



UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

24 MARCH 1952

SUMMARY RECORDS AND ANNEX

NEW YORK

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council (first special session)* include the corrections to the provisional summary records which were requested by the delegations, and such drafting and editorial modifications as were considered necessary.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

A check list of all documents relating to the agenda of the Council will be found on page viii.

CONTENTS

	<i>Pages</i>
DELEGATIONS	v
AGENDA	vii
CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS	viii
 569TH (ONLY) MEETING	
<i>Monday, 24 March 1952, at 11 a.m.</i>	
Opening of the session	1
Proposal for suspension of rule 19 in relation to the special session (E/2174 and Corr.1)	1
Adoption of the agenda (E/2177 and Corr.1)	1
Point of order raised by the USSR delegation regarding the representation of China	2
Action required by General Assembly resolution 549 (VI) of 5 February 1952: "Special session of the Economic and Social Council to precede the eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights"	2
Distribution of the Russian and French texts of Council documents	5
Closure of the session	5
 <i>ANNEX</i>	
Document E/2174 and Corr.1 — Note by the Secretary-General	7

DELEGATIONS

Members of the Council

ARGENTINA

Representative

S. E. el Sr. D. Luis A. Arean, Minister

Alternates

S. E. el Sr. B. Andrés M. Lescure, Counsellor
S. E. el Sr. D. Cecilio J. Morales, Counsellor

BELGIUM

Representative

S. E. M. Fernand van Langenhove, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations

Alternates

M. Robert Fenaux, Counsellor of Embassy
M. Jules Woulbroun, Attaché of Embassy

CANADA

Representative

Mr. D. M. Johnson, Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations

Adviser

Mr. A. R. Crépault, Adviser, Permanent Delegation of Canada to the United Nations

CHINA

Representative

Dr. C. L. Hsia

Alternate

Mr. Cheng Paonan

Advisers

Mr. P. Y. Tsao
Dr. Hsiu Cha

CUBA

Acting Representative

Sr. Carlos Blanco

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Representative

Mr. Jiří Nosek, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations

Alternate

Mr. Milan Glozar, Adviser to the Permanent Delegation of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations

EGYPT

Representative

Dr. Mahmoud Azmi Bey

FRANCE

Representative

M. Philippe de Seynes

Alternates

M. Gérard Amanrich
M. Roger Gorse

IRAN

Representative

Dr. Ali Gholi Ardalan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Iran to the United Nations

Alternate

Dr. Djalal Abdoh, Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Representative of Iran to the United Nations

Adviser

Dr. Fereydoun Adamyat

MEXICO

Representative

S. E. el Sr. José Gorostiza, Ambassador, Alternate Representative of Mexico to the United Nations

Alternate

Sr. Manuel Rodríguez de San Miguel, Secretary of the Permanent Delegation of Mexico to the United Nations

PAKISTAN

Representative

Mr. A. A. Farooq, Second Secretary, Pakistan Mission to the United Nations

PHILIPPINES

Representative

H. E. Carlos P. Rómulo, Ambassador

Alternates

Dr. José D. Inglés
Mr. Mauro Méndez
Mr. Adriano R. García

POLAND

Representative

Mr. Henryk Birecki, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Poland to the United Nations

Alternate

Dr. Stefan Boratynski, First Secretary of Embassy

SWEDEN

Alternate Representative

Baron Göran von Otter, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the United Nations

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Representative

Mr. Georgii Filippovich Saksin

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN
IRELAND

Representative

Mr. C. M. Anderson

Alternate

Mr. H. T. A. Overton

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Representative

The Honorable Isador Lubin

Alternate

The Honorable Walter Kotschnig

URUGUAY

Representative

Profesor Enrique Rodríguez Fabregat

Specialized agencies

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Representative

Dr. R. A. Metall

Alternate

Mr. A. A. P. Dawson

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS

Representative

Miss Alicia Baños

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Representative

Mr. Solomon V. Arnaldo

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

Representative

Mr. M. Gillen

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Representatives

Dr. Mabel S. Ingalls

Mr. George Hill

Non-governmental organizations

CATEGORY A

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS

Representative

Mr. Stephen Schwebel

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE ALLIANCE

Representative

Mr. Leslie Woodcock

INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE
UNIONS

Representative

Miss Toni Sender

CATEGORY B

WORLD UNION FOR PROGRESSIVE JUDAISM

Representative

Mr. Ronald L. Ronalds

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Representative

Dr. Gerhard Jacoby

CO-ORDINATING BOARD OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS
FOR CONSULTATION WITH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Representative

Col. Bernard Bernstein

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Representative

Dr. Max Beer

INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF COMMERCE AND
PRODUCTION

Representative

Mr. Earl F. Cruickshank

AGENDA

Adopted by the Council on 24 March 1952

Document E/2177 and Corr.1

20 February 1952

[Original text: English]

1. Proposal for suspension of rule 19 in relation to the special session.
2. Action required by General Assembly resolution 549 (VI) of 5 February 1952: "Special session of the Economic and Social Council to precede the eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights".

**CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
(FIRST SPECIAL SESSION)**

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/2174 and Corr.1	1	Note by the Secretary-General	See p. 7
E/2177 and Corr.1	—	Provisional agenda of the first special session of the Economic and Social Council	Mimeographed document only. For agenda, see p. vii
E/L.312	2	Philippines: draft resolution	Adopted without change. See E/2192
E/2192	2	Resolution of 24 March 1952	Mimeographed document only. See <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, First Special Session</i> , Resolution No. 415 (S-1)

UNITED NATIONS
**ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**
OFFICIAL RECORDS



FIRST SPECIAL SESSION, 569th
(ONLY) MEETING

Monday, 24 March 1952, at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Opening of the session	1
Proposal for suspension of rule 19 in relation to the special session (E/2174 and Corr.1)	1
Adoption of the agenda (E/2177 and Corr.1)	1
Point of order raised by the USSR delegation regarding the representation of China	2
Action required by General Assembly resolution 549 (VI) of 5 February 1952: "Special session of the Economic and Social Council to precede the eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights"	2
Distribution of the Russian and French texts of Council documents	5
Closure of the session	5

President: Mr. Jiri NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

Present: The representatives of the following countries:

Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Iran, Pakistan, 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, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization.

Opening of the session

1. The PRESIDENT declared the first special session of the Economic and Social Council open.
2. He welcomed the representatives of the new members, Argentina, Cuba and Egypt, as well as Mr. Georges-Picot, Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs.
3. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) joined in the President's welcoming remarks to the representatives of Argentina, Cuba and Egypt and to the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs.
4. AZMI Bey (Egypt) thanked the President and the United Kingdom representative for their welcoming remarks. Egypt was honoured to take part in the work of the Economic and Social Council.

5. Mr. AREAN (Argentina) also thanked the President and the United Kingdom representative for their welcome and said that Argentina would co-operate fully with the Council to help it attain the lofty objectives laid down by the United Nations Charter in the economic and social field.

6. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) joined in the thanks offered by the Argentine and Egyptian representatives. Cuba, which had already been a member of the Council, would continue to co-operate with it in its economic and social work as in the past.

Proposal for suspension of rule 19 in relation to the special session (E/2174 and Corr.1)

[Agenda item 1]

7. The PRESIDENT read the Secretary-General's note (E/2174 and Corr.1) indicating that the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States, together with the representative of Belgium, proposed the suspension of rule 19 of the Council's rules of procedure, relating to the election of office-bearers for the duration of the Council's special session, and that the First and Second Vice-Presidents elected for 1951 should be appointed President and Vice-President of the special session.

The proposal was adopted.

Adoption of the agenda (E/2177 and Corr.1)

The provisional agenda of the first special session (E/2177 and Corr.1) was adopted.

Point of order raised by the USSR delegation regarding the representation of China

8. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the seat of China was occupied by a person who represented not the Chinese Republic, but the Kuomintang group. He recalled that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had on several occasions declared the presence of representatives of the Kuomintang in United Nations organs to be illegal and had requested that they should be expelled and replaced by accredited representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

9. The USSR delegation associated itself with that legitimate request and was submitting a draft resolution reading as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Decides:

"(a) To exclude from the Council the representative of the Kuomintang group;

"(b) To invite the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to sit on the Council as the representative of the Chinese people."

10. Mr. GLOZAR (Czechoslovakia) recalled that the Czechoslovak delegation had often stated that the seat of China was illegally held by representatives of a private group in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and that the only legal representatives of the Chinese people were those appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

11. He would accordingly vote in favour of the USSR proposal.

12. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had consistently opposed the exclusion of representatives of the Nationalist Government of China and would continue to do so. It considered that a proposal to that effect should not even be considered, in view of the fact that the Chinese communist Government, in its international behaviour, and specifically in Korea, was showing open disrespect for the principles upheld by the United Nations.

13. The United States delegation therefore formally proposed that all debate on the question of the representation of China should be adjourned *sine die*, in accordance with rule 49 of the rules of procedure. He added that his proposal should be voted on before that of the USSR representative.

14. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) supported the United States representative's motion for adjournment. The United Kingdom delegation considered that the situation prevailing in Korea and the armistice negotiations in progress made any discussion of the question raised by the USSR representative unwise.

15. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) was against the United States representative's proposal to adjourn indefinitely a debate on a question of great importance to the Council's work. The whole world was aware of the great economic and social progress made by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, whose representatives were the only persons

qualified to speak in the name of the Chinese people. It was also well known that the Kuomintang represented nobody but a group of mercenaries in the pay of the United States Government. He was surprised to hear the United States representative mention the current situation in Korea as an argument in support of his proposal. As a matter of fact, it was rather the question of the bacterial warfare waged in Korea by the United States which should be discussed in the Council.

16. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States representative's proposal for the adjournment *sine die* of all debate on the question of the representation of China.

The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions, one member being absent when the vote was taken.

17. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the decision just adopted by the Council was illegal because the representative of the Kuomintang could not represent the Chinese people.

18. Mr. GLOZAR (Czechoslovakia) said that, in view of the Council's decision, the Czechoslovak delegation would not consider itself bound by the decisions adopted at that session, the representative of the Kuomintang being present.

19. Mr. HSIA (China), explaining his vote, said he was sorry that the USSR representative had seen fit to draw the Council into a futile discussion. He recalled that at its sixth session, the General Assembly had, by a two-thirds majority, adopted the resolution submitted by China (resolution 505 (VI))¹ stating that the Soviet Union had not fulfilled the obligations undertaken under its treaty with China.

20. He added that the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, had re-elected China as a member of the Economic and Social Council,² thus reaffirming its confidence in the Government which Mr. Hsia had the honour to represent.

Action required by General Assembly resolution 549 (VI) of 5 February 1952: "Special session of the Economic and Social Council to precede the eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights"

[Agenda item 2]

21. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that the only purpose of the Council's special session was to transmit to the Commission on Human Rights certain General Assembly resolutions (resolutions 543 (VI), 544 (VI), 545 (VI), 546 (VI), 547 (VI) and 548 (VI)) on the international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation so as to enable the Commission to comply with the directives of the Assembly (General Assembly resolution 549 (VI)) and complete its work in connexion with the draft covenant at its eighth session. The Philippine delegation had first intended to draft a resolution which would have given detailed instructions to the Commission on Human Rights, but to avoid a long debate in the Council on the substance

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 369th meeting.

² *Ibid.*, 349th meeting.

of the General Assembly's resolutions which would not be warranted by the terms of reference of the Council's special session, it had opted in favour of a short resolution drafted in general terms. Under the Philippine draft resolution (E/L.312), the Council would simply transmit the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly to the Commission on Human Rights and request it to take appropriate action on them, among other things, by drawing up two draft covenants on the basis of the Assembly's instructions and submitting them to the Council at its fourteenth session, so that the Council, in turn, could submit them simultaneously to the General Assembly at its seventh session, together with its recommendations.

22. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make a few remarks on the Philippine draft resolution. The USSR delegation, during the Council's lengthy debates on the question at its thirteenth session and during the General Assembly's discussions at its sixth session, had explained the USSR Government's position on the principles of human rights. There did not appear to be any need to explain it again in detail.

23. The USSR delegation saw no reason why the Commission on Human Rights should not draft a covenant which would state in definite terms the right of peoples to self-determination as well as economic, social and cultural human rights.

24. It saw no objection, moreover, to altering the wording of the Spanish text by using the term *derechos humanos* (Assembly resolution 548 (VI)).

25. With regard to transmitting the General Assembly's resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights, however, the USSR delegation could not adopt any position other than that which it had held in earlier debates and could not, for example, agree to the drafting of two separate covenants. Political and civil rights and economic, social and cultural rights were inextricably bound together and it would be useless to attempt to separate them into two groups.

26. He added that his Government could likewise not agree to the introduction of provisions in the draft international covenant on human rights regarding the receivability or non-receivability of reservations. Every sovereign State was entitled to make reservations on any convention to which it was a party. That was its inalienable right. The proposals contained in the documents listed in General Assembly resolution 547 (VI) did not improve the measures of implementation and amounted to interference in the internal affairs of the various countries.

27. Accordingly, there were some of the General Assembly resolutions listed in the draft resolution submitted by the Philippine delegation (E/L.312) which the USSR delegation could not agree to transmit to the Commission on Human Rights and, without going into their substance, it wanted each of the General Assembly resolutions mentioned in the Philippine draft resolution to be voted on separately so that the Council members could express their views on the transmission of those various resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights.

28. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) pointed out that the Council had met in special session to

transmit to the Commission on Human Rights certain General Assembly decisions (resolutions 543 (VI) to 548 (VI) inclusive). In doing so, the Council was not committing itself to any extent regarding the various resolutions, and their transmission to the Commission on Human Rights did not prejudge the Council's subsequent position regarding them.

29. After completing its work, the Commission would submit proposals; the Council would then doubtless wish to consider them and could devote whatever time was necessary to that task. For the time being, the United States representative saw no point in transmitting the resolutions separately, or in taking a separate vote on each.

30. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that he had not suggested a discussion on the substance of the question of human rights. He had merely proposed a procedure which would enable all delegations, by their vote, to express their opinion on the advisability of transmitting any given resolution and especially on the second part of the Philippine draft resolution, which explicitly requested the Commission to draw up two draft covenants.

31. Mr. GLOZAR (Czechoslovakia) fully supported the proposal of the USSR representative.

32. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) wondered what the result would be if the USSR proposal were adopted. The Council would be anticipating the action to be taken by the Commission on Human Rights and would be adopting a position on those questions. That was not the purpose of its special session. It had met merely to transmit the General Assembly's resolution to the Commission on Human Rights, which was its subsidiary organ.

33. The Uruguayan delegation would alter the position it had held in the General Assembly only in the Commission on Human Rights, if that became necessary. It would therefore vote for the Philippine draft resolution or for any other proposal to transmit the General Assembly's resolutions to the Commission.

34. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated that he did not wish to enter into the substance of the question. His was merely a procedural proposal.

35. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation would have liked the Council to transmit the General Assembly's resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights without delay. In the General Assembly, Pakistan had not voted in favour of all the resolutions. In fact, his delegation had voted against the proposal to prepare two covenants, because it felt that there could not be two categories of rights. The Council could not, however, at that stage, take any substantive decision; the time was not yet ripe to raise those problems. The Philippine draft resolution should be adopted as a whole because a separate vote on the various parts would merely create a want of balance in the drafting.

36. Mr. JOHNSON (Canada) also considered that the Council should transmit the General Assembly's resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights in accordance with the former's request. Not until a later

stage, when the Commission had submitted its report, would the Council have the opportunity of discussing the questions in detail.

37. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) also did not wish to enter into the substance of the debate. He favoured the transmission of the resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights, but he wished to indicate, by his vote, that he did not approve the separation of the various rights or the measures contemplated.

38. Mr. FENAU (Belgium) saw no objection to voting for the Philippine draft resolution provided it were submitted as its author had conceived it.

39. The Council would have an opportunity to examine all aspects of the question at its fourteenth session; for the moment, the only decision it had to take was a simple procedural decision in accordance with the instructions of the General Assembly. If a roll-call vote was to be taken, however, the Belgian delegation might take a different position and abstain with regard to certain resolutions.

40. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) said that his delegation would have agreed to having the question of the transmission of the General Assembly's resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights voted on either by a show of hands or by roll-call, if the USSR and Polish delegations had not made the issue too specific by pointing out that a roll-call vote would make it possible to ascertain the position of each delegation as regards each resolution. The French delegation did not view the matter in that light. The Council could vote separately on the transmission of each individual resolution to the Commission, without the vote indicating what the attitude of each delegation would be with regard to the various resolutions when the substantive debate began. The French delegation wished to make it clear that it would vote in favour of transmission of all of the resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights, but it pointed out most formally that its vote left it entirely free to adopt whatever position it desired on each of the resolutions at the fourteenth session of the Council.

41. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had voted in the General Assembly against some of the resolutions in question. For that reason he reserved his position as regards the substance of those resolutions. Subject to that condition, his delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution of the Philippines.

42. AZMI Bey (Egypt) supported the Philippine draft resolution. He recalled that his delegation had been among those which had most vigorously opposed the drafting of two separate covenants. Nevertheless, his delegation considered itself bound by the decisions of the General Assembly; and the latter had asked the Economic and Social Council to convene a special session in order to transmit the resolutions adopted by the Assembly to the Commission on Human Rights, which was to meet on 14 April 1952.

43. As regards the request of the USSR representative, he drew attention to the difficulties which would result if one of the resolutions mentioned in the Philippine proposal were rejected. For example, if the General Assembly's resolution concerning the draft-

ing of two covenants were rejected, the Commission on Human Rights would be unable to examine at its next session a matter to which the General Assembly had desired it to give priority.

44. Such a situation would be paradoxical; in order to avert it, he asked the USSR representative to withdraw his proposal for a roll-call vote and requested the Council to support the Philippine draft resolution.

45. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that his proposal concerned only the procedure of transmission of the resolutions to the Commission on Human Rights and raised no substantive questions whatever.

46. Mr. HSIA (China) pointed out that a fundamental difference existed between the Philippine proposal and that of the USSR. If the Council decided to transmit the General Assembly's resolutions *en bloc* to the Commission on Human Rights, the several delegations would not be required to take any position on any of the resolutions. On the other hand, if the transmission of each resolution was voted on separately, the Council would be taking a position, indirectly, on the substance of each resolution, a step which it could not take without reopening the general debate. Such a possibility could not be considered. Moreover, each delegation's views had already been recorded in the summary records of the sixth session of the General Assembly.

47. For those reasons, Mr. Hsia would vote in favour of the Philippine draft resolution.

48. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) thought it preferable to transmit all the resolutions at the same time. It was only after the Commission on Human Rights had studied all the questions referred to it and submitted its report that the Council could give an opinion on the substance of the resolutions.

49. The Cuban delegation would therefore vote in favour of the Philippine proposal, while reserving its right to express, at the proper time, its views on the questions raised in the General Assembly's resolutions.

50. Mr. FENAU (Belgium) associated himself with the view of the French representative. Whether the General Assembly's resolutions were transmitted to the Commission by virtue of a vote by show of hands or a roll-call vote was purely a matter of procedure, as long as it was clearly understood that the vote in no way committed any delegation as regards the substance of the resolutions in question.

51. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) wondered whether it would not be simpler for the USSR representative to propose an amendment designed to eliminate from the Philippine proposal any references to resolutions of the General Assembly which his delegation could not approve.

52. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not feel that such an amendment would serve any useful purpose, particularly since his delegation had a perfect right to make known its views with regard to the several resolutions.

53. The PRESIDENT announced the closure of the debate.

54. He called for a vote on the Philippine draft resolution (E/L.312), stating that each reference to a

different resolution in the first paragraph would be put to the vote separately.

The reference to resolution 543 (VI) was approved by 13 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The reference to resolution 544 (VI) was approved by 17 votes to none.

The reference to resolution 545 (VI) was approved by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The reference to resolution 546 (VI) was approved by 14 votes to 3.

The reference to resolution 547 (VI) was approved by 14 votes to 3.

The reference to resolution 548 (VI) was approved by 17 votes to none.

55. In response to a question from the PRESIDENT, Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) asked that the question of the transmission of resolution 549 (VI) should also be put to the vote, since that resolution contained important instructions for the Council and the Commission on Human Rights.

The reference to resolution 549 (VI) was approved by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

56. The PRESIDENT put the Philippine draft resolution (E/L.312) to the vote as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

57. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran), Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan), Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom), AZMY Bey (Egypt) and Mr. JOHNSON (Canada) stated that their votes in no way committed their respective delegations as regards the substance of the General Assembly's resolutions.

58. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had opposed some of the resolutions in the General Assembly. Nevertheless, it had held the view that the Commission on Human Rights should study the questions dealt with in those resolutions. For that reason, he had voted in favour of transmission of the resolutions to the Commission, with the understanding that his vote in no way expressed the attitude of his delegation as regards the individual resolutions in question.

59. Mr. AREAN (Argentina) explained that his delegation had voted simply on the procedural question of transmission of the General Assembly's resolutions

to the Commission on Human Rights. It was for that reason that he had voted in favour of the transmission of all the resolutions, even though his delegation was not in favour of two separate conventions.

Distribution of the Russian and French texts of Council documents

60. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the Secretariat to the delay which he had already mentioned in the distribution of the Russian text of Council documents. Owing to that delay, his delegation was having some difficulty in making its preparations for the fourteenth session of the Council. Moreover, the agenda of the current session had not yet been distributed in Russian. He hoped that the Secretariat would make every effort to enable the USSR delegation to receive the Russian text of important documents in good time.

61. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) made similar observations as regards the distribution of the French translations of documents.

62. Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Council) explained that the delay was due in part to the fact that the General Assembly's sixth session had continued after 1 January, but assured the USSR and French representatives that the Secretariat would do its best to remedy the situation.

Closure of the session

63. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs) associated himself with the expressions of welcome which had been addressed to the representatives of Argentina, Cuba and Egypt, and thanked the President on his own behalf for his cordial words. Like his predecessor, he would endeavour to be objective and impartial in carrying out his duties.

64. The PRESIDENT thanked the members of the Council, the Assistant Secretary-General and the Secretary of the Council for their collaboration.

65. He extended his thanks also to the other members of the Secretariat who had helped to service the special session.

66. He declared the first special session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

ANNEX

Agenda item 1: PROPOSAL FOR SUSPENSION OF RULE 19 IN RELATION TO THE SPECIAL SESSION

DOCUMENT E/2174 AND CORR.1

Note by the Secretary-General

[Original text: English]
[20 February 1952]

1. The Secretary-General has received formal notice, under rule 85 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, that the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of the United States of America will propose that, subject to the views of other members of the Council, rule 19 (relating to the election of office-bearers) should be suspended for the duration of the special session of the Council called under resolution 549 (VI) of the General Assembly of 5 February 1952. A letter has also been received by the Secretary-General from the permanent represent-

ative of Belgium recommending suspension of rule 19 during the special session of the Council.

2. It is pointed out in the notes from the United Kingdom and United States representatives that, if adopted by the Council, the effect of their proposal, having regard to rules 20, 22, and 23, would be that the First Vice-President elected for 1951 would act as President for the special session and the Second Vice-President elected for 1951 would act as First Vice-President; and that the election of office-bearers for 1952 would take place at the first meeting of the Council's regular session, that is, on 13 May 1952.