



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 43:</i>	
<i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued)</i>	
<i>General provisions: articles 2 to 5 (continued).....</i>	255

*Chairman:* Mr. Nemi Chandra KASLIWAL  
(India).

AGENDA ITEM 43

**Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (A/2907 and Add.1-2, A/2910 and Add.1-6, A/2929, A/5144, E/2573, annexes I-III, A/C.3/L.978, A/C.3/L.1017, A/C.3/L.1024/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1025, A/C.3/L.1026/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1027-1028) (continued)**

GENERAL PROVISIONS: ARTICLES 2 TO 5 (continued)

1. Mr. BUSTAMANTE said that, although most of the questions examined by the Committee in connexion with the general provisions of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were outside the competence of his organisation, article 3 had the same aims as certain instruments adopted by the International Labour Conference, including two of its most important conventions: the Convention concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value,<sup>1/</sup> ratified so far by forty-two States, and the Convention concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation,<sup>2/</sup> ratified by thirty-seven States. Those Conventions were supplemented by a series of recommendations and resolutions adopted by various organs of the ILO. The agency had always considered that the problems and interests of working women were no different, generally speaking, from those of male workers, and that the same criteria should be applied to them; however, subject to that fundamental principle, it had endeavoured to define the measures of special protection which women should be accorded in their capacity as mothers and housewives.

2. For the information of the Chilean representative, who had asked for information regarding the participation of women in employment, the yearbook of labour statistics, 1961,<sup>3/</sup> gave the following figures for employment in manufacturing: 228,000 women and 686,000 men in Argentina, 57,200 women and 170,000 men in Chile and 166,000 women and 411,000 men in Switzerland, where the figures also covered handi-

<sup>1/</sup> International Labour Office, *Official Bulletin*, vol. XXXIV, 1951, No. 1, Convention No. 100.

<sup>2/</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. XLI, 1958, No. 2, Convention No. 111.

<sup>3/</sup> International Labour Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1961 (Geneva).

crafts. In the case of Switzerland it should also be noted that women occupied an important place in the liberal professions and in public administration, which employed 11,800 women and 20,200 men in the wage earning category and 31,600 women and 67,100 men as salaried employees.

3. Although those figures, which were based on the statistical data supplied by Governments, were a few years out of date, the participation of women in economic life in the various countries could be said to be increasing considerably in all fields of activity. Moreover it could be inferred from the trend in all countries towards accelerated economic and social development that they would have to make a wider use of their human resources, both male and female.

4. The ILO was now preparing, for examination at the next meeting of the Panel of Consultants on the Problems of Woman Workers, a study on vocational guidance and training for women, which would include an analysis of the chief characteristics of trends in female employment in the various regions of the world.

5. Mr. SALSAMENDI (UNESCO), in response to the Chilean representative's request for information on UNESCO's role in improving the status of women, presented a brief survey of his organization's past, present and future activities in that field.

6. Under its constitution, UNESCO was required, in order to promote collaboration among the nations, to encourage States to provide equality of educational opportunity without regard to race, sex or any distinctions, economic or social. Over the years UNESCO had played a steadily increasing part in the efforts made to improve the status of women, both by opposing all forms of discrimination and by striving to ensure equal treatment for women in regard to access to education. To that end UNESCO had collaborated actively with the Commission on the Status of Women, with other inter-governmental organs and with women's international non-governmental organizations, and had made a number of general surveys of educational opportunities for women, which were well known to all States Members of the United Nations and which supplemented the more specific surveys dealing with particular subjects or regions.

7. In considering what social reforms were needed to eliminate the difficulties faced by women, UNESCO had found it necessary to study the political role of women because, although they were not numerically in the minority, they could in a sense be regarded as a group with certain minority characteristics. UNESCO had therefore published a compilation of studies carried out in four European countries on the political role of women. In 1956 it had published another document comprising surveys on women and the problem of education in Japan, Mexico and Pakistan, where women were making very rapid progress. A third series of surveys had been used as a basis for the programme

of work for 1955-1956, when UNESCO had again turned its attention to the problems of women's political rights in Asia by organizing a series of seminars, one of which had been held at New Delhi.

8. Since 1955 UNESCO had been using the so-called "action research" method to study educational opportunities for women in relation to the role they could play in community development and local administration. It had also launched a campaign for the civic education of women and had subsequently analysed the results obtained. Even before 1955, UNESCO had been concerned with the status of women in Africa and had carried out, in various African countries, surveys which had drawn attention to the important part that African women graduates, a new element in the community, could play in regions evolving rapidly through industrialization and urbanization.

9. UNESCO's work had always enjoyed the support of Governments, UNESCO national committees and non-governmental organizations, as witness the conference on free and compulsory education for girls, held in 1955, by the Pan Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association, the contract signed by UNESCO in 1957 with the International Federation of University Women for the preparation of an international study on the access of women to higher education, and the conference held at UNESCO headquarters, also in 1957, at which twenty-one international non-governmental organizations had met to examine suggestions for the preparation of a long-term programme covering the various aspects of UNESCO's activities relating especially to women.

10. Apart from its many activities on behalf of women, of which he had been able to cite only a few examples, UNESCO was also seeking to improve educational opportunities for girls through its Major Project on the Extension and Improvement of Primary Education in Latin America, and had given women an important place in its Major Project on the Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values. Furthermore, at its tenth session, the General Conference had taken the important decision to draw up a convention against discrimination in education; that text had been adopted, with the corresponding recommendation, at the eleventh session,<sup>4/</sup> and was a major instrument for the protection of women's rights from both the legal and the moral standpoint.

11. In the UNESCO surveys to determine the educational needs of Africa, Asia and the Arab countries, and at the conferences of Ministers of Education which had followed those surveys, the problem of education for girls had been given special attention, and specific recommendations had been made with a view, *inter alia*, to more balanced progress in education for boys and girls in Africa, to an increase in the number of Arab women teachers, and to a further rise in the level of girls' education in South East Asia. Moreover UNESCO fellowships were granted on the principle that men and women should have equal opportunities. Lastly, the Department of Mass Communication always disseminated information on the results of UNESCO's efforts to improve the status of women and on the successes achieved by women in the various fields of activity with which UNESCO was concerned.

12. As to the future, the General Conference of UNESCO, which was currently holding its twelfth

<sup>4/</sup> See UNESCO, General Conference, Eleventh Session, Paris, 1960, Resolutions, section B.

session in Paris, would examine the Proposed Programme and Budget of the organization for 1963-1964, which provided for an increase of 92 per cent over the preceding budget in the amount to be spent on promoting equality of educational opportunities and preventing discrimination. The appropriation in question amounted to \$62,000; under the relevant draft resolutions, the Member States were invited to accede to the Convention against Discrimination in Education and to apply the provisions of the corresponding Recommendation, and the Director-General was authorized to undertake activities designed to promote respect for the principle of equality of educational opportunity. Another draft resolution provided for an appropriation of \$76,500 (representing a 60 per cent increase over the 1961-1962 budget) for the promotion of human rights and racial equality. The work programme for 1963-1964 also included many other projects designed to promote the interests of women in various ways.

13. UNESCO had always sought to improve the status of women by drawing attention to the progress achieved and the difficulties encountered in connexion with educational opportunities for women and by studying the highly complex factors working for and against women's progress. In that connexion it had made annual statistical surveys in co-operation with the International Bureau of Education at Geneva, as well as several series of studies on the social taboos which delayed the recognition of equal rights for men and women and which hampered women's participation in the economic and social development of nations.

14. Mr. CAPOTORTI (Italy) stated that the amendment submitted by his delegation in conjunction with the Argentine and Mexican delegations (A/C.3/L.1028) was designed to reflect the general trend of the discussion and the questions raised by many delegations. It was really in two parts. The first part, which associated the idea of the recognition of rights with that of their exercise, was justified on technical grounds by the fact that, in order to exercise a right, it was first of all necessary to possess it; and it was justified on grounds of substance inasmuch as it made more comprehensive the guarantees which States undertook to provide. States would have to adopt, on the one hand, whatever legislative measures were required to modify as necessary the legal status of the individual and, on the other hand, measures designed to ensure that the rights recognized were enjoyed in practice.

15. The second part of the amendment, which would replace the word "distinction" by the word "discrimination", took into account the Committee's discussion, which had shown that some distinctions might be justified—for example, preferential treatment for certain under-privileged groups—and that it was discrimination which should be condemned. Moreover the term "discrimination" appeared three times in article 24 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the Committee had adopted at the sixteenth session (1102nd meeting).

16. Miss MARSH (Canada) said that she wished to define her delegation's position with regard to articles 2, 3 and 4 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. For the sake of uniformity she would like to see the phrase "The States Parties to the Covenant" used in articles 2 and 4. She doubted the effectiveness of the Costa Rican amendment (A/C.3/L.1025) to article 2, paragraph 1, which she was prepared to support as it stood.

17. With regard to article 2, paragraph 2, her delegation considered that its purpose was the same as that of article 3, and that the two provisions could accordingly be combined to good advantage. The result would be a new article 3, which could be framed on the lines of article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and might read as follows: "The States Parties to the Covenant undertake to ensure the equal right of all persons to the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status". At all events her delegation could not accept the existing paragraph 2 unless the word "guarantee" was replaced by the word "ensure", as proposed by the United States of America (1182nd meeting); on the other hand it could support article 3 in its existing form if the Committee preferred to retain it.

18. She was prepared to support article 4 but felt that the words "in the enjoyment of those rights provided by the State in conformity with this Covenant, the State may..." should be replaced by the words "in ensuring the enjoyment of the rights set forth in this Covenant, they may...". Lastly, to improve the drafting of the English text, she proposed that the words "and then" should be inserted before the words "only in so far".

19. Mrs. CATTAROSSO (Uruguay) said that in the matter of human rights her delegation had always upheld two essential principles: first, that those rights were inalienable and, second, that the United Nations was under an obligation to promote respect for them in accordance with Article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations.

20. On the whole, her delegation approved articles 2 to 5 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as they stood, and would therefore support only such proposals as did not affect the spirit of those provisions. It accordingly supported the three-power amendment and was happy to note that it would replace the word "distinction" by the word "discrimination"; if the first part of that amendment was put to the vote separately, however, Uruguay would have to abstain, for it considered that the idea of "recognition" was covered by the word "enjoyment".

21. Her delegation could not vote in favour of either the Indonesian amendment (A/C.3/L.1027) or the United Kingdom revised amendment (A/C.3/L.1026/Rev.1). With regard to the latter, she considered it imperative to stipulate that Member States should undertake to adopt, *inter alia*, legislative measures with a view to achieving the realization of the rights recognized in the Covenant.

22. As to article 3, she found it surprising that some delegations should object to a mere repetition when it was precisely the purpose of the draft Covenant to combat discrimination, including discrimination against women. In her views, the exercise by women of equal economic, social and cultural rights with men was wholly compatible with the traditional concept of the family. It was only when modern women fully exercised their rights that they would be able to play the role which was naturally theirs. She would therefore support the retention of that article.

23. Lastly, her delegation would in principle support articles 4 and 5 of the draft Covenant in their existing form.

24. Miss GRINAN (Cuba) said that, like the USSR representative, she would have preferred it if article 2 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had been more strongly worded. Nevertheless, she could accept it in its present form. She would support the Costa Rican amendment, but not the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1026), as it would allow States to substitute unspecified measures for legislative action. The revised text of that amendment was equally unsatisfactory. Instead, Cuba would support the Indonesian amendment and considered that the three-Power amendment improved the text.

25. She would vote for article 3, believing that the principle of the equality of the sexes was sufficiently important to bear repetition.

26. With regard to article 4, she found the phrase "only in so far as this may be compatible with the nature of these rights" too vague and would like it to be more explicit.

27. Lastly, she fully supported article 5, in the belief that no powerful individual or group of individuals should be allowed to destroy the rights and freedoms that a Government had won for its people at the cost of heavy sacrifice.

28. Mr. CHOW (China) thought that the draft Covenants were exceptionally important documents which should be acceptable to all States. The Chinese delegation would therefore support only those amendments that were designed to facilitate acceptance without compromising any principles.

29. With regard to article 2 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, his delegation was in favour of the notice of progressive application. As the Costa Rican amendment provided for the progressive realization of rights, without unnecessary delays, he would vote for it. He also supported the revised United Kingdom amendment, which dispelled the doubts that had been raised by the original version.

30. As regards article 3, the Chinese delegation was inclined to favour its retention in the draft Covenant for two reasons. First, it was generally acknowledged that women were still denied the exercise of certain rights, even in the highly developed countries, although the principle of the equality of the sexes was universally recognized. It was therefore desirable to devote a special article to that principle. Also, it could hardly be suggested that article 3 duplicated article 2; if that were the case, the draft declarations and conventions on the elimination of racial discrimination and religious intolerance proposed by the Committee would duplicate article 2, paragraph 2, which dealt with distinction based on race and religion.

31. In conclusion, he stressed that the principle of equality for women was embodied in China's constitution and legislation; also, he fully shared the views of the Uruguayan representative concerning the advancement of women and their role in society.

32. Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia) considered articles 2 to 5 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to be the most important, since the effectiveness of the other provisions depended upon them. Article 2, in particular, was essential, since it was designed to ensure the genuine exercise of the rights proclaimed. Those rights would remain a dead letter if States were not compelled to undertake legislative, administrative or other action to guarantee their exercise. Czechoslovakia was firmly attached to

that principle, which was explicitly stated in the Constitution of 11 July 1960. Not only did the Constitution enunciate extensive rights but it defined the means for ensuring their full exercise. Article 15, in particular, laid down that the State should carry out social, economic, cultural and public health policies designed to ensure that the physical and cultural development of the population went hand in hand with increased production and improved levels of living.

33. Great care should accordingly be taken to avoid weakening the draft Covenant. In view of those considerations her delegation was unable to accept the United Kingdom revised amendment which relegated legislative action to the background, but it would vote for the Costa Rican amendment.

34. For the same reasons the Czechoslovak delegation was in favour of retaining article 3, which was based on the Charter of the United Nations and the recommendation made by the General Assembly in resolution 421 (V). Equality in the economic, social and cultural fields was a principle for which the women of the entire world were fighting, and the Commission on the Status of Women had all too often had occasion to note that it was not applied everywhere.

35. As regards the three-Power amendment, she thought that the term "distinction" was broader than "discrimination". Since the two notions were different without being mutually exclusive, she would propose replacing the words "without discrimination on any ground" by the words "without distinction or discrimination of any kind".

36. Finally, the Indonesian amendment was justified in so far as a country, particularly an under-developed country, should be able to prevent foreign monopolies from taking advantage of its resources. However, she drew the attention of the Indonesian delegation to the fact that the provisions of that amendment might lead to discrimination against certain groups.

37. Mr. IDRIS (Indonesia), introducing his amendment to article 2, paragraph 2, recalled that a number of delegations had wondered to whom the provisions of that article applied. Neither paragraph 1 nor paragraph 2 provided a clear-cut answer to that question so that any individual, including a foreigner, might lay claim to the guarantees provided in article 2. The Indonesian delegation, in common with a number of others, had already pointed out that the developing countries would find themselves at a considerable disadvantage if they had to undertake to guarantee the same exercise of economic rights to aliens as to their own nationals. He had therefore felt it necessary to introduce an amendment in which, to avoid any misunderstanding, he was willing to substitute the word "nationals" for "citizens". The developing countries had to make an intensive effort to build up their national economies. One of the many obstacles which they encountered derived from the dominant economic position enjoyed by foreigners as a result of the colonial system. Preferential treatment should therefore be accorded to a country's own nationals so that they could progressively take over their rightful role in the national economy. That was why his delegation sought to make clear in article 2, paragraph 2, to whom the provisions of that article applied.

38. If its amendment was adopted it would vote for the three-Power amendment; otherwise it would have to vote against that amendment as it tended to reinforce

a notion to which it could not subscribe—namely, equal economic rights for both aliens and nationals.

39. Sir Douglas GLOVER (United Kingdom) introduced the revised text of his amendment. He pointed out that article 2, paragraph 1, as prepared by the Commission on Human Rights, was unacceptable to the United Kingdom, since the rights set forth in the Covenant could not always be guaranteed to racial groups by adopting legislative measures. In some cases it might be both necessary and more effective to undertake long-term educational measures to induce certain sectors of the population to accept the principle of equality. Under the revised amendment, the State would have to use all appropriate means, including legislative measures. Therefore the substance of the article, far from being weakened, was actually strengthened.

40. With regard to amendments introduced by other delegations, he supported the suggestion to replace the word "guarantee" by the word "ensure" in article 2, paragraph 2. Since the term "guarantee" was incompatible with the notion of progressive application conveyed in paragraph 1, he would be unable to vote for paragraph 2 unless that suggestion was adopted.

41. The Indonesian amendment was unacceptable. The first part merely contained a drafting amendment which did not seem very helpful. The phrase "States Parties" was used throughout the draft Covenant except in article 2, paragraph 1. If any amendment were needed, it should therefore be made to that paragraph. He was even more firmly opposed to the second part of the Indonesian amendment, as it had the effect of allowing a State to discriminate against certain groups, and that was in direct conflict with the basic purposes of the article and of the entire Covenant.

42. The United Kingdom delegation would also be unable to vote for the Costa Rican amendment. With regard to article 3, despite the fact that he thought it was redundant, he wished to inform the Committee that he would not actually vote against it.

43. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said that he appreciated the effort of the sponsors of the three-Power amendment to make the terms of article 2, paragraph 2, more stringent; however, they should realize that where human rights were concerned the stringency of terms was not the only factor calling for consideration. Due account must also be taken of the effects which the introduction of a particular legal concept might have upon the extent of the obligations assumed by States.

44. First, the idea of enjoyment implied that of recognition; it was hard to see how a State could guarantee the enjoyment of a right without at the same time recognizing it. Second, his delegation was prepared to admit that there was a difference, from the procedural standpoint, between the recognition of rights and their enjoyment; however, since all the articles in the Covenants began with the words "The States Parties recognize", the inclusion of the idea of recognition in article 2 would serve no purpose, all the more so since paragraph 1 of that article included the words "the full realization of the rights recognized in this Covenant". However, the three-Power amendment was not merely redundant but dangerous; the combination of the ideas of recognition and enjoyment with that of progressive application would seem to justify States in proceeding in two stages, first, that of recognizing the rights and,

second, that of guaranteeing their enjoyment. What mattered most, however, was not recognition of the rights, for example the right to education, which was proclaimed in many constitutions, but guaranteeing the enjoyment thereof by building schools and training teachers. He did not, of course, question the fact that considerations of legal technique were important, but he did feel that they should give way to economic, social and cultural realities and that the advantages of the three-Power amendment were very meagre in comparison with the difficulties it would create. He had no objection to the use of the word "discrimination" in paragraph 2, but it must not be allowed to supplant the word "distinction"; for there was a difference between the two, and the Commission on Human Rights had not idly chosen to use the word "distinction" in the provision in question. At all events it would be a mistake to give verbal logic overmuch importance if the aim was to build for the future.

45. His delegation regretted that the United Kingdom revised amendment had been changed in the light of the Brazilian representative's observations. In developing countries, including those of Latin America, State action was extremely important; only vigorous and decisive intervention by the authorities would enable those countries to raise their peoples' level of living.

46. In the new United Kingdom proposal, legislative measures seemed in a sense to have been relegated to the background. He was well aware that the historical development of countries like the United Kingdom had been very different from that of Chile, for example, where, only thirty years earlier, social action had been the exclusive province of charitable organizations. There was no question, however, but that the authorities—and legislative measures—had a vital part to play in the developing countries.

47. The Indonesian amendment was unacceptable to his delegation. He saw no point whatsoever in replacing the words "The States Parties" by "The State Party". Moreover, the insertion of the words "to all its citizens" would create discrimination not only against aliens but also against nationals of each State Party. In Indonesia's case, for example, all those who did not enjoy civic rights—including, among others, all children—would be deprived of the benefits of the Covenant. Furthermore, many countries admitted migrant workers to their territory. He saw no reason why such workers, when regularly employed in a State's territory, should not enjoy the rights recognized in the Covenant: why, for example, they should not be able to send their children to school in the country where they were working. In article 2 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Commission on Human Rights had used a very carefully chosen form of words: "all individuals subject to its jurisdiction". It was for each State to determine, in the exercise of its sovereignty and with due respect for human rights, to what persons it would guarantee the rights recognized in the Covenant, and no arbitrary restrictions must be imposed on it in so doing. For those reasons his delegation would vote against the Indonesian amendment.

48. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) pointed out that the provision under consideration had been drafted by a highly competent technical body; representatives should exercise some self-discipline in submitting amendments. He was anxious to expedite the Committee's work and, since all views had now been expressed, he moved the closure of the debate on article 2, in

accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

49. Miss NASSER (Jordan) recognized that time was short; however, there were still many points to be cleared up. In view of the importance of article 2 to many countries, the discussion should continue and she therefore opposed the Mauritanian representative's motion.

50. U KHIN MAUNG PYU (Burma) felt that many representatives had not yet made up their minds about the Indonesian proposal and that it would be most regrettable to close the debate before all doubts had been dispelled.

*The motion for closure of the debate was rejected by 24 votes to 13, with 43 abstentions.*

51. Begum Anwara KHATOON (Pakistan) wished to state her delegation's position on articles 2, 3 and 4 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. With regard to article 2, paragraph 1, legislative action was certainly not the only means of guaranteeing respect for the rights enunciated in the Covenant; her delegation therefore supported the United Kingdom revised amendment. The idea that the full realization of the rights should be achieved progressively was fully justified, for few States were in a position to apply all the provisions of the draft Covenant straight away; in most countries, many of those provisions could be applied only after certain material conditions had been met. It was difficult to tell exactly how long that would take, if only because conditions differed widely from State to State; however, it could be said in general terms that developing countries would have more difficulty than developed countries in installing the essential infrastructure. It had nevertheless been proposed in some quarters that a time-limit should be set, and the Costa Rican delegation had submitted an amendment to the effect that States Parties should adopt the necessary reforms at an accelerated rate. It was most unlikely, however, that most States would be in a position to adopt such reforms in a short time. In the circumstances it would be better not to amend the existing text of article 2 on that point; consequently her delegation would be unable to vote for the Costa Rican amendment, which would upset the general balance of the article.

52. Paragraph 2 was of great importance; care must therefore be taken to see that the obligations stated therein could be discharged by an adequate number of countries. In some respects, however, the present wording was somewhat unsatisfactory; in most countries, for example, aliens did not receive equal treatment with nationals where employment was concerned, and it would be unreasonable to hope that identical treatment could immediately be extended to both categories of workers. Her delegation supported the suggestion that the word "guarantee" should be replaced by "ensure". The word "distinction" could perfectly well be replaced by the word "discrimination", which applied to any form of arbitrary distinction and was thus entirely appropriate for paragraph 2. Her delegation agreed with the Indian representative that paragraph 2 should not be construed to prohibit the adoption of special measures for the benefit of backward groups. That was a most useful idea, which might be included as an interpretative statement in the Committee's report.

53. Her delegation would support article 3, although the Saudi Arabian representative had very rightly

emphasized the special role which women played in society. It was true that mothers were in duty bound to care for their children, but it must be recognized that women sometimes had to work in order to help support the household. Article 3 should therefore be retained.

54. Article 4 as it stood was acceptable as a whole, on the understanding that the expression "the general welfare" included State security. It was out of the question to promote the general welfare at the expense of collective security. She had some misgivings about the words "in a democratic society", which should

probably be given the widest possible interpretation, but whose precise scope should nevertheless be defined in order to obviate all future controversy.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would have to suspend its work on the draft Covenants for about two weeks because it had to take up the next item on the agenda at its following meeting. He asked those delegations which intended to submit amendments to article 2 to do so as quickly as possible.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.