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595) had been based. His delegation had withdrawn its amendment because it felt that the Greek text provided a basis both for complaints by one State against another and for those emanating from private persons.

57. Modern States recognized the need for protecting the individual against the public authorities and set up special administrative bodies for that purpose. That method could surely also be used at the international level. The argument advanced by the United States delegation was not convincing: the prestige of the United Nations could not but grow if the Organization received a great many complaints. The State could no longer treat individuals as it pleased, for since the entry into force of the Charter, human rights had become a principle of international law. Accordingly, it was regrettable that the Committee had not asked the Commission on Human Rights to study measures, even mere interim measures, designed to prevent violations of human rights and was simply transmitting certain documents to the Commission.

58. Mr. TALAAT (Egypt) said that he had voted in favour of paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the draft resolution. He had with regret abstained in the vote on the Syrian amendment and on the draft resolution as a whole, because the Syrian text did not adequately replace paragraphs 2 and 3 of the former revised Greek draft resolution and did not offer a satisfactory answer to the question of the interim measures to be taken pending the entry into force of the Covenants. He had voted against the words "for examination" because in his view it was not the function of the Commission on Human Rights to express judgment on the documents relating to the proceedings in the Third Committee; it was, naturally, open to the Commission to take note of the documents for information purposes, but that was too self-evident to require confirmation in a resolution.

59. Miss BRUUN (Denmark) said that she had abstained on the main votes. It would be wrong to prejudge whatever decisions the Committee might take later for the purpose of dealing with the Covenants. Besides, no special resolution was required to bring the Committee's documents to the attention of the Commission on Human Rights, which was free to consult them at all times.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.