

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SECOND SESSION

SUMMARY RECORD OF FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday 17 December, 1947, at 3 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt (United States of America)

Rapporteur: Dr. C. Malik (Lebanon)

Members: Col. W.R. Hodgson (Australia)
Prof. F. Dehousse (Belgium)
Mr. A.S. Stenanienko (Byelorussian S.S.R.)
Dr. C.H. Wu (China)
Mr. O. Loutfi (Egypt)
Prof. R. Cassin (France)
Mrs. Hansa Mehta (India)
Mr. A.G. Pourvelly (Iran)
Mr. M. Amado (Panama)
Gen. M.C. Romulo (Philippine Republic)
Mr. M. Klekovkin (Ukrainian S.S.R.)
Mr. A.F. Bogomolov (U.S.S.R.)
Lord Dukeston (United Kingdom)
Mr. A.C. Victorica (Uruguay)
Dr. V. Ribnikar (Yugoslavia)

Representatives
of the Commission
on the Status of
Women:

Mrs. E. Uralova, Rapporteur

Secretariat:

Prof. J.P. Humphrey

Mr. E. Lawson

Specialised Agencies: Mr. J. de Givry (I.L.O.)

Mr. J. Havet (UNESCO)

Miss Barble (Preparatory Commission for
the International Refugee
Organization)

Non-Governmental
Organizations:

Category A:

Miss Toni Sender (American Federation of
Labour)

Mr. P.V.S. Serrarens (International
Federation of Christian Trade
Unions)

Non-Governmental
Organizations:

Category B:

Mr. O.F. Nolde (Commission of the
Churches on International Affairs)

Dr. Bienenfeld (Consultative Council of
Jewish Organizations)

Mr. Riegner (World Jewish Congress)

Miss de Romar (Union Internationale
des Ligues Feminines Catholiques.
Union Catholique Internationale
de Service Social)

Miss van Eeghen) (International
Mme Edes) Council of
Women)

Mme Duchesne (Federation Internationale
Democratiques des Femmes)

Consideration of Proposals submitted by the Sub-Commission on
the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities

(Document E/CN.4/68)

Part I. Paragraph II - Proposals relating to education

1. Education Programme

The CHAIRMAN observed that the decision of the Sub-Commission took the form of a request to the Economic and Social Council and enquired whether the Commission was prepared to sponsor that request.

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was not clear who was charged with the realization of this world-wide programme of education, nor to whom it was to be applied, when and where. The proposals appeared to be based on implementation by UNESCO but certain Member States did not take part in the work of that Organization.

The CHAIRMAN thought there was a misunderstanding in the reading of the text, which simply contained a request to the Secretary-General to make a study of the question of education in the fields of the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities and to make a report. There was no suggestion of UNESCO initiating such a programme, but merely of affording some collaboration. She saw nothing against this decision.

The decision of the Sub-Commission was put to the vote, and adopted by 8 in favour and none against with 5 abstentions.

2. Committee on Education

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Commission was prepared to adopt this recommendation by the Sub-Commission for the creation of a Committee. In that case the words "Commission on Human Rights" would be substituted for "The Sub-Commission" in the text of the decision of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was against the proposal. There were already a number of various Committees in existence and the creation of an additional Committee was both premature and unnecessary before a solution had been reached on the general problem of human rights. He saw no justification for the creation of a Committee to propagate democratic education on a universal basis. A number of States would not be represented as although they formed part of the Commission on Human Rights, they were not members of UNESCO. The Commission on Human Rights could attend to this problem at a later stage with the assistance of experts in the field of education.

Dr. WU (China) said that if the proposed Committee was to be formed of world leaders there was no reason why it should be limited to members of UNESCO. The difficulty raised by the Soviet Union representative did not therefore seem to exist. The work of that Committee would in no way be binding but would be devoted to a theoretical study of education.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the adoption of the decision of the Sub-Commission as a recommendation of the Commission.

Adopted by 7 votes in favour, 4 against with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph III - Insertion in the peace treaties of clauses relating to the protection of minorities.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if approved, the text of the proposed request by the Sub-Commission could be adopted as a request of the Commission by substituting the words "Commission on Human Rights" for "Sub-Commission".

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) wished to propose an amendment. He considered the text reading "peace treaties still to be ratified" incorrect both from a legal and political point of view. The series of peace treaties concluded in Paris last year had already

been ratified and were in force. He referred to those with Italy, Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria and Finland. Those treaties contained guarantees for the fundamental rights of freedom but nothing in respect of the rights of minorities. It was now too late to alter that omission but there were three other treaties pending in which it was hoped that such provisions might be inserted. He proposed that the words "in all treaties not yet concluded" should be substituted for "still to be ratified".

Mr. CASSIN (France) thought that public opinion would not understand why the protection of human rights was not stated in the proposed declaration. He suggested that the text should be altered to read "to protect human rights and minority rights".

Colonel HODGSON (Australia) thought that the whole proposal should be dropped. A clause had been inserted in the five peace treaties ratified which read "to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms". If a declaration was to be made, he would prefer to see it in that form. He did not, however, consider such a declaration necessary. The work of drafting the remaining three treaties had now been concluded and those protections had already been provided. He would not propose the deletion of the paragraph as a motion but would vote against the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the following text as proposed by the representatives of Belgium and France:

"The Commission on Human Rights declares that in all peace treaties not yet concluded there be included wherever appropriate a specific clause seeking to protect human rights and minority rights."

The text was adopted by 7 in favour, 1 against and 5 abstentions.

Paragraph IV - Request for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice concerning the survival of certain treaties and declarations.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) said that he was in favour of the proposal for both a general and a particular reason. Firstly, if it was desired to preserve the conception of international justice under present world conditions, it was time to give the International Court of Justice some work to do. That Court had been in existence for two years during which it had only dealt with two cases, that of Corfu and that of a request for an advisory opinion submitted by the last General Assembly. It was necessary to employ this Organization in order to save its prestige. His particular reason was in connection with the problem of the former minorities existing under the League of Nations. It was important to know what had become of those treaties which had been ratified under the guarantee of the League. It was to be presumed that those treaties were still theoretically in operation but in practice they were dormant since the machinery with which their operation was linked was no longer in existence. It was essential to obtain an opinion concerning the survival of these treaties. The question was also one of general interest since it concerned the whole technique of the conclusion and termination of treaties.

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not speaking against the proposals but he wished to make a suggestion. He proposed that reference should be made to the Legal Department of the United Nations instead of to the International Court of Justice. He did not agree with the Belgian representative that the authority of the International Court of Justice would be increased by such a submission. There was no warrant for requesting from this organization an overall opinion on the validity of minority treaties. That was the function of

the Legal Department of the United Nations. He reminded representatives that the General Assembly had stressed the advisability of making full use of the Secretariat, and here was a case in point. He made this suggestion as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment of the Soviet Union representative to the vote, which was rejected by 5 votes in favour, 7 against with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the acceptance of the paragraph as sponsored by the representative of Belgium, which was carried by 8 votes in favour, 3 against with 3 abstentions.

PART II - Decisions concerning the Sub-Commission.

Paragraph I - Terms of Reference of the Sub-Commission.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the proper procedure might be to request the Sub-Commission to indicate what changes they suggested in their Terms of Reference.

Dr. WU (China) agreed. He said that if it were desired to re-examine this question it would be necessary to refer the matter to a Sub-Committee, which it was now too late to do. The CHAIRMAN's solution was best and the matter could be brought up in discussion again at the next session of the Commission.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) said that a vicious circle was being created. The text of the document read that the Sub-Commission requested the Commission to qualify its Terms of Reference and it was now proposed to formulate a question to the Sub-Commission.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that it was not unusual for a Sub-Commission to suggest changes in its Terms of Reference.

Mr. CASSIN (France) suggested that the proposal of the representative of China should be adopted and that the Secretariat should at the same time be asked to make a preliminary study of the question in order that a paper might be in the hands of representatives before the next session.

Dr. WU (China) withdrew his proposal in view of the fact that the Commission would be meeting in May which was before the next meeting of the Sub-Commission. He then proposed that the whole question should be deferred until the next session.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether it would not be in order to request the Chairman of the Sub-Commission to prepare some suggestions for study at the next session of the Commission. She thought it would be useful to have this information before the Commission.

Prof. HUMPHREY (Director of the Division of Human Rights) said there was no reason why the Commission should not address a letter to the Chairman of the Sub-Commission. The difficulty arose from the uncertainty of the Sub-Commission as to what precisely it required to be specified in its Terms of Reference. He thought that the Commission would prefer to postpone the question until its next session when the whole problem of the protection of minorities would have become crystallized.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of the representative of China that the question of re-examination of the Terms of Reference of the Sub-Commission should be postponed until the next session of the Commission.

This was adopted by 12 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph II - Communications relating to Discriminations and Minorities.

The CHAIRMAN said that the observations of the Sub-Commission on this matter had been taken into account in the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Communications which had already been adopted by the Commission.

Paragraph III - Communication from the Democratic Federation of Women.

The CHAIRMAN said that the substance of this paragraph had been previously settled.

Paragraph IV - Machinery for the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

The CHAIRMAN said that no action was required since the Commission had already adopted by 11 votes to 4 the paragraph appearing under this heading on page 9 of Document E/CN.4/68.

Paragraph V - Convening of the next Session of the Sub-Commission

The CHAIRMAN said that if these proposals were agreed, a suitable text would be found at the bottom of page 11 of Document E/CN.4/68.

Dr. MALIK (Lebanon) considered it would be preferable to address the request to the Economic and Social Council and to amend the text to read: "To request the Economic and Social Council to make the necessary arrangements with the Secretary-General for convening."

Colonel HODGSON (Australia) said that he was against the proposal. Unless the Commission could be more specific in the task to be given to these experts, he could see no object in a vague recommendation of this sort.

Dr. WU (China) pointed out that the Commission had, in the Working Groups on the Declaration and Implementation, adopted quite a number of contributions from the Sub-Commission.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text with the amendment of the representative of Lebanon, which was adopted by 8 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions.

PART III - Draft Declaration of Rights

The CHAIRMAN said this Part of the Document required no comment.

PART IV - Terminology regarding prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

Paragraph I

The CHAIRMAN said it would only be necessary for the Commission to take note of this paragraph which constituted a definition.

Paragraph II

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) said that he wished to repeat the observations made by the Belgian member of the Sub-Commission. In the definition of minorities afforded by this paragraph there was a sentence which read: "Protection applies equally to individuals belonging to such groups and wishing the same protection". It had always been considered up to now that the protection of minorities applied to nationals of a State of which they formed part. That definition would cover aliens as well. He, therefore, considered that it would be dangerous to adopt this text.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a decision had been taken merely to refer the text of the whole document to Member States for their comments.

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested the postponement of the question until the next session of the Commission when the Declaration would come up for consideration.

Mr. CASSIN (France) supported the Soviet Union proposal. He wished, at the same time, to point out to the Belgian representative that the words in question were qualified by a subsequent sentence which read "Its members must also be nationals of that State". He agreed, however, with the substance of the remarks of the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) stated that he accepted the Soviet Union and French proposals. He requested, however, that both his observations and those of his colleague on the Sub-Commission should be recorded in the summary records of the Working Group and of the Commission and in the Report of the Commission. He still considered the wording ambiguous and could not be committed to such a text.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal that this paragraph should be postponed until the third session of the Commission, which was adopted unanimously.

Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the report of the Sub-Commission on the Freedom of Information and of the Press (Document E/441), pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had already approved this Report, and that it only remained to consider the Draft Resolution proposed by the Representative of the Philippines (Document E/CN.4/54).

As representative of the United States of America, the CHAIRMAN supported this resolution. She said that the Conference on Freedom of Information was convened for 23 March 1948 and would last one month. It seemed possible that the Conference would wish to entrust certain tasks to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. She said that, as a matter of sound procedure, it would be preferable to have the life of the Sub-Commission extended for a year, as from 28 March 1948. If its life was not extended, she said, the Commission would have to consider the problem at its third session and also elect the members, at a time when they would be very busy with the work on the Declaration and the Convention.

She added that the life of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information, if extended for one year, would be identical with the life of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

Colonel HODGSON (Australia), supporting the resolution of the representative of the United States of America, added that the Conference might decide either to establish its own machinery or

to use the existing Sub-Commission to implement its decisions. He suggested also that the Commission should rely upon its own Sub-Commission for assistance in drafting the Articles of the Declaration and Convention, which relate to freedom of information. He considered, therefore, that the life of the Sub-Commission should continue on the basis on which it was originally established, which was to carry out any tasks allotted to it either by the Conference or by the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the resolution of the representative of the Philippines which was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Provisional Questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council.

The CHAIRMAN then referred to the Provisional Questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council and to the relevant United States proposal (Document E/CN.4/55).

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that each representative should have the right to submit additional questions for the provisional questionnaire. This was accepted.

Mr. CASSIN (France) supported the United States proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put the United States proposal to the vote, which was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Programme of Future Work

The CHAIRMAN, referring to future work, said that the chief item was the preparation of the final International Bill of Human Rights. She did not consider that any action was necessary by the Commission concerning future business.

Mr. CASSIN (France) suggested that the report of the Secretary-General concerning information groups and local human rights committees (E/CN.4/28) should be discussed at the next session.

This was accepted.

Colonel HODGSON (Australia) asked when the Report of the Commission would be circulated to governments for comments and whether a time was fixed for the submission of replies by governments.

Professor HUMPHREY (Director of the Human Rights Division) said that it was intended to circulate the documents concerned, in the name of the Secretary-General, as quickly as possible, which would be about the first week of January. He pointed out that no resolution had been adopted by the Commission to fix a time limit for the submission of replies by governments. He thought that such a course was advisable and suggested that a date should be fixed which would give the Secretariat time to collate the replies before the meeting of the Drafting Committee on 3 May 1948.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in her opinion, it was obvious that governments must send their replies before the meeting of the Drafting Committee; for example, by 1 May 1948.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) said that he considered that governments should be asked to send their comments to the Secretariat by 3 April; it would be unwise for the Drafting Committee to be overwhelmed by comments when they were attempting to draft the Declaration and Convention.

He said that he did not consider that the period of 14 days between the meeting of the Drafting Committee and the meeting of the Commission was sufficient; he suggested that the Economic and Social Council should be asked to extend this period by one week.

Professor HUMPHREY (Director of the Human Rights Division) pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had absolute power in fixing the programme. He also pointed out that the Human Rights Division had to service the Conference on Freedom of Information, and would be unable to return to Lake Success before 3 May. He

also referred members to the rule of a six weeks' limitation concerning the receipt of reports of the Commission by the Economic and Social Council; he said that it would be necessary to ask the Economic and Social Council to waive this rule.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in her opinion, the Drafting Committee should not try to draft in final form the documents concerned, as this would mean a subsequent duplication of the work by the Commission. She considered that it would be the duty of the Drafting Committee to gather comments, to decide what should and could be incorporated in the text, and to decide the order of the Articles, in order that the work of the Commission would be as clearly defined as possible. It was for this reason, that she had stressed the length of time necessary for the Commission to consider the details of drafting.

Dr. MALIK (Lebanon) agreed that it was important to fix a time-limit for the submission of replies by governments.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) suggested the following Resolution:

Lord DUKESTON (United Kingdom) asked if it was intended that the replies from governments should be circulated to the members of the Commission on Human Rights. He thought that the replies of governments should be circulated when received so that they could be adequately studied.

The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Belgium to include such a provision in his resolution.

Mr. CASSIN (France) proposed that the original date of the session of 17 May should be retained.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) suggested that his Resolution should be voted paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 of the Belgian Resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the Belgian Resolution, as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom, was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 of the Belgian Resolution was adopted by 5 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 of the Belgian Resolution was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Consideration of the Rapporteur's Report (Document E/CN.4/77)

Dr. MALIK (Lebanon), RAPPORTEUR, presented his Report. He reminded the representatives that the Report was still in draft form and therefore open to correction; consequential amendments following upon decisions taken after the preparation of the draft report would also be made. He pointed out that on page 1 it would be necessary to add the date of the termination of the session, and also to change the title of Chapter IV to "International Covenant of Human Rights", and of Annex B to "Draft Articles for an International Covenant of Human Rights."

On page 2, paragraph 1, the number of meetings held and the date of termination would require to be entered. Regarding the list of members in paragraph 2, he mentioned that it had been necessary to enter certain members as alternates, because of the fact that the Economic and Social Council had not so far confirmed their appointment as representatives. He asked that any corrections of names and titles should be handed to him in writing.

On page 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, there appeared the names of representatives of Specialized Agencies and of Categories A and B, Non-Governmental Organizations, who had attended the session. He again asked for any corrections to be handed to him in writing.

Paragraph 5 on page 4 constituted an explanation to the Economic and Social Council as to why the session was one day late in starting. It was left to the RAPPORTEUR to complete paragraph 6 and to give the exact number of meetings attended by each representative. In paragraph 7, he pointed out that the words "diverse meetings of" after the word "attended" should be inserted.

The RAPPORTEUR said that paragraph 13 was no longer necessary, as the procedure outlined therein had been formally adopted by the Commission in its Rules of Procedure. It was therefore agreed to delete it. He reminded representatives of the Belgian Resolution, regarding the transmission of the Commission's work, accepted during the meeting, and said that it would be inserted in place of paragraph 14.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as no comment had been made, the introductory Chapter of the Report, with the additions and alterations outlined, was adopted.

The RAPPORTEUR then drew attention to Chapter II of the Report, which embodied the decisions of the Commission on the method of work to be followed.

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the words "by a majority vote" should be inserted after the word "decided" in both paragraphs 15 and 16.

The RAPPORTEUR pointed out that the results of the vote were recorded in the Summary Records. However, he was prepared to accept the Soviet Union's suggestion. It was agreed to enter the exact majority by which the decisions had been taken.

The RAPPORTEUR presented the following new text for paragraph 18 on page 7:

"Two titles were frequently used in respect of the documents under preparation, Declaration and Convention. The latter was to be entered into and ratified by Governments and not only to be discussed and adopted by the General Assembly. The question arose whether the term "Bill of Rights" was to be applied only to the Convention, or only to the Declaration, or to the two documents taken together. In its night meeting on December 16, 1947, the Commission decided:

- (a) to apply the term "International Bill of Human Rights", or, for brevity, "Bill of Rights", to the entirety of documents under preparation;
- (b) to use the term "Declaration" for the articles in Annex A of this report;
- (c) to call the Convention on Human Rights embodied in Annex B, "the Covenant on Human Rights;" and
- (d) to refer to the outcome of the suggestions embodied in Annex C as "measures for implementation", regardless of whether these measures will eventually form part of the Covenant or not."

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) suggested that the words "as a recommendation" should be inserted in line 4 after the words

"General Assembly", and the word "present" before the word "Government" in the last line.

Mr. CASSIN (France) opposed the insertion of the words "as a recommendation" on the grounds that it amounted to pre-judging the future actions of the General Assembly. He felt that it would be more prudent to retain the original text.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) was of opinion that his suggestion was in conformity with the Charter, according to which, he said, the General Assembly was empowered to make recommendations only.

Mr. CASSIN (France) pointed out that the General Assembly was able to make decisions, as, for example, regarding the Budget. He again emphasized the necessity for retaining the original text because, in his opinion, the addition of the words proposed would constitute a distortion of fact. It was obvious that the right to a nationality, for example, was a right which applied to everyone and which could not be conferred by a recommendation of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Belgian amendment to paragraph 18; it was rejected by 5 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions.

The RAPPORTEUR pointed out that the words "the Declaration, the Covenant and the Measures for Implementation" should be added at the end of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 18, and the words "two documents" altered to "Declaration and the Convention" in line 1 of paragraph 19.

In paragraph 20, the words "before the closure of the Session" should be inserted after the word "submit".

Mr. VICTORICA (Uruguay) pointed out that various proposals which he had made during discussion and which had been rejected did not appear in the Report. He understood that such alternative

texts should appear in Annex A, and enquired why they had been omitted.

The RAPPORTEUR reminded the representative of Uruguay that the remarks of every representative were summarised and appeared in the Summary Records. He regretted that the comments of the representative of Uruguay did not appear in the draft Report but, as they had been given to him in Spanish, he therefore had to wait for translation. He stated that the comments would eventually appear in the Report in the appropriate place.

The CHAIRMAN supported the RAPPORTEUR's observations as to the necessity for receiving comments in writing. She requested permission to include the United States version of the Declaration as contained in Document E/CN.4/36 as a comment at the end of the Declaration.

As there were no further comments she stated that Chapter II, with the additions and alterations outlined, was accepted.

Chapter III "International Declaration on Human Rights" and Chapter IV "International Covenant of Human Rights" were read and adopted.

The RAPPORTEUR read Chapter V "The Question of Implementation".

Mr. BOGOMOLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to remind the Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Question of Implementation that the Soviet Union representative at the Working Group had asked for his statement concerning an International Tribunal to be inserted in the report.

The RAPPORTEUR suggested that that statement be included in the form of a corrigendum to the Report of the Working Group (document E/CN.4/53).

It was agreed that the statement would be included in the form of a corrigendum and Chapter V was adopted.

The RAPPORTEUR read Chapter VI "Communications" and the addition to Chapter VI in document E/CN.4/77/ADD.1.

At the suggestion of Dr. WU (China) it was agreed that the names of the members of the ad hoc committee would be inserted in the first sentence of paragraph 28.

Chapter VI was adopted.

The RAPPORTEUR read Chapter VII, "Freedom of Information and of the Press". He stated that paragraph 30 would be replaced by the resolution proposed by the Representative of the Philippines Republic and adopted during the meeting, (E/CN.4/54). The paragraph would then begin with the words "The Commission adopted the following resolution". The resolution in paragraph 30 would be rearranged and completed.

Chapter VII was adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.