

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/CN.4/SR.18
6 February 1947
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday
6 February 1947 at 12:45 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:	Mrs. Roosevelt	(United States of America)
Vice-Chairman:	Dr. Chang	(China)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Malik	(Lebanon)
Members:	Mr. Moore	(Australia)
	Mr. Ksminsky	(Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
	Mr. Nieto del Pío	(Chile)
	Mr. Ebeid	(Egypt)
	Prof. Cassin	(France)
	Mrs. Mehta	(India)
	Mr. Chani	(Iran)
	Gen. Romulo	(Philippine Republic)
	Mr. Teplov	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Maj. Dukes	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. Mora	(Uruguay)
Alternates:	Mr. Lebeau	(Belgium)
	Mr. Guardia	(Panama)

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. Darchambeau	(UNESCO)
Mr. E. Hutchinson	(ILO)

Non-Governmental Organizations:

Consultant:	Miss Sender	(American Federation of Labor)
-------------	-------------	-----------------------------------

Secretariat: Prof. J. Humphrey

I. Item 3 on the Agenda: Relations with Non-Governmental Organizations
(continued).

The CHAIRMAN announced that the discussion begun that morning would be resumed. Two texts were before the Commission, the Lebanese proposal and the Soviet amendment.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon), Rapporteur, read his proposal:

"That the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, in drawing up the preliminary draft of the International Bill of Human Rights, may consult any document or person deemed by them of relevance to their work."

Professor HUMPEREY (Secretariat) read the amendment submitted by the Soviet representative. It specified that the Drafting Committee might consult the non-governmental organizations in Category (a) and, in particular, the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Professor CASSIN (France) considered that the two proposals were not compatible. He thought that the Drafting Committee should be free to gather information from all useful sources and, more particularly, that it should be able to consult the organizations in Category (a) of which the World Federation of Trade Unions was the most important.

The CHAIRMAN considered that if the World Federation of Trade Unions was mentioned, the other organizations in Category (a) would have to be mentioned too. The Soviet representative's amendment seemed to her inopportune.

Major DUKES (United Kingdom) thought it was difficult to assign a special position to any particular organization, and the Drafting Committee should be left free to consult whomever it wished.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the object of his amendment was to give directions to the Drafting Committee in order to avoid confusion in the future.

Miss SENDER (American Federation of Labor) stated that the Soviet amendment drew an arbitrary distinction between the four non-governmental organizations. She regretted, moreover, that the Commission had not considered the draft Bill of Human Rights submitted by her organization.

Mr. MOORE (Australia) thought the Lebanese motion was sufficient to guide the Drafting Committee in its work, and opposed the Soviet amendment.

/Professor CASSIN

Professor CASSIN (France) thought that legal equality was not the only criterion, and that the moral importance of certain federations should also be taken into consideration. He recalled that, in the last war, thousands of workers, now represented by the World Federation of Trade Unions, had risen to fight the enemy, and that it was largely thanks to them that it was now possible to debate here in full freedom.

Nevertheless, he would prefer to adopt the Lebanese proposal as a working basis, with the reservation that special mention be made of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which represented par excellence those who had fought for the rights of man.

Mr. MORA (Uruguay) preferred the Lebanese proposal, which did not give the impression of discriminating between the various organizations. He would therefore vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN put the Soviet amendment to the vote.

DECISION: The amendment was rejected by six votes to two.

The CHAIRMAN put the Lebanese proposal to the vote.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the terms of the Lebanese motion were in contradiction with the Charter of the United Nations.

DECISION: The proposal was adopted by eight votes to one.

II. Item 4 on the Agenda: Relations with Specialized Agencies.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission had every reason to be satisfied with its relations with the ILO and UNESCO, and she hoped that this collaboration would continue along the same lines.

Professor HUMPHREY (Secretariat) pointed out that the Co-ordination Committee had dispersed without settling the question of liaison between UNESCO and the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as United States representative, stated that her delegation had submitted a plan for co-ordination between these two organizations.

Mr. DARCHAMBAU (UNESCO) stated that the question of human rights was a fundamental one for UNESCO. He therefore hoped that collaboration between the Commission on Human Rights and UNESCO would be effective in the two essential points now under consideration, especially in a sphere of particular interest to UNESCO, namely, the Bill of Human Rights and the Conference for the Freedom of Information and of the Press.

In regard to the Bill, three meetings of philosophers and experts had been arranged to take place in June, July or September 1947, in order to clarify the philosophical principles which must be the basis of any bill of human rights.

It was desirable that UNESCO should communicate the result of its work to the Commission on Human Rights.

As regards the Conference for the Freedom of Information and of the Press, the United Nations viewed this problem from a political angle, and UNESCO from a purely technical angle. This Conference envisaged by the United Nations had also been planned by UNESCO. He sincerely hoped that it would be officially convened in the name of the United Nations and UNESCO, and that the agenda would be drawn up jointly by both organizations.

The CHAIRMAN stated that due note would be taken of the UNESCO representative's remarks, but that she did not think that any action was called for at present concerning special co-operation or any change in the relations between UNESCO and the United Nations.

Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) supported the Chairman and stated that relations between the Economic and Social Council and its Commissions, on the one hand, and the specialized agencies on the other, had been provided for in full detail and that consequently the Commission had reason to congratulate itself on the way in which these relations had been functioning.

III. Item 5 on the Agenda: Relations with the Trusteeship Council
(Document (E/CN.4/W.6)).

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Commission could perhaps leave this

question until the Trusteeship Council met.

Professor HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that the provisional agenda for the next meeting of the Economic and Social Council included an item relating to co-ordination between the three Councils.

Professor CASSIN (France) wondered whether it would not be sufficient to remind the Economic and Social Council that the Commission on Human Rights existed and did not wish to be left out when any problems affecting the fundamental rights of man were being considered.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, since the question would be raised by the Trusteeship Council and by the Economic and Social Council, the Commission might confine itself to mentioning in its report that it had discussed the question and was awaiting the meeting of the Economic and Social Council to make further recommendations.

In reply to a question from Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) the CHAIRMAN explained that the suggestions made in no way precluded the working group from receiving and utilizing any information which the Trusteeship Council might provide.

IV. Item 6 on the Agenda: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether it would not be appropriate for the Commission to request the Secretary-General to analyze the data on human rights in non-self-governing territories, and then to make suggestions either to the Secretary-General or to an ad hoc committee of the General Assembly.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that information from non-self-governing territories would be useful to the working group. The Commission could simply note that the working group would use such information as the Secretariat might provide.

Mr. MOORE (Australia) remarked that the reports had to be transmitted to the Secretary-General for the next session of the General Assembly, and a Commission of the Economic and Social Council could hardly ask for a report before it had been submitted to the Assembly.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN said that this was quite true, and that the Commission could only mention the question in the meantime.

V. Item 7 on the Agenda: Co-ordination with other Commissions.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the main function of the Economic and Social Council was to co-ordinate the work of the various Commissions, and he therefore considered that this task should be left to the Council.

Dr. CHANG (China), Vice-Chairman, thought that this question should be left aside until the next session, and that for the moment the system should be kept as simple and practical as possible.

Mrs. MEETA (India) drew the Commission's attention to the last paragraph of document E/CN.4/W.2 which suggested that, when the Commission on Human Rights placed on its agenda an item which might be of interest to other Commissions, it should inform them and ask them to designate a member to participate in discussions, without the right to vote.

She considered it to be an excellent suggestion, which ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN was of the opinion that it might be left to the Economic and Social Council to take a decision on the matter, and that such co-operation could take place without a formal recommendation being necessary.

VI. Items 8 and 9 on the Agenda: Programme of Future Work - Other Items.

Professor CASSIN (France) recalled that the Economic and Social Council had examined the possibility for Members of the United Nations to set up information groups. The French Government was trying to establish such a group, and he wished to know whether other nations could give any information on the position they would adopt on this matter.

Mr. MOORE (Australia) observed that the Australian Government would like to have more precise information on the nature of the functions of

such groups before taking a final decision on their formation.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the task of these groups would be to collect all the information possible on questions concerning human rights and to transmit it, through their Governments, to the Secretary-General. It was not necessary for the Commission to take any concrete action until more reports had been received from governments.

Professor HUMPHREY (Secretariat) thought it might be well for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council that the functions of these groups be more clearly defined.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) held the view that the question was quite new to the Commission and that probably none of the members was in a position to consider it for the time being or to make recommendations to the Council. He requested that the Commission leave the question aside for the moment, and moved that the debate be adjourned.

The meeting rose at 4:30 p.m.
