



CONTENTS

	Page
Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (E/1880 and Corr.1 and E/1880/Add.1 to 7) (<i>continued</i>)	23
Hearings of non-governmental organizations: report of the Council NGO Committee	25
Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (E/1880 and Corr.1 and E/1880/Add.1 to 7) (<i>continued</i>)	26

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: The representatives of the following countries:

Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Telecommunication Union, World Health Organization.

Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (E/1880 and Corr.1 and E/1880/Add.1 to 7) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 12]

1. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) recalled that his delegation had already expressed its views on the draft international covenant on human rights, both in the General Assembly and in the Commission on Human Rights. He did not wish to repeat those views, but he wanted to make a matter of record in the Council the unqualified adherence of his delegation to resolutions on the subject adopted at the fifth session of the General Assembly.

2. The delegation of the Philippines had shared the majority view in the General Assembly that the first draft international covenant was inadequate, not only because it had contained an incomplete enumeration of civic and political rights, but also because it failed to provide for economic, social and cultural rights.

3. His delegation had moreover been one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 422 (V), by which the General Assembly requested the Commission on Human Rights to include an article in the draft cove-

nant providing for its automatic application to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. That resolution was based on an amendment to the draft covenant which his delegation had submitted at the fifth session of the Commission on Human Rights.

4. He felt some anxiety on that subject because some delegations, particularly those of the Administering Authorities, had criticized the General Assembly resolution. It would be well to have some assurance that their representatives on the Commission would not oppose the new article. His delegation, for its part, did not think that a subsidiary organ could question the wisdom or expediency of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly. If a full discussion of the matter were desired, however, his delegation preferred that it take place in the Council and not in the Commission. As the parent body of the Commission, the Council should not only co-operate in seeing to it that the General Assembly's instructions are carried out, but should also assume full responsibility for any miscarriage of those instructions.

5. It was common knowledge that the Administering Authorities had always opposed measures of the kind envisaged. He recalled that, at one of the sessions of the General Assembly, the delegations of the Philippines, China, Costa Rica, Mexico, Liberia and Egypt had submitted a joint draft resolution requesting the Trusteeship Council to invite the Administering Authorities to fly the United Nations flag together with their own in the Trust Territories under their administration.¹ The purpose of that resolution had been to make sure that the emblem of the United Nations should have its place in the Trust Territories, reminding the populations of the Organization's authority and of its interest in their welfare. The joint draft resolution had been adopted by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly (resolution 325 (IV)), but it had been rejected at the

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Fourth Committee, Annex, document A/C.4/L.11/Rev.1.*

sixth session of the Trusteeship Council² because of the opposition of all the Administering Authorities, except the United States of America, which had supported it both in the General Assembly and in the Trusteeship Council. In any event, the United Nations flag still did not fly over the Trust Territories in spite of the General Assembly's resolution and the compromise text finally adopted by the Trusteeship Council.

6. Returning to the two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the question under discussion, he wished to explain how his delegation considered the Council should deal with them. Resolution 422 (V), concerning the territorial application of the draft covenant, was addressed direct to the Commission on Human Rights so the Council should simply take note of it, and transmit it to the Commission without in any way altering the text of the proposed new article.

7. On the other hand, resolution 421 (V), concerning the future work of the Commission on Human Rights, was addressed to the Economic and Social Council. For example, in part A of the resolution, the Assembly called upon the Council to request the Commission on Human Rights to continue to give priority in its work to the completion of the draft covenant and measures for its implementation. He drew the attention of members particularly to parts C, D, E, F and G of the resolution asking the Economic and Social Council to give precise instructions to the Commission on Human Rights on each of the various points raised. He felt that the Council would be failing in its duty if it simply transmitted that resolution to the Commission on Human Rights. He believed that the members of the Council were entitled to submit proposals as to what particular articles should be included in the draft covenant, in line with the General Assembly resolution, although the Council was not called upon to accept or reject, immediately, any or all of those proposed articles.

8. He felt that for the time being, the Council should refrain from drafting the actual texts to be included in the draft covenant. The Council would not deal with the question until the Commission on Human Rights had submitted to it the drafts it had prepared. That also applied to the provisions which the USSR delegation had proposed for inclusion in the draft covenant (E/L.137). Some of those provisions, he added, were acceptable to his delegation in principle.

9. In short, his delegation thought the Council should transmit to the Commission on Human Rights without modification Assembly resolution 422 (V), regarding the territorial application of the covenant. It should act upon resolution 421 (V), concerning the future work of the Commission on Human Rights, by adopting a draft resolution following the Assembly's instructions to the letter.

10. Although his delegation was no longer a member of the Commission on Human Rights, he hoped its views on what new articles should be added to the draft covenant would be taken into account, especially as they had been circulated in one of the Commission's documents (E/CN.4/353/Add.3). He also hoped that the

Commission would take into account not only the views expressed by delegations during the fifth session of the General Assembly and the eleventh session of the Council, but also the statements made during the Council's twelfth session by members of the Council as well as by the representatives of specialized agencies who had made interesting and helpful suggestions.

11. He would later propose an amendment to the joint draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and Uruguay (E/L.139).

12. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) regretted to have to speak again but explained that he had to reply to the direct allusions to his country and to him personally made by several members of the Council at the previous meeting. He referred in particular to the United Kingdom representative, who had spoken of him in slanderous terms and had accused him of indulging in unhealthy propaganda. The United Kingdom representative had not, however, based his arguments on any concrete facts. Neither had he denied that there were defects and gaps in the draft covenant on human rights. He wondered how the United Kingdom representative could possibly deny that there were cases of racial discrimination even in his own country. The facts were generally recognized. The United States representatives had themselves admitted that racial discrimination existed in their country, and no one had ever gone so far in his allegations as had the United Kingdom representative. His speech accusing the Polish delegation of indulging in propaganda had in itself been a propaganda speech. The arguments put forward, however, had not been based on any concrete facts.

13. The United Kingdom representative had also alleged that Poland had refused to contribute to the funds which had been collected for Palestine and Korea. In fact, the Polish delegation had stated, with regard to Palestine, that those who were responsible for the war there should pay for the damage and that Poland was not prepared to make any sacrifice to make good the disastrous results of the United Kingdom's policy in Palestine in the last fifty years. As regards Korea, a single American air-raid on a non-strategic objective caused such damage that all the funds collected thus far for Korea would not suffice to repair it.

14. When attempts had been made to provide effective assistance for those who needed it, Poland had never failed to offer its contribution. It had taken part in the work of UNRRA and of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund in spite of the fact that the damage it had itself suffered as a result of the war had amounted to 50,000 million dollars. In that connexion, he recalled that it had been the United Kingdom and the United States which had insisted during the second part of the first session of the General Assembly that UNRRA should be dissolved. That historic meeting had marked the end of a period of international collaboration and understanding and the beginning of a period of misunderstanding and of economic pressure exerted for political ends.

15. Poland was making its contribution towards progress by doing its best to build a socialist society, by carrying out far-reaching economic and social reforms

² See document T/SR.279 (77th meeting).

and by encouraging all efforts for the preservation of peace, as was evidenced by the way in which it had welcomed the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace to its territory. What was the United Kingdom doing in its turn towards helping the under-developed countries? On that point, he need only mention an example from the *New York Times* which had stated in an article on 17 February 1951 that the United Kingdom authorities had razed to the ground a town in Malaya after evacuating its inhabitants on the pretext that they constituted a communist threat.

16. The United Kingdom representative had also accused Poland and other countries of failing to protect freedom of information and various other freedoms. He had alleged that Poland's support of the USSR proposal for the deletion of articles 19 to 41 of the draft covenant proved that it did not wish to submit to any supervision of its observance of human rights. In actual fact Poland was a free country, as was clear from the way in which it welcomed large numbers of foreigners and journalists. Everyone was well aware, on the other hand, of the difficulties encountered by Polish journalists and correspondents when they had attempted to enter certain countries, particularly the United States of America.

17. Poland had always been one of the foremost champions of human rights. It had always sought to make a reality of the covenant. That was why it had always emphasized the need to guarantee fundamental human rights. The very delegations which had accused Poland of opposing the preparation of a covenant had themselves been the first to raise numerous difficulties in an attempt to delay its adoption. As for the measures of implementation, the real aim of the United States and the United Kingdom was not to ensure the implementation of the covenant itself, but to secure a pretext for intervening in matters which fell essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of other countries. If the United States and the United Kingdom wished to exercise supervision they should start at home.

18. The value of the covenant depended entirely upon confidence among the various countries and upon their being able freely to comply with its provisions. Everyone could rest assured that Poland for its part would always honour its signature.

19. In his opinion, the discussions on the draft covenant should be continued until a satisfactory text had been prepared, a text which the Assembly could adopt. Furthermore, it was essential that a representative of the people of China should take part in those discussions and he was glad to note that the United Kingdom had changed its attitude on that subject, probably because it had realized the dangers of the existing situation.

20. His delegation supported the USSR proposal for the insertion of certain rights in the text of the draft covenant, because it considered those rights to be essential.

21. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) deplored the fact that he was involved in a controversy so little in keeping with the Council's dignity. In view, however, of the nature of the observations made by certain representatives, he must reply and clarify the situation.

22. The Council had once more had to listen to a speech which sought to prove that black was white. The Polish representative strove to impute his own motives to others. If he was to be believed, the representative of the United Kingdom had, at the preceding meetings, done nothing but make charges against Poland. He would like to point out that the expressions for which he was reproached were the very expressions that had been used by the representative of Poland. The latter had claimed that the United Kingdom delegation had been unjust towards his country, but the Council knew who it was that had accused the United Kingdom and the United States of America of provoking famine throughout the world. He would venture to recall that his country had contributed to international aid to an extent it could ill afford, whereas Poland had sought to invoke political reasons for not participating. Poland had observed the same attitude in connexion with the encouragement of the economic development of the under-developed countries. The facts were there and they spoke louder than words.

23. What the delegations of Poland and some other countries were really trying to do was to make the covenant a mere statement of rights and principles with no provisions for their enforcement and it was for that reason that they were trying to secure the deletion of the articles relating to implementation. The United Kingdom delegation could not accept such a solution, for it wanted deeds, not words.

24. The fact that the Polish delegation had thought fit to absent itself from the meetings of the Council at its eleventh session and to attend at the current session in no way changed the situation within that body. Those who recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China were still a minority and must bow before the decision of the majority. The United Kingdom delegation had just as good reasons as Poland for refusing to participate in the work of the Council, but it thought such an attitude would be quite undemocratic. By deciding to absent themselves from the meetings of the Council, some delegations had thought they would put an end to that body's democratic and constructive deliberations, or at least make its work futile and objectless. After noting the success of the work done at Geneva, however, they had decided to resume their seats in the Council. They had then begun to hurl insulting accusations against governments and persons, in order to provoke incidents and discredit the United Nations in the eyes of the peoples of Latin America. Those delegations preached peace, but in fact in the name of peace they were waging a cold war and trying to undermine the authority of the United Nations.

25. He keenly deplored that the level of the Council's discussions, which had been so high in the absence of certain delegations, had been lowered by incidents like those that had just occurred.

Hearings of non-governmental organizations: report of the Council NGO Committee

[Agenda item 28 (b)]

26. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had

just reached a decision with regard to the hearing of non-governmental organizations on items 12 and 14 of the agenda.

27. If the Council wished, the Chairman of the Council NGO Committee might be asked to describe the reasons that had led the Committee to reach its decisions.

It was so agreed.

28. Mr. DE SEYNES, Acting Chairman of the Council NGO Committee, announced that the Committee had reached the following decisions:

29. With regard to item 14 — "Trade-union rights: allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights" — the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had had before it three applications for hearings, submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. The NGO Committee was recommending to the Council that it should hear those three organizations.

30. With regard to item 12 — "Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation" — the NGO Committee had had before it three applications, from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the World Federation of United Nations Associations and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, respectively. By 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, the Committee had decided to recommend to the Council that it should not hear those non-governmental organizations. That recommendation was based on the fact that item 12 of the agenda was essentially a procedural question which it was for the Council to decide without its being necessary to ascertain the opinion of non-governmental organizations.

31. He would like to observe that the discussions in the NGO Committee had been very rapid and that no non-governmental organization had made a declaration of principle. The Committee had drawn attention to the fact that in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure, any governmental organization might have a written statement on item 12 circulated, just as on any other item of the agenda, if it thought fit to do so.

32. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, the recommendations of the NGO Committee would be adopted by the Council.

The recommendations of the NGO Committee were approved.

Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (E/1880 and Corr.1, E/1880/Add.1 to 7) (continued)

[Agenda item 12]

33. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said he must protest against the United Kingdom representative's last speech, which he regarded as one of the most unjustified and insulting which the Council had ever heard. The acts of the Polish Government and the achievements of Poland would bear comparison with anything that had been done in other countries, including the United Kingdom.

34. He thought the violent charges brought against Poland and the Polish delegation by the representative of the United Kingdom were without foundation, but might justly be addressed to the United Kingdom and its delegation.

35. Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the United Kingdom representative had slandered the Soviet Union by asserting that it had adopted a policy aimed at provoking and sustaining the war of nerves and at sabotaging the activities of the United Nations. The best way to refute such slander was to quote the reply given by Generalissimo Stalin to the questions put by a correspondent of *Pravda*.

36. When the correspondent of *Pravda* asked his opinion on the declaration made before the House of Commons by Prime Minister Attlee to the effect that the USSR had not demobilized at the end of the war, and was, on the contrary, increasing the strength of its armed forces, Generalissimo Stalin replied that such a declaration was pure slander, for the world was very well aware that the USSR had demobilized at the end of the war. That demobilization had taken place in three stages: the first two in 1945, and the third from May to September 1946. Furthermore, most of the older classes had been demobilized in 1946 and 1947, and the remainder in 1948.

37. Mr. Attlee must have sufficient knowledge of economics and finance to understand that no State could develop its national economy as the Soviet Union had done and at the same time increase its military forces and appropriations. Since the war, the USSR had undertaken some gigantic public works, particularly the building of dams. It had invested several thousand millions in the reconstruction of the war-devastated country. It had increased its production and appreciably reduced the prices of consumer goods. The example of the United Kingdom and certain other countries should show Mr. Attlee that an increase in the strength of military forces and armaments automatically involved an increase in taxation and the cost of living, and consequently a reduction in standards of living.

38. Mr. Attlee's slanders against the USSR were necessary to justify the armaments race upon which the United Kingdom had embarked in pursuance of its current foreign policy. Mr. Attlee had to attack the Soviet Union in the effort to justify his own policy of aggression and the United Kingdom's preparations for the third world war which the ruling circles of the United States of America were seeking to unleash.

39. Mr. Attlee set himself up as a defender of the peace. In that case why had his government rejected the USSR proposals for the immediate reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons? Why had his government prohibited the meeting in the United Kingdom of the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace? Why had his government rejected the proposal for the conclusion of a five-Power pact?

40. Generalissimo Stalin's recent statements clearly showed that the USSR had for its part adopted a genuinely peaceful policy aimed at the maintenance of international peace and security, whereas the United Kingdom seemed to be pursuing a policy aimed at war.

41. He considered it his duty to recall what the head of the Government of the USSR had said, so as clearly to demonstrate the slanderous nature of the United Kingdom representative's speech, according to which the Soviet Union was seeking to unleash a third world war.

42. The PRESIDENT said he would like to remind members of the Council that all delegations had been given the opportunity to reply at leisure to any charges that might have been made against them. He recalled that under the rules of procedure he was empowered to request speakers to confine their observations to consideration of the item of the agenda under discussion. He hoped representatives would respect that principle and that he would not be obliged to call them to order.

43. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) recalled that in a previous speech he had explained his delegation's position with regard to the draft covenant on human rights and had explained why his delegation would support the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union (E/L.137).

44. The Czechoslovak delegation would like to make a few additional observations on the future work of the Commission on Human Rights. It was of the opinion that the Economic and Social Council should not confine itself to serving as an intermediary between the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights. On the contrary, its task was to show the Commission the lines on which it should undertake the revision of the draft covenant, and present it with definite proposals for that purpose. If it acted otherwise, the Council would not be playing its part and would thus detract from its prestige.

45. The delegations which did not share that point of view invoked two arguments. The first was an erroneous interpretation of General Assembly resolution 421 (V); the second was that the draft covenant was still under consideration by other organs of the United Nations. The interpretations placed on General Assembly resolution 421 (V) by those delegations was erroneous in the sense that that resolution contained no provision in any way limiting the Council's right to consider the draft covenant and present its recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights. The second argument was equally unjustified because the very spirit of the covenant had hitherto been considered only very superficially, as was clearly shown by section B, paragraph 3, of the resolution in question. That argument could be invoked only by delegations concerned, for one reason or another, to prevent the draft covenant from being discussed by the Council.

46. The Czechoslovak delegation thought it essential that the Council should consider the draft covenant and present definite recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights. Such a task would be the easier since the Council had before it the amendments submitted by the delegation of the USSR (E/L.137), which proposed that the Commission on Human Rights should be called upon to incorporate in the draft covenant fundamental provisions in respect of political rights, economic, social and cultural rights and trade-union rights, and provisions relating to the application of the covenant in Non-

Self-Governing Territories and federal States. The Czechoslovak delegation warmly supported the USSR proposals and hoped the Council would adopt them.

47. He recalled that the representative of the United States had attacked the USSR and the other peoples' democracies and attempted to give the impression that the United States of America was trying to help the rest of the world at the sacrifice of its own personal interests. He had said, in particular, that the United States perfectly understood the needs of other countries and was doing all in its power to help to satisfy them. The representative of the United States should recognize, however, that his country was displaying an absolutely unjustified discrimination in its trade dealings with Czechoslovakia.

48. In the same way the United Kingdom representative had attacked Czechoslovakia when he had brought up the question of aid to Korea. Observations of that kind should rather be addressed to the United States of America, whose armed forces were spreading death and destruction in Korea.

49. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, in view of the rules of procedure and the President's remarks, he would not reply to the USSR representative's statement, which had no connexion with the item under discussion and could, strictly speaking, be discussed only when the world economic situation was examined.

50. The Polish representative had alleged that certain delegations including that of the United States wished to retain articles 19 to 41 of the draft covenant simply to give themselves a pretext for intervening in the internal affairs of other States. It was indeed strange that such a statement should come from a representative who seemed to take a constant and special interest in the affairs of the United States of America.

51. Articles 19 to 41 of the draft covenant had as their sole aim the creation of an impartial body, composed of persons of the greatest competence and of the highest moral standing, which would ensure the implementation of the covenant's provisions — namely the observance of human rights — in accordance with a clearly determined legal procedure. It was indeed curious that certain delegations were so strongly opposed to the setting up of an impartial and objective body, which would render considerable services to the cause of human rights.

52. Examining some of the proposals of the USSR delegation (E/L.137), he pointed out that that delegation had asked for the insertion in the draft covenant of certain rights which were not respected in the Soviet Union itself. For example the decree of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet dated 2 October 1940 laid down that one million young men and women should be conscripted each year and sent to industrial schools to serve as labour reserves; that showed that the youth of the USSR could not choose their education freely though no one would deny that the USSR had made great progress in providing educational facilities. Similarly, the decree of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet of 26 June 1940 provided that no one would be authorized to leave his work or seek other employment without the

consent of his employer; that showed that the people of the Soviet Union were not free to choose their own work.

53. Thus delegations were quite entitled to the view that the Soviet Union's proposals could not be seriously considered as long as that State was opposed to the retention of articles 19 to 41 in the draft covenant.

54. In connexion with the statements of the Polish representative, he wished to point out that he had by no means implied that Poland had not contributed to the work of UNRRA or UNICEF. Everyone was familiar with Poland's contribution to those two organizations but also with the very much larger volume of the aid it had itself received. The United States had freely and substantially contributed to that aid. The people of the United States of America had the greatest admiration for the Polish people, a people with liberal traditions whose history had been and continued to be a succession of struggles for liberty and independence against tyrannical governments.

55. Before concluding he urged all the members of the Council not to lose sight of the fact that the aim of the covenant on human rights was to guarantee respect for the rights and fundamental liberties not of governments but of individuals, so that they might achieve better conditions of existence in a free and peaceful world.

56. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) recalled that he had already explained his delegation's view on the procedure to be followed regarding the covenant on human rights. The draft covenant should be referred, with General Assembly resolution 421 (V), to the Commission on Human Rights, which should prepare a new draft for the Council to discuss at its summer session.

57. In connexion with the statement made by some representatives that the attitude of his delegation was due to a desire to delay the completion of the covenant, he pointed out that his country had always played an active part in the work on human rights. However, not only must the covenant be drafted, but its implementation must also be ensured, and his delegation approved the proposal for the establishment of an international body to see that the provisions of the covenant were respected. It even thought that recognized non-governmental organizations as well as States should be entitled to submit complaints to that body.

58. The Soviet Union proposals for the deletion of the measures of implementation, on the grounds that they would involve questions of internal jurisdiction, would make it impossible to ensure the protection of human rights at the international level.

59. He supported the joint Pakistan-Uruguay draft resolution (E/L.139), and submitted an amendment proposing that the words "as well as the amendments to the draft covenant submitted at the twelfth session of the Economic and Social Council" should be added in paragraph 1, after the word "resolutions".

60. It was possible that some of the USSR proposals (E/L.137) deserved to be retained.

61. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) wished to reply briefly to the United States representative. He thanked

him for having expressed his admiration for the Polish love of liberty; that quality would enable his country to overcome all attacks, including the aggressive moves of the United States.

62. He noted that no objections of substance had been made to the USSR draft resolution. That draft should be discussed and would no doubt be approved by the majority of the Council.

63. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) stressed the fundamental importance of respect for human rights. Those rights should be protected against all attacks, even those which came from the governments of the peoples victimized.

64. From the point of view of procedure, there was no doubt that it was the right and the duty of the Council to study the question of human rights; it should not merely act as a go-between. While it was for the Commission on Human Rights to draw up the original draft, the Economic and Social Council should subject it to a thorough examination and if necessary alter it before submitting it to the General Assembly. At its eleventh session, the Council had decided that the draft submitted by the Commission on Human Rights was inadequate, since it did not contain provisions on economic, social and cultural rights, nor any measures for its implementation in federal States and colonial territories, where the protection of human rights required particular attention. The Council had, however, wished to consult the General Assembly on the matter, and the latter had approved the Council's views and framed instructions for the benefit of both the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights.

65. As there had been differences of opinion in the Commission on Human Rights and in the Council on the question of the measures of implementation, those bodies had asked the General Assembly for instructions. The Assembly had asked the Commission to study the question of measures of implementation and to draw up proposals on the subject, which would be embodied either in the text of the covenant itself, or in a separate protocol.

66. If respect for human rights was to be assured, there must be measures of implementation. It was not enough for human rights to be guaranteed in constitutions which, on paper, provided all the guarantees desired, when violations of human rights were a very frequent occurrence even in the most liberal and progressive countries. It was therefore essential to ensure that such violations should be made known to the world at large, so that the latter might at any rate apply some sort of moral pressure on the governments guilty of such violations. It was therefore imperative to include measures of implementation in the draft covenant.

67. Consequently the attention of the Commission on Human Rights must be drawn to the General Assembly's recommendations, and it must be asked to bear them in mind when drawing up the draft covenant; it should also be requested to make provision for collaboration with the specialized agencies as proposed in the joint Pakistan-Uruguay draft resolution (E/L.139). The Council could then examine the draft resolution at its following session.

68. He approved of the Chilean amendment to the joint draft resolution and asked that the summary records of the current session of the Council should also be made available to the Commission. That was all the more necessary as certain members of the Council were not represented on the Commission.

69. He hoped that the United Nations would be able to adopt a covenant which would ensure respect for rights that could be enjoyed by men and women throughout the world.

70. Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the representative of the United Kingdom, said that his delegation's attitude to the question of measures of implementation had not changed: ever since the fifth session of the Council it had considered and it still considered that the question fell within the domestic jurisdiction of States. The proposal submitted by the USSR delegation (E/L.137) was based on that concept. The responsibility for implementation was left to the governments, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. It should however be pointed out that the draft resolution did provide for concrete measures of implementation in the case of the rights which it listed.

71. The proposals for implementation made by the representatives who were opposed to the concrete draft suggested by his delegation were contrary to the spirit of the Charter. They encouraged interference in the internal affairs of States and thus added to the causes of international tension. His delegation's proposals on the other hand should satisfy all those who yearned for lasting peace and true respect for human rights.

72. He noted that the United States representative had recognized the progress achieved in education in the USSR, but had distorted the significance of that education. He read out article 121 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, which guaranteed all citizens the right to education, and went on to quote statements made by a British subject who had visited the USSR and had noted that the masses of the people there had free access

to primary education, that the entire population received free medical care and that young people could, if they wished, enter industrial schools at the age of fourteen. Such statements showed that the slanderous accusations made against his country were quite incorrect.

73. Although respect for human rights was fully guaranteed in the Soviet Union, no attempt could be made to apply a similar system in every country in view of the differing political régimes. That was why the USSR delegation had introduced much more flexible proposals which could be applied in every country.

74. If it was not to fail in its task, the Economic and Social Council should discuss and adopt his delegation's proposals, which certain representatives wished to shelve *en bloc* without submitting objections of substance.

75. The PRESIDENT declared the general discussion closed as he had no more speakers on his list.

76. During the afternoon meeting the Council would have to decide on the two draft resolutions before it; the texts of the amendments submitted by Chile and India (E/L.140) to the joint Pakistan-Uruguay and draft resolution (E/L.139) would be circulated.

77. Mr. DE LACHARRIERE (France) asked whether an amendment could still be submitted.

78. The PRESIDENT read out the rule of procedure prohibiting the submission of new amendments after the closure of the debate.

79. Mr. DE LACHARRIERE (France) asked whether the debate could not be reopened so that he might submit his amendment.

80. The PRESIDENT said that since there was no objection to that proposal, the general discussion would be resumed at the afternoon meeting.

81. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) reserved his delegation's right to submit an amendment at the afternoon meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.