



COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
Nineteenth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH MEETING (OPEN PART\*)

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 3 April 1963, at 3.35 p.m.

Contents:

	<u>Page</u>
Further promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (item 11 of the agenda) (concluded)	3
Representations from non-governmental organizations	13
Draft principles on freedom and non-discrimination in the matter of political rights (item 6(b) of the agenda)	14
Report of the fifteenth session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (item 6(c) of the agenda)	15
Election of a member of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to fill a vacancy (item 6(d) of the agenda)	20
Study of the right of arrested persons to communicate with those whom it is necessary for them to consult in order to ensure their defence or to protect their essential interests (item 5 of the agenda)	20
Advisory services in the field of human rights (item 3 of the agenda)	21
Postponement of certain items	26
Study of the right of everyone to be free from arbitrary arrest, detention and exile, and draft principles on freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention (item 4 of the agenda)	27

\* The summary record of the closed part of the meeting appeared under symbol number E/CN.4/SR.770/Add.1.

Present:

Chairman:

Rapporteur:

Members:

Canada

Chile

China

Denmark

Ecuador

France

India

Lebanon

Liberia

Netherlands

Panama

Philippines

Poland

Turkey

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist  
Republic

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics

United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland

United States of America

Observers for Member States:

Argentina

Cuba

Iraq

Israel

Representative of another United Nations organ:

Commission on the Status of Women

Representative of a specialized agency:

International Labour Organization

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY

Mr. TARDU

Mr. RESICH (Poland)

Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy)

Miss AITKEN

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA

Mr. CHENG Paonan

Mr. TAO

Mr. MADSEN

Mr. PONCE y CARBO

Mr. CASSIN

Mr. CHAKRAVARTY

Mr. HAKIM

Mr. DOE

Mr. BEAUFORT

Mr. CALAMARI

Mr. BRILLANTES

Mr. QUILMBAO

Mr. WIECZOREK

Mr. LUTEM

Mr. NEDBAILLO

Mr. NASSINOVSKY

Sir Samuel HOARE

Mrs. Tree

Mr. GARCIA PINEIRO

Mr. GONZALEZ-PINEIRO

Mrs. AFNAN

Mr. ROSENNE

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX

Mr. METALL

Director, Division of  
Human Rights

Secretary of the Commission

FURTHER PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (item 11 of the agenda) (E/CN.4/L.667, L.674, L.675, L.677) (concluded)

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he could not accept the view of the Lebanese representative that the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.677) was procedural. It was an independent proposal, submitted after the Working Party's draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.667), and should therefore, in accordance with article 61 of the rules of procedure, be voted on last.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that the Commission should first take a decision on the Soviet Union proposal to defer the whole question to the following year. If, however, the Soviet Union representative would agree to withdraw his proposal and join the delegations which approved of the draft prepared by the Working Party, the French delegation would agree, for the sake of unanimity, to submit paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of draft resolution B in the Working Party's draft as a separate proposal.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) explained that he regarded the Soviet Union draft resolution as procedural because it did not deal with the substance of the item but merely postponed further discussion on it till the following year. If the Working Party's draft resolution was adopted before the Soviet Union's draft resolution had been considered, the Commission would obviously have no chance of expressing an opinion on the Soviet Union's proposal.

Mr. LUTEM (Turkey) said he agreed that the Soviet Union draft resolution, being procedural, should be put to the vote first, but the Commission was master of its own procedure and should allow itself some latitude in the interpretation of its rules.

The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution prepared by the Working Party would be voted on first, paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that his delegation had made an offer in a spirit of conciliation. As that offer had not been accepted, it had no longer any reason to detach its original proposal (E/CN.4/L.656) from the original Lebanese draft (E/CN.4/L.653), which had been incorporated in the Working Party's draft as section II.A.

First paragraph

The first paragraph was unanimously adopted.

Second paragraph

The second paragraph was unanimously adopted.

Third paragraph

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that the words in brackets, which were taken from General Assembly resolution 1716 (XVII), be included in the approved text of the paragraph.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that although the words were quoted from the General Assembly resolution, they would be difficult to fit in to, at any rate, the English text. If they were to be included, the Secretariat would have to be allowed considerable latitude to amend the paragraph to make it read well. It should be noted that the words in brackets were not part of the Working Party's draft resolution; they had been included in order to give one member, who was not prepared to accept the wording proposed by the majority, an opportunity of submitting them as an amendment, as he had now done.

The CHAIRMAN put the Ukrainian amendment to the vote.

The Ukrainian amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.

The third paragraph was unanimously adopted.

Fourth paragraph

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the report and recommendations being submitted to the Council for transmission to the General Assembly were definitive. Paragraph 3 of the ensuing report, however, referred to the Commission's decision to continue its study and discussions at its twentieth session. The recommendations submitted were therefore only preliminary, and he suggested that the word "preliminary" should be inserted immediately in front of the words "report and recommendations".

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that such a report could hardly be regarded as preliminary, since it presented in final form the results of the work completed by the Commission and its programme of future work.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) proposed that the words "first report" should be used instead of the word "preliminary".

Mr. CASSIN (France) and Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) supported the Lebanese proposal.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he also accepted the Lebanese proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourth paragraph, as amended.

The fourth paragraph, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

The introductory part as a whole, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

Section I.

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

Paragraph 2

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the words in brackets expressed the opinion of the majority in the Working Party. They had been put in brackets because one member of the Working Party had wished them omitted.

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that, in his opinion, the meaning of the paragraph would be clearer without the words in brackets; he proposed that they should be deleted.

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said he agreed with the Ukrainian representative that the words were superfluous.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that the majority of the Working Party had felt that the phrase was both informative and necessary.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the proposal to retain the phrase in brackets should be treated as an amendment.

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that the listing should be limited to items (i), (ii) and (iv), followed by the words "and others", as in the sentence in brackets at the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said he thought it was desirable that the General Assembly should have a clear idea of the extent of the work before the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN put the Ukrainian amendment to the vote.

The Ukrainian amendment was rejected by 15 votes to 3.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the words "draft convention" in sub-paragraph (ii) be replaced by the words "draft declaration".

Mrs. TREE (United States of America) said she agreed that a "draft declaration" should be mentioned in sub-paragraph (ii), but felt that mention should also be made of the draft convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would assume that the Commission agreed that both a draft declaration and a draft convention should be mentioned in sub-paragraph (ii). The phrase in brackets had been retained.

It was so agreed.

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

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 3

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) proposed that the words "and giving to this question an appropriate degree of priority" be added at the end of paragraph 3. The addition was justifiable in view of the importance of the whole question of the future direction of the work of the Commission and of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) said that paragraph 3 consisted of two parts, the former of which related more directly to the terms of reference which the General Assembly had laid down for the Commission. If the Polish amendment was designed to change the direction of the Commission's work, he could not accept it.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) explained that his amendment was intended to apply to both parts of paragraph 3. To make his intention clearer, the words "these two questions" could be substituted for the words "this question" in the wording he had proposed.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested, to meet the Italian representative's point, that the additional wording proposed by the Polish representative might be inserted after the words "the Commission" at the beginning of the paragraph.

Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) said that the word "priority" could hardly be inserted after the reference to the General Assembly resolution, since that would imply that it was the General Assembly which had asked for priority to be given to the question.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said he agreed that the phrase suggested by the Polish representative should be inserted after the words "the Commission" at the beginning of the paragraph; the passage might then read "the Commission, at its twentieth session, will continue to give an appropriate priority to this question ...". The priority should apply to the study of measures and to the review of the whole question of the future direction of the work of the Commission and of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. CALSIN (France) recalled that the Commission had already adopted a resolution giving priority to the elimination of religious intolerance. If it used the same word, "priority", for the other questions, it would be storing up difficulties for its next session. All that was needed as a recognition of the importance of the future direction of the Commission's work was to introduce the words, "in appropriate order", as an indication that a result had to be reached during the session.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) remarked that the point of syntax raised by the Italian representative would not be cleared up by adopting the Lebanese suggestion. The Commission should first decide whether it wanted priority to be given to the study of measures for accelerating the development of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, or whether it wanted to give priority both to that study and to the review of the question of the future direction of the Commission's work. He himself doubted whether the Polish amendment was either necessary or useful. The draft resolution was a report to the General Assembly, which was not really concerned with the order in which the Commission discussed items on its agenda; The Commission could establish an order of priority by adopting an internal resolution. In its report the Commission was giving the General Assembly an assurance that it would tackle the two questions, and the General Assembly would automatically assume that the Commission would give appropriate priority to them.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) pointed out that the Commission had already established a priority for one item on its next session's agenda. He was not suggesting that the same priority should be given to the questions mentioned in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution; what he was suggesting was that those questions should be given an appropriate priority. He could accept the wording suggested by the Lebanese representative.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) replied that every item on the Commission's agenda was given an appropriate priority. If the Polish representative thought that his proposal was valid and pressed for its adoption, he would vote against it.

Mr. MEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the question of priority also involved the question of time. The two matters dealt with in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution deserved special attention at the next session, and the Commission should be certain of giving them a degree of priority which would ensure that they were dealt with at the next session. The Polish-Lebanese amendment would give the General Assembly the assurance that the Commission would deal with both questions at its twentieth session.

Mr. MASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Lebanese amendment to the Polish amendment was acceptable. A precedent already existed for giving priority to an item to be discussed at a following session, and the matters referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution were no less important than the matter which had then been involved. He could see no valid objection to the proposal, especially since the Commission had not complied with the General Assembly's request to submit a report and recommendations to it at its eighteenth session. The Commission should reassure the General Assembly that it did not intend to postpone discussion of those questions indefinitely.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said he believed the Commission should mention that it intended to give some priority to the matter because it was not, in fact, complying with the request to submit a report and recommendations to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session. The General Assembly had adopted resolution 1776 (XVII) because it had felt that measures designed to accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms required special attention during the United Nations Development Decade, and the Development Decade would be half over by the time any recommendations made by the Commission could be adopted by the General Assembly and implemented by Member States.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) observed that the insertion of the additional words where the Lebanese representative had suggested would give the impression that the Commission would accord appropriate priority to the question at its twentieth session pursuant to resolution 1776 (XVII) of the General Assembly, which was not the case.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) observed that giving the question a degree of priority would be in accordance with the General Assembly's resolution. If members of the Commission had any difficulty in accepting the proposal, some such formula as "In accordance with the desires of the General Assembly as expressed in resolution 1776 (XVII)" might meet the case.

Miss ATKIN (Canada) said that, since the additional words would not affect the meaning of the paragraph, her delegation was prepared to agree to their inclusion at an appropriate place. It was pointless to spend time on such an unimportant matter.

Mr. WICZOREK (Poland) asked that his proposal, as amended by the Lebanese representative, should be put to the vote immediately.



Mr. SERRUTI (Italy) said that if the amendment were put to the vote in that form, he would have to abstain because the General Assembly resolution did not refer to the direction of the Commission's work.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish amendment, as amended by the Lebanese representative.

The amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 3 was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 4

Paragraph 4 was unanimously adopted.

Part II

Section A

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Ukrainian representative had proposed an amendment (E/CN.4/L.675) to section II A, which involved adding three new paragraphs. He would put the Working Party's text of section A to the vote first, and then take the Ukrainian amendment paragraph by paragraph.

Section A was unanimously adopted.

Mr. MDOBILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he had suggested the addition of three extra paragraphs, to be numbered 3, 4 and 5 to section A of the draft resolution. He asked for a separate vote on, first, paragraph 3 with sub-paragraph 3(a), and, secondly, sub-paragraph 3(b).

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 and sub-paragraph 3(a) of the Ukrainian amendment.

At the request of the USSR representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Liberia, Netherlands, Philippines, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States, Canada, China, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Italy.

Abstaining: Chile, India, Lebanon.

Paragraph 3 and sub-paragraph 3(a) were rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph 3(b) of the Ukrainian amendment.  
Sub-paragraph 3(b) was rejected by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 4 of the Ukrainian amendment.

Paragraph 4 was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked that sub-paragraphs 5(a) and 5(b) be put to the vote separately.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph 5(a) of the Ukrainian amendment.

Sub-paragraph 5(a) was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph 5(b) of the Ukrainian amendment.

Sub-paragraph 5(b) of the Ukrainian amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

### Section B

The CHAIRMAN suggested that section B should be voted on part by part, first the part upon which the Working Group had unanimously agreed, consisting of the preamble and paragraph 1, and then the part which appeared in brackets, consisting of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

Mr. CASSIN (France) recalled that he had accepted the Chilean representative's suggestion that the words "trade unions and other organizations concerned with human rights" should be added after "universities, institutes and learned societies" in paragraph 2. The words "the contribution of intellectual circles" should therefore be replaced by the words "their contribution".

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preamble and paragraph 1 of section B.

The preamble and paragraph 1 were unanimously adopted.

In successive votes, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 were adopted by 15 votes to 3.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Philippine amendment for the addition of a section C providing for the extension of the twentieth session to at least five weeks (E/CN.4/L.674), and the Chinese representative's oral proposal, at the previous meeting as an amendment to it, that the extension should run to eight weeks.

Mr. MASIMOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what the financial implications and administrative consequences of adopting the Philippine proposal would be.

Mr. HURHREY (Secretariat) said that it had not been possible to obtain from Headquarters information on the financial implications of the Philippine and Chinese amendments; there would obviously be some. It must also be remembered that the programme of conferences for 1964 was very heavy. The Council's Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences would weigh all those considerations before the Council came to a final decision. The Commission usually expressed its own views on the duration and place of its next session.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that obviously proposals such as those before the Commission must be dealt with by the appropriate body. The USSR delegation could not support the Philippine proposal because the financial implications and administrative consequences were not clear. The Philippine representative should not raise the matter in the Commission but in the appropriate United Nations organ.

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said it was quite proper for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Council regarding the duration of the Commission's sessions; in fact once, during its session, the Commission had asked the Council to extend the session for a week, and its request had been granted. The Commission had not only the right but the duty, in the present instance, to recommend that its twentieth session be extended. The financial implications of an extension were a matter for the Council. It was not even known whether the Commission could meet in 1964 at Headquarters because of plans for repairs to the conference area. The Commission need merely to make a recommendation, and the Council would either accept it or modify it, depending on the pattern of conferences to be held in that year.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said that in view of the heavy agenda the Commission would be faced with at its next session and in view of the obligations it had to the General Assembly, it should clearly state that a four-week session would be insufficient. The Council, which would have all the relevant facts before it, would certainly take account of that view. He would support the Philippine proposal on the understanding that it was intended to be an expression of the Commission's view.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that he could not commit himself to accepting, on behalf of his Government, the financial implications of extending the length of the Commission's twentieth session, especially in view of the state of United Nations finances. With regard to the Chinese proposal, he recalled that when the Commission had previously held eight-week sessions, it had had one specific task. It was a totally different matter when the agenda contained many difficult items; members would become tired, and the momentum and efficiency of the Commission's work would gradually decrease. He could not support the proposal. He was not sure that it would be useful even to extend the next session by one week, as the Philippine representative had proposed. It would take twelve weeks or more to cover the agenda, and one week added to the normal four-week session would not make much difference. The General Assembly, after all, had referred two difficult items to the Commission,

and it must have been aware when it did so that the Commission would not be able to complete its other work in order to deal with them. A list of all the work in hand was contained in part I, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, in which it was also stated that the Commission expected the completion of that work to take more than one session. That was sufficient. He would abstain on the vote on the Philippine proposal.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said he welcomed the change in the attitude of various members of the Commission since the previous session, when he had submitted a similar proposal. The argument that one week more would not make much difference to the amount of work the Commission could accomplish was hardly valid; no one was likely to suggest on the basis of that argument that the session should be reduced to three weeks instead of four. As the Lebanese representative had pointed out, the Commission would merely be expressing its view to the Council, with which the final decision would rest. He asked the Chinese representative not to press his amendment to a vote.

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said he must maintain his amendment. It was quite unrealistic to look at the Commission's programme of work and suggest that five weeks would be sufficient for its completion. If the Commission was realistic, it would suggest that its next two sessions should both last eight weeks.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chinese oral amendment to the Philippine amendment.

The Chinese amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Philippine amendment (E/CN.4/L.674).

The Philippine amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (E/CN.4/L.667), as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.<sup>1/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> For the text of the resolution as adopted, see Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 8, resolution 8 (XIX).

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, first, because he did not consider that it should contain suggestions of a practical nature when the Commission was to review the whole question of the future direction of its work at its next session, and secondly, because the Commission had not adopted the Polish-Lebanese amendment to part I, paragraph 3, thereby showing that there was no agreement on the importance of studying, as a matter of priority, measures for accelerating the development of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom. His delegation had proposed certain measures at the eighteenth session, but the discussion of them had been postponed to the nineteenth, and now the matter had been deferred again until the twentieth. His delegation had done its utmost to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, and he thanked the representatives of India, Chile and Lebanon for the understanding attitude they had shown towards his delegation's proposals. He hoped the Commission's work would be more fruitful at its next session.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because he believed that only paragraph 3 of part I had anything to do with the request made to the Commission by the General Assembly; it was most unfortunate that the Commission had not been able to agree to give priority to the activities mentioned in that paragraph. Moreover, he did not believe that paragraphs 2 to 4 in part II, section B had any place in a draft resolution of that kind. Another reason why he had abstained was that he was not authorized by his Government to vote on a proposal which had financial implications without knowing what those implications were.

The CHAIRMAN said that that concluded the Commission's consideration of item 11.

#### REPRESENTATIONS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

The CHAIRMAN said he had received a letter from Mr. Szmitkowski, representative of Pax Romana, in his capacity as the Vice Chairman of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, pointing out that a number of representatives of non-governmental organizations had been unable to address the Commission, owing to pressure on the Commission's time.<sup>2/</sup> The fact would be noted in the record.

<sup>2/</sup> For the list of documents for the nineteenth session issued in the non-governmental organization series, see Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 8, pp. 103-104.

DRAFT PRINCIPLES ON FREEDOM AND NON-DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF POLITICAL RIGHTS (item 6(b) of the agenda) (E/CN.4/830, 837 and Add.1-7, 845 and Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider item 6(b) of its agenda.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, since the Commission had not had time for a thorough discussion of item 6(b), the consideration of that important item should be deferred to the next session. He proposed the following draft resolution for adoption by the Commission:

"The Commission on Human Rights,

Recognizing the exceptional importance of this question and taking into account resolution 4 (XV) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities,

Notes with regret that it has not had sufficient time to give proper attention to this matter at its nineteenth session,

Decides to postpone consideration of this item to its twentieth session and to accord it priority".

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) suggested that the term "an appropriate degree of priority" which had been used in the two resolutions adopted by the Commission at its morning meeting should be used instead of the word "priority".

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) proposed the deletion of the word "exceptional" from the first preambular paragraph.

Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said he supported both the proposed amendments.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland), noting that Commission resolution 4 (XVIII) (E/3616, para.184) mentioned the importance of the item, said that the Soviet Union's proposed draft resolution evidently reflected the Commission's views. Moreover, since the question could not be postponed indefinitely, it should certainly be accorded some priority.

Mr. CASSIN (France) supported the proposal for the deletion of the word "exceptional"; also instead of "priority" it would be better to speak of "some degree of priority".

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) suggested that priority should be accorded to two or three questions and then an order of priority should be established among them, in order to ensure that sufficient time should be available for their thorough discussion.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he accepted the deletion of the word "exceptional". The reference to "priority" in his draft resolution was not intended to mean that the question should be the first item to be discussed at the twentieth session.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) proposed that, in the interests of clarity, the word "priority" should be replaced by the words "giving it a priority appropriate to its importance".

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he accepted that wording.

The USSR draft resolution, as amended, was unanimously adopted.<sup>3/</sup>

REPORT OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES (item 6(c) of the agenda) (E/CN.4/846 and Corr.1; E/CN.4/L.672)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider item 6(c) of its agenda, in connexion with which Denmark, Liberia and the Philippines had jointly submitted a draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.672) on the study of discrimination in respect of the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Mr. MADSEN (Denmark) said that in the sixth line of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution the words "of Member States" should be inserted after the word "Governments".

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) supported the draft resolution; it was similar to those adopted by the Commission in previous years on other matters.

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile), with regard to paragraph 3, said he felt it would be unwise for the Secretary-General to make available draft principles which had not been approved either by the Commission or by the Economic and Social Council. Also, although he agreed in principle with paragraph (3) of the draft resolution in paragraph 5, he considered that invitations should be extended either to all the Special Rapporteurs of the Sub-Commission whose reports were to be considered, or to none.

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said he questioned the wisdom of referring draft principles of a political nature to the Conference on International Travel and Tourism, as suggested in paragraph 3. Surely that body was not competent to deal with such political issues and would be at a loss to know what action it should take on them.

---

<sup>3/</sup> Text of the resolution as adopted, ibid., resolution 3(XIX).

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) explained, on behalf of the sponsors, that the action suggested in paragraph 3 was based on a recommendation of the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/846, resolution 2 D(XV)). The Secretary-General, in transmitting the draft principles in question, would certainly state that they had not yet been adopted. The invitation to the Special Rapporteur was similar to invitations addressed in the past to other special rapporteurs who had participated in the discussion of their reports, and was therefore in keeping with practice.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the joint draft resolution was meant to replace parts B and D of resolution 2 (XV) of the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/846, pages 41 and 43). If so, he preferred the Sub-Commission's resolution to the joint draft resolution. The Sub-Commission had, incidentally, devoted far too much time to secondary matters, such as the right of everyone to leave any country, to the detriment of really important questions such as racial discrimination and colonialism. Had it devoted more time to consideration of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, for example, the Commission's work would have been greatly facilitated and it could have concentrated on other important matters, in accordance with the wishes of the General Assembly.

The report left much to be desired, particularly as it was based on the erroneous assumption that the Special Rapporteur's report was entirely satisfactory. His delegation had no objection to the transmission of the draft principles to member governments, but they should not be referred to the Conference on International Travel and Tourism. He would also find it difficult to accept paragraphs (1) and (2) of the draft resolution in paragraph 5, since he was opposed to the printing and circulation of the study both for reasons of substance and on financial grounds. The study should not be circulated until it had been approved by the Commission. As regards the invitation to the Special Rapporteur in paragraph (3), the Commission should not decide forthwith to whom invitations should be addressed.

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said he would have no difficulty in voting for the draft resolution in paragraph 5.

Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, as the report had not been considered by the Commission, it would be most irregular to propose that it be printed and circulated. The joint draft resolution could be adopted only after the report had been considered and approved.



Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the draft resolution should begin:

"The Commission on Human Rights,

Having considered the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities concerning the work of its fifteenth session relating to the study of discrimination in respect of the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country,"

and that paragraphs 1, 3 and 5 of the joint draft resolution should be deleted.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) moved the closure of the debate.

The motion for the closure was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that his amendment should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment for the deletion of paragraph 1.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 15 votes to 3.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment for the deletion of paragraph 3.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment for the deletion of paragraph 5.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 15 votes to 3.

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) suggested that in the first two lines of paragraph 2, the words "the draft principles on freedom and non-discrimination" should be replaced by the words "the Special Rapporteur's study". Though the Commission should not transmit to an international conference principles which it had not yet approved, it could transmit a valuable report.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said he disagreed with the representative of Chile. If the principles recommended by the Sub-Commission aroused misgivings, the report of an individual could not be expected to inspire greater confidence. The proposed change was almost a slight to the Sub-Commission.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that the wishes of the Chilean representative would perhaps be met if the report were transmitted as provisional; in the past, reports and principles had, wherever possible, been considered together, and they were normally printed in the same volume. It should be made

clear that the principles would not be adopted without final approval by the United Nations organs to which the Commission was responsible.

Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said that the question was particularly important from the standpoint of procedure in connexion with the future work of the Commission. He had not of course intended any disrespect to the Sub-Commission by his proposal. The Working Party had demonstrated its esteem for the Sub-Commission in adopting the Sub-Commission's draft as the basis for its own resolutions, even though its own draft diverged from it on some points. He had no objection to the submission of the draft principles as an annex to a provisional report, as had been done with the study on religious discrimination and as suggested by the United Kingdom representative. He proposed then that the Secretary-General should be asked to transmit to the Conference on International Travel and Tourism the Special Rapporteur's report together with the draft principles.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said he accepted the amendment by the representative of Chile.

Mr. CHENG Paonan asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

Mr. MASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.672) be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

Preamble

The preamble was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 15 votes to 3.

Paragraph 2

Paragraph 2 was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 3

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3, as amended by the Chilean representative.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 10 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 4

Paragraph 4 was unanimously adopted.

Paragraph 5

Sub-paragraph (1)

Sub-paragraph (1) was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Sub-paragraph (2)

Sub-paragraph (2) was adopted by 15 votes to 3.

Sub-paragraph (3)

Sub-paragraph (3) was adopted by 15 votes to 3.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.672) as a whole, as amended.

The joint draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to 3.<sup>4/</sup>

Mrs. TREE said that the Commission still had to adopt another resolution in connexion with the future work of the Sub-Commission. Resolution 1 (XV) of the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/846, para.30) stated that the Sub-Commission had decided "to undertake the study of equality in the administration of justice, in accord with Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to appoint a Special Rapporteur for that purpose." Mr. Mohamed Ahmed Abu Rannat, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Sudan, who had been re-elected to the Sub-Commission the previous year, had been appointed the Special Rapporteur. She wished to submit, together with the United Kingdom delegation, a draft resolution.

"The Commission on Human Rights

Recommends to the Economic and Social Council the adoption of the following draft resolution:

The Economic and Social Council.

Approves the decision taken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to undertake a study of equality in the administration of justice, in accord with Article 10 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and to appoint a Special Rapporteur to carry out this study."

The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution to the vote.

The United States and United Kingdom draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.<sup>5/</sup>

Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said that to complete item 6(c), the Commission would have to adopt another draft resolution, which might read:

"The Commission on Human Rights

Takes note of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (fifteenth session) (E/CN.4/846 and Corr.1)."

The CHAIRMAN put the Chinese draft resolution to the vote.

The Chinese draft resolution was unanimously adopted.<sup>6/</sup>

4/ Text of the resolution as adopted, ibid., resolution 4(XIX) and Chapter XIII, draft resolution II.

5/ Text of the resolution as adopted, ibid., resolution 5(XIX) and Chapter XIII, draft resolution III.

6/ Ibid., resolution 6(XIX).

ELECTION OF A MEMBER OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES TO FILL A VACANCY (item 6(d) of the agenda) (E/CN.4/833/Add.1, 849 and Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1, Add.2-3)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to elect by secret ballot a member of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Charles Ammoun (Lebanon), for the remainder of his term of office. The list of candidates was:

Rev. Mr. François Akoa (Cameroon)

Mr. Zenon Rossides (Cyprus)

Mr. Phouvong Phimmason (Laos)

Mr. Mohammed Awad Mohammed (United Arab Republic)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Madsen (Denmark) and Mr. Litem (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	18
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	18
Required majority:	10

Number of votes obtained:

Rev. Mr. François Akoa (Cameroon) .....	4
Mr. Zenon Rossides (Cyprus) .....	0
Mr. Phouvong Phimmason (Laos) .....	1
Mr. Mohammed Awad Mohammed (United Arab Republic) .....	13

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Mohammed Awad Mohammed (United Arab Republic) was elected a member of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

STUDY OF THE RIGHT OF ARRESTED PERSONS TO COMMUNICATE WITH THOSE WHOM IT IS NECESSARY FOR THEM TO CONSULT IN ORDER TO ENSURE THEIR DEFENCE OR TO PROTECT THEIR ESSENTIAL INTERESTS (item 5 of the agenda) (E/CN.4/856)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to elect by secret ballot two members to the Committee on the Right of Everyone to be Free from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention and Exile, to replace the representatives of Argentina and Pakistan, whose membership of the Commission on Human Rights expired on 31 December 1962.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Madsen (Denmark), and Mr. Lütem (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	18
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	18
Required majority:	10

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Diaz Casanueva (Chile .....	3
Mr. Ponce y Carbo (Ecuador) .....	14
Mr. Hakim (Lebanon).....	2
Mr. Doe (Liberia) .....	16
Mr. Jiménez (Panama) .....	1

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Ponce y Carbo (Ecuador) and Mr. Doe (Liberia), were elected.

ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (item 3 of the agenda) (E/CN.4/834 and Add.1, E/CN.4/L.657 and Add.1-2)

Miss AITKEN (Canada) said that Chile, Ecuador, India, Lebanon, Liberia, Netherlands and Philippines, had joined in sponsoring the Canadian draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.657/Add.2). The importance of the United Nations advisory services lay in the contribution they enabled the Commission to make towards the advance of human rights by meeting the need for greater knowledge and more effective skills among persons in positions of leadership and promoting the development of the resources and conditions upon which human progress depended. Although it was impossible to assess the impact of advisory services on public opinion, she was sure the importance of the programme of services could hardly be overestimated.

The distinction between "developed" and "developing" countries should not be the predominant feature of the programme. While developing countries would always have an undisputed claim on the limited financial resources the United Nations allocated to technical assistance, it should also be remembered that almost all technical assistance involved both developed and developing countries together. All needed opportunities to learn as well as to teach. In that respect group experience acquired in seminars was particularly valuable.

A few comments might be useful on the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.4/834) and on the three types of advisory services at present offered, consultant services, seminars and fellowships. Consultant services were not mentioned in the report; they had not been very successful and appeared unlikely to become so. Seminars had produced more encouraging results, particularly in directing attention to the sociological as well as the legal aspects of human rights, by covering such subjects as the role of the police in the protection of human rights, participation of women in public life, the protection of minorities, freedom of information and human rights in developing countries. The interest shown in seminars and fellowships could undoubtedly be capitalized. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt that governments ought to find better methods of selecting candidates for fellowships. Improved study programmes should be provided for selected candidates, and the fellowship programmes should never be improvised. They might be backed up by the regional courses proposed by the Secretary-General in his report, which were the basic feature of the present resolution.

Regional courses could fill a gap in the existing programme, combining the group experience of seminars with the educational function of fellowships. They would be more comprehensive and longer than the seminars, though less specialized and shorter than the fellowships. They would be conducted under closer guidance than was normally provided for fellows and would probably be accessible to sectors unable to take advantage of the existing advisory services. Special syllabuses might be prepared for mentally mature persons in leading positions in both governmental and non-governmental spheres and in education. A two-year experimental period for the new regional courses was suggested by the Secretary-General (E/CN.4/834, para.19). The first course might be organized in 1964 - Canada would be glad to be the host country - and a second in 1965. The word "regional" should be interpreted broadly.

Although the Commission did not have to deal with the problem of financing the new courses, the draft resolution suggested that the cost should be absorbed "preferably within the level of appropriations for technical programmes financed from the regular budget of the United Nations." In chapter V of the regular budget, out of the \$6.5 million voted for technical programmes, \$140,000 was appropriated for the Human Rights Advisory Services, while \$40,000 more was authorized for fellowships to be charged to savings under part V. The additional \$50,000 for regional

courses would be added to the \$40,000 for additional fellowships, so that \$90,000 in all would have to be financed out of those savings. It should, however, be borne in mind that adequate savings always materialized under chapter V. The financial question would be considered by the Technical Assistance Committee at its session in May 1963. The Secretary-General's estimate (E/CN.4/L.657/Add.1) was a maximum, based on an eight-week course and on the assumption that no fellowships granted to participants would be charged to the fellowships programme. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt that the funds required would not represent an excessive claim on the regular budget for technical programmes.

Mr. QUIAMBAO (Philippines) said the usefulness of the regional courses proposed in the joint draft resolution fully justified their organization. The subjects on which training courses could be given, outlined in paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.4/834), deserved serious consideration, at least on an experimental basis. As the Secretary-General suggested, courses might be given in co-operation with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The inquiry initiated by the Secretary-General into the possibility of sending observers to the European Court of Human Rights was especially welcome in view of the forthcoming consideration of the measures of implementation for the draft International Covenants on Human Rights. Newly-independent countries would certainly be most interested in the functioning of the Court.

As the first host country to a seminar on human rights, the Philippines had had experience of the value of the advisory services in promoting those rights and strongly supported the programme outlined in paragraph 9 of the report. As one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 1872 (XVII), his country was particularly gratified by the success of the fellowships programme. He agreed with the Secretary-General that applicants for fellowships should be sponsored by governments and selected from persons likely to occupy responsible positions in connexion with the development of their country. Fellowships for periods of from eight to ten months, instead of the customary four to six months, would give recipients a better chance of becoming fully acquainted with the methods and techniques practised in other countries.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that on the whole his delegation approved both the Secretary-General's report and the joint

draft resolution. He must, however, express the strongest reservation regarding paragraph 21 of the report, since it was not appropriate for the United Nations either to send observers to attend the European Court of Human Rights or to grant fellowships for study of the procedure there. The Court was a closed regional organization of very limited scope; its activity was therefore one-sided, and any participation in its work by the United Nations would be all the more undesirable in that nothing similar was suggested in respect of other regions or other systems of law. That apart, the joint draft resolution would be acceptable to his delegation if it entailed no additional expenditure from the United Nations budget.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that while he appreciated the considerations put forward by the Canadian representative when introducing the joint draft resolution, he had doubts about the proposal it contained. The purpose of seminars was to enable people who held responsible positions in government services concerned with human rights to learn what was being done in other regions of the world with a view to changing the system in their home countries; in other words, seminars were supposed to lead to action at the national level. Fellowships, similarly, were granted to eminent persons to enable them to study institutions in other countries with a view to seeing how far successful practices in other countries might be applied at home. He could not, however, see what real advantage was to be gained by holding training courses for junior or intermediate officials, as suggested in paragraph 17 of the Secretary-General's report, since such lower grade staff were clearly not in a position to take any action which would help to fulfil the aims of seminars and fellowships. Regional training courses would be very expensive, and he doubted their immediate usefulness. If they were to be tried as an experiment, the experiment should be for one year only, rather than the two suggested in the joint draft resolution. The experiment might, of course, show advantages which he himself could not foresee.

With regard to the USSR representative's comments concerning the possibility of sending observers to attend the European Court of Human Rights, the reason the suggestion had been made was because no other comparable institute existed. Any courses held there would be open to observers wishing to study the procedure and composition of the Court; no one would be compelled to study there. Such courses would be useful, and the fact that they were held there would in no way preclude the possibility of holding similar courses elsewhere.



Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the wording of the fourth preambular paragraph of the internal resolution in the joint draft resolution gave the impression that General Assembly resolution 1776 (XVII) stated that "the effectiveness of the United Nations' activity in this field would be enhanced and its practical results increased" if regional courses were developed; but the Assembly resolution said nothing of the kind. The reference should therefore be deleted. His delegation would in any case be unable to vote for the joint draft resolution because of the additional expenditure it would entail.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) said that his Government had shown great interest in advisory services in the field of human rights and would be the host to a seminar in the current year. He approved both the Secretary-General's report as a whole and the principle of the joint draft resolution, but the measures contemplated should be international, not merely regional, in scope. Moreover, they should not entail additional expense which would leave less money available for technical assistance, in the strict sense of the term, to developing countries. He would, therefore, abstain.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said he approved of the Secretary-General's report and the joint draft resolution. In planning the suggested experiments, every allowance should be made for the great differences in available resources in the various regions. Courses should not be confused with seminars, which were attended by members of the judiciary and legislature. His delegation hoped that progress would be made along the lines indicated, at minimum cost, and that the greatest expenditure would be incurred in those countries which were least well endowed with universities and establishments for higher education. What was needed was effective teaching of human rights from a broad viewpoint, divorced from all propaganda.

Miss AITKEN (Canada) said that to remove the misgivings of the USSR and Polish representatives, she could only repeat what she had said when introducing the joint draft resolution, that there was no suggestion that additional funds should be obtained to carry out the proposed experiments. Funds would be provided from savings which it was certain would be made under chapter V of the United Nations regular budget. The figure of \$50,000 represented the maximum cost of organizing the courses. She accepted the Ukrainian representative's proposal that the words "as requested by resolution 1776 (XVII) of the General Assembly" should be deleted from the fourth preambular paragraph of the internal resolution.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution, as amended.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the vote be taken paragraph by paragraph.

First preamble

In successive votes the first, second, third and fourth paragraphs were unanimously adopted.

First operative paragraph

The operative paragraph of the Commission's draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Second preamble

The first paragraph was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second paragraph was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Second operative paragraph

The operative paragraph of the resolution for the Council was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

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

The joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.657/Add.2), as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.<sup>7/</sup>

POSTPONEMENT OF CERTAIN ITEMS

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) proposed that the Commission should mention in its report that owing to lack of time it had decided to postpone the consideration of items 5, 6 (a), 7 (a), 7 (b), 8 and 15 to its twentieth session.

It was so decided.

The public meeting was suspended at 11.50 p.m. and resumed at 12.20 a.m. on Thursday, 4 April.

<sup>7/</sup> Text of the resolution as adopted, ibid., resolution 1(KIK) and Chapter XIII, draft resolution 1.

STUDY OF THE RIGHT OF EVERYONE TO BE FREE FROM ARBITRARY ARREST, DETENTION AND EXILE, AND DRAFT PRINCIPLES ON FREEDOM FROM ARBITRARY ARREST AND DETENTION (item 4 of the agenda) (E/CN.4/826 and Corr.1-2, 835 and Add.1-6 and Add.6/Corr.1; L.670/Rev.1)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the draft resolution on item 9 of the agenda submitted jointly by Chile, Denmark, India, Lebanon, Liberia and Turkey (E/CN.4/L.670/Rev.1).

Mr. LUTEM (Turkey) said that the comments from governments on the draft principles on freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention were very encouraging and showed the importance that States ascribed to that question. His own Government's comments would deal with articles 5, 14 (paragraph 1), 20, 22 and 38 (paragraph 3). Any work of general codification was by its very nature bound to be slow. It had been said in criticism of the draft that it was too long and detailed and was the product of a particular legal system, and it had been suggested that the principles should merely lay down general rules. He himself suggested that the Secretary-General should convene a number of experts, preferably experts in criminal law, on an equitable geographical basis, to review the draft in the light of the comments of governments and to make a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council concerning its final form. A simpler and shorter draft would stand a better chance of being accepted by a large number of States. His delegation would have liked to see the Committee's report (E/CN.4/826) printed, but apart from the financial implications, its rather special nature was perhaps an obstacle. Nevertheless, the possibility of printed publication should be given careful consideration at the Commission's twentieth session.

Mr. WIECZOREK (Poland) said he supported the joint draft resolution, but regretted that the Commission had not had time to consider the question thoroughly. He drew attention to the appeal recently addressed to the General Assembly by Lord Russell regarding the continued arbitrary detention of over a thousand political prisoners in Greece who had done nothing more than express their opposition to Hitlerite crimes. Lord Russell's appeal for an amnesty for those prisoners should not go unheeded.

Mr. NASSINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he supported the joint draft resolution and requested that it be put to the vote.

Mrs. LEFAUCHEUX (Commission on the Status of Women), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that the Commission on the Status of Women naturally followed with keen interest the extremely important work of the Commission on Human Rights. She hoped to be able to provide the Commission with a report on the views of her colleagues on the items considered by the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution to the vote.

The joint draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.670/Rev.1) was unanimously adopted.<sup>8/</sup>

The meeting rose at 12.40 a.m. on Thursday, 4 April

---

<sup>8/</sup> Text of the resolution as adopted, ibid., resolution 2 (XIX).