United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-FIRST SESSION
Official Records *

THIRD COMMITTEE
45th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 10 November 1976
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 45th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/31/SR.45
15 November 1976
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 69: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued):

(b) REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (A/10018; A/31/18; A/C.3/31/7, A/C.3/31/8; E/5813; A/31/151 (S/12144), A/31/178 (S/12179); A/C.3/31/L.18 and L.20)

1. Mr. WEISS (Austria) said that he hoped that the number of States parties to the Convention would continue to increase.

2. He paid a tribute to the work accomplished by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and its efforts in connexion with the Decade for Action to Combat Racial Discrimination and the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and thanked the Committee for honouring his country by accepting its invitation to hold its fifteenth session in Vienna from 28 March to 15 April 1977.

3. In its report, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination noted with appreciation that Austria's second periodic report dealt with a certain number of subjects which had not been dealt with in its initial report and on which the Committee had requested information, and that the comprehensive information contained in the report was organized in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the Committee at its first session.

4. With regard to the statement made by the representative of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia concerning the situation of the Slovenes and Croats living in Austria, his Government firmly rejected the accusation that private Austrian organizations were engaged in neo-Nazi activities, especially since such activities were forbidden under Austrian law. Moreover, as was indicated in paragraph 56 of the report, no evidence had turned up which would show that the objective of the so-called Kärntner Heimatdienst was to eliminate Slovene or other minorities.

5. The Austrian Federal Government had always striven for the faithful fulfilment of all provisions of the State Treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria, including article 7. It should be pointed out, however, that the wording of its paragraph 3 was not as clear as the representative of Yugoslavia would have everyone believe. There were, for instance, no administrative or judicial districts in Styria with a Slovene, Croat or mixed population, all those areas having been ceded to Yugoslavia shortly after the First World War.

6. Furthermore, the notion of "mixed population" was an extremely imprecise one since it could mean anything from 50 per cent to less than 1 per cent of the population in a given area.

7. Moreover, the implementation of article 7, paragraph 3, of the State Treaty and of the Law on Ethnic Groups, enacted on 7 July 1976 with the consent of all

(Mr. Weiss, Austria)

political parties in the Austrian Parliament, would not depend on the results of the secret poll regarding the mother tongue, which would be taken throughout Austria on 14 November 1976. That census would be carried out in complete secrecy and would not be subject to any outside influence or pressure. The conduct of statistical surveys on the composition of the population was a sovereign right of any State and was in no way forbidden by the relevant provisions of the Austrian State Treaty.

8. The purpose of the census was not to reduce the number of members of minority groups, or to restrict their status or assimilate them. As the Austrian Chancellor, Mr. Bruno Kreisky, had said when addressing the Council of Ministers, the census was not intended to divide Austrians but to guarantee to all of them, irrespective of their mother tongue, enjoyment of equal rights and, in addition, special rights for linguistic minorities. The new Law on Ethnic Groups provided precisely for those special rights, which included subsidies and representation in ethnic advisory councils, to be created by law. Those rights would apply to all minorities without exception. As could be seen from the Austrian Official Gazette (No. 398 of 5 August 1976), the confidential census of the mother tongue referred only to German, Croatian, Slovenian and Hungarian, with one more category provided for those who had a mother tongue other than those just mentioned.

9. He quoted from section 1, paragraph 1, of the Federal Act of 7 July 1976 concerning the legal status of ethnic groups in Austria, which provided that ethnic groups and their members enjoyed the protection of the law, which safeguarded their preservation and security and ensured respect for their language and culture.

10. In conclusion, he noted that one of the fundamental principles of Austrian foreign policy was to maintain friendly relations with all countries, and especially its neighbours. The Austrian Government therefore attached the greatest importance to the maintenance of good neighbourly relations with the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and welcomed the close contacts existing between the two countries in many areas, leading to a true relationship of trust and confidence which had been beneficial to both countries.

11. Mr. LIUNDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation found it very encouraging to note that there were now 90 States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. That was a sign of good political will to end discrimination. His own country had been a party to the Convention since October 1972, because of its firm conviction that all men were equal and that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority was scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially injust and dangerous", as stated in the Political Declaration of the Non-Aligned Conference of Heads of State or Government at Colombo in 1976.

12. Turning to the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/31/18), he said that although that Committee had had to send reminders to States parties in accordance with article 9 of the Convention, the reports were much improved and were being received more promptly.

(Mr. Liundi, Tanzania)

13. His country's second periodic report was discussed on page 43 of the report (A/31/18), and his delegation noted that in paragraph 145, CERD observed that the interim Constitution of the country was less specific than the Party constitution. It was important to remember, however, that the Constitution was interim and that the Party was supreme. It was a single party, which directed the political, economic and social and cultural life of the country and which, through the Government, was trying to build a body of laws to provide equal opportunities for everyone, irrespective of sex, race, religion or status, and to eliminate all forms of exploitation, intimidation and discrimination.

14. In the spirit of the Arusha Declaration, the Party was also pursuing a policy whereby everyone who was able to work had to work. His country's next periodic report to the Committee would include the various clarifications requested. In conclusion, he reiterated that his country would co-operate fully with the United Nations in the implementation of resolutions on racism, racial discrimination, apartheid and the liberation of peoples subjected to colonial and foreign domination.

15. Mr. SOBHY (Egypt) said that the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was a further proof of the effectiveness of that body, which played an important role in the struggle against racial discrimination and helped to establish the guidelines for action which would be followed, in turn, by the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

16. On reading the report on the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, whose clarity and succinctness made it easy to form a clear idea of the progress made during that period, members would note with some satisfaction that the Committee had not been content merely to receive from States parties periodic reports in which they simply denied the existence of any racial discrimination in their territory, citing certain provisions in their constitutions. It had asked them to describe in great detail the legislative, administrative or other measures which they had taken to implement the provisions of the Convention.

17. His delegation supported the request by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination that member States should send comprehensive reports on measures taken to implement each of the provisions of the Convention, and invited all States which had not yet done so to do that. It also considered that States should include in their reports information on their relations with the racist régimes of southern Africa, and the extent to which they were implementing the relevant United Nations resolutions. In conclusion, his delegation was pleased that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was prepared to take an active part in the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and in the activities of the Decade proclaimed by the United Nations for the same purpose.

18. Miss ILIC (Yugoslavia) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.18 concerning the reports of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and

(Miss Ilic, Yugoslavia)

said that some changes needed to be made in the text. In the first preambular paragraph, the number of the resolution on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (3223 (XXIX)) and the number of the resolution on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (3225 (XXIX)) should be deleted, and the spaces left blank for the insertion of the numbers of the resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly on those two questions at the current session.

19. After reading out the draft resolution, she pointed out that the word "report" in paragraph 2 and the word "meeting" in paragraph 5 of the English text should be in the plural. She explained that the sponsors had taken care to include the important decisions and recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, while trying to give an exact idea of the nature of its work. The sponsors recommended the adoption of the current text, which resembled in both substance and form the resolution adopted unanimously two years earlier, and they hoped that it would also receive the unanimous approval of the members of the Committee.

20. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that, as representative of a country that had been the first to ratify the Convention and whose contribution to the struggle against colonialism, racism and apartheid was well known, he had joined with the delegation of Czechoslovakia in submitting two amendments (A/C.3/31/L.20) to draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.18. The amendments simply provided for the incorporation of two operative paragraphs in the draft resolution, which the two delegations supported unreservedly. In the first paragraph the General Assembly would commend the Committee's solidarity with the peoples struggling against racism in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia - a solidarity which was particularly significant in the light of the events that had occurred during 1976 in southern Africa. The General Assembly, which was a political body with responsibilities in the matter, should take a position in that regard. The second paragraph was designed to make the Convention truly universal by inviting all States to become parties to it.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that documents A/C.3/31/L.18 and L.20 should, as far as possible, be adopted unanimously and that the wording of the two texts should remain within the framework of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; that was in fact what the members of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had always wished, as could be seen from its decision 2 (XI). The sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendments should try to work towards that end, so that the Third Committee could vote on them in good time. He also announced that the Sudan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.18.

22. He invited delegations wishing to do so to exercise their right of reply.

23. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said he did not understand the allegations made by the Yugoslav delegation at the previous meeting. Everyone knew that there was no racial discrimination in Bulgaria, whose nationals enjoyed complete equality and whose Government sought to create the necessary material conditions for the exercise of political, economic,

(Mr. Bahnev, Bulgaria)

social and cultural rights as could be seen, in any case, from the fourth periodic report which Bulgaria had submitted to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. He also wished to point out that the Bulgarian Government, which had always prevented the awakening of nationalist feelings and prohibited all hate propaganda, had constantly sought to promote co-operation between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia in all fields, acting on the basis of the commonly accepted principles of sovereign equality, inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity, non-interference in domestic affairs and mutual respect, and of scrupulously respecting the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the international conventions and agreements to which the two countries were parties. The Government of Bulgaria dealt with problems of nationality on the basis of absolute democracy, and gave all citizens the freedom to indicate their national affiliations. The insinuations of the Yugoslav delegation therefore appeared to be somewhat strange, to say the least, and wholly inappropriate.

24. His delegation emphasized that no bilateral or multilateral agreement currently in force, or concluded at any time in history, recorded the existence of a Macedonian minority in Bulgaria. In fact Bulgaria had in the past signed many agreements relating to ethnic minorities, whether in its territory or in the territory of other countries - such as Yugoslavia - without, however, ever seeking to take advantage of such a situation. There had definitely never been a Macedonian minority in Bulgaria that constituted a separate group in terms of race, origin, language or religion. The Yugoslav delegation was trying to impose a theory that had no foundation, for history attested to the fact that no concept of "Macedonian" nationality had ever been linked with the region of Blagoevgrad, and that the Slavic population of that region had always been recognized, and had always considered itself, as an integral part of the Bulgarian nation, whose constitution dated from the second half of the eighteenth century.

25. His delegation stated categorically that the peoples of the People's Republic of Bulgaria condemned the chauvinistic policy of other, bourgeois, countries in the Balkans, a policy which had given sinister connotations to the term "balkanization". He also recalled that after the victory over facism in 1944 the People's Republic of Macedonia had been created within Yugoslavia. In the difficult conditions following the Second World War, negotiations had been initiated with a view to merging Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, which would have thus formed a single State, inhabited by South Slavs. The principal parties concerned had not reached agreement on that point, but it should be noted that, in that case too, there had never been any question of a Macedonian minority. Today, one need only go to the region of Blagoevgrad to see the cultural, economic and social development of that region, which unquestionably considered itself an integral part of Bulgaria.

26. Lastly, he pointed out that Bulgaria and Yugoslavia continued to enjoy friendly relations and were endeavouring to create a favourable climate for dialogue. He therefore thought it unfortunate that the Yugoslav delegation should have wasted the Committee's valuable time by making allegations that showed a lack of understanding of historical facts and of the true present-day situation.

27. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that

(Mr. Sherifis, Cyprus)

at the previous meeting the representative of Turkey had indulged in polemics concerning issues that were well beyond the competence of the Committee and clearly extraneous to the items under discussion. The representative of Turkey had seen fit to reiterate false allegations that had been repeatedly stated in the past and each time refuted by the delegation of Cyprus with the aid of facts and arguments which were a matter of record. Thus, it was unnecessary to point out that 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus was occupied by a foreign army, that one third of the population of Cyprus consisted of displaced persons, refugees in their own country, living in misery and deprivation. Nor was it necessary to elaborate on the efforts made by Turkey to colonize the occupied area of Cyprus through the immigation of mainland Turks who, if added to the Turkish soldiers, outnumbered the Turkish Cypriots. In an earlier statement, he had strongly opposed the policy of separation of ethnic or racial groups in South Africa. Similarly, he wished to disagree with the position of the representative of Turkey who championed the separation of the ethnic communities in Cyprus for security reasons, since such separation merely served foreign and racist interests.

28. The Turkish position conflicted with paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, as well as other resolutions, including some that had emanated from the Third Committee. He wondered how the representative of Turkey could speak of human rights when he represented a country which uno actu had violated every right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and which held in subjection by force of arms a small and defenceless non-aligned country which it had ruined and destroyed, and was exploiting and oppressing, and which openly denied the exercise of human rights to Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike, whose homes and properties were distributed as war booty to hordes of immigrants from mainland Turkey. He also wondered why Turkey had voted in favour of paragraph 5 of resolution 3212 (XXIX) in which the General Assembly called for the return of all Cypriot refugees to their homes in safety when, two years after its adoption, the Turkish armies arrogantly prevented the return of those refugees. He also wondered how Turkey had implemented resolution I (XXVIII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities which, in paragraph 1, had expressed concern at the continuing plight of the displaced persons in Cyprus, and which, in paragraph 2, had called for the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations concerning the return of the displaced persons. How had Turkey implemented paragraph 4 of resolution 3395 (XXX), which the General Assembly had adopted by 117 votes to 1 (that of Turkey), or paragraph 1 of resolution 4 (XXXI), which the Commission on Human Rights had adopted with Turkey's consent and in which it called for urgent measures for the return of all refugees in Cyprus to their homes in safety. He could quote numerous other resolutions of the United Nations or other organizations which Turkey, rejecting the calls of the international community and of the non-aligned countries, had refused to implement, whether it had voted for or against those resolutions. Thus, today, two years after the invasion, a pitiful picture unfolded in Cyprus: not even one refugee had returned to his home and, if anything, the number of refugees had increased. Greek Cypriots who had remained in the occupied areas had been expelled by force, and those who were still in the north were subjected to all sorts of restrictions and pressures, as could be seen from the Secretary-General's report dated 30 October 1976.

29. Mr. SOYLEMEZ (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in his statement at the preceding meeting he had confined himself to the allegations made by the Greek Cypriot representatives before the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination at its last four sessions and to the sections of the Committee's reports relating to the question of Cyprus, for he had felt that the Third Committee was not the appropriate forum for a discussion of the problem of Cyprus. His delegation had emphasized once again that that question should be dealt with in the intercommunal talks under the auspices of the Secretary-General. It therefore urged the Greek Cypriots not to bring their woes to different forums but to negotiate the Cyprus question seriously in the intercommunal talks. The facts and figures spoke for themselves. The members of the Committee could not be misled by exaggerations and false accusations; as Mr. Türkmen, the Ambassador of Turkey, had recalled in a statement in plenary meeting, if the Greek Cypriots were to be believed, everything in Cyprus had begun in 1974 with the Turkish invasion. If they were to be believed, up to 1974 Cyprus had been an island paradise where the two communities had lived side by side in harmony under the humane and enlightened guidance of Archbishop Makarios; then Turkey had suddenly decided to invade Cyprus and misfortune had befallen the island. According to that argument, if Turkey withdrew its forces, Cyprus would revert to its previous happy days and the Turkish Cypriot refugees would return to the enclaves in which they had lived before 1974. The only snag was that the Turkish community might suffocate and disappear, which was of course a small price to pay for the total Hellenization of Cyprus and the realization of the long-standing dream of Enosis.

30. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Turkey had referred once again to the violations of human rights in Cyprus. He rejected the allegations that human rights had been violated by the Cypriot Government, for the Turkish army was responsible for the sufferings of the Cypriots, whether of Greek or Turkish origin. He proposed to the Turkish delegation that an independent body should be sent to Cyprus to inquire into past and present violations of human rights in the occupied zones and in the south of the island, which was under the control of his Government. On behalf of his Government, he pledged co-operation in that undertaking and invited Turkey to take up the challenge and do the same.

31. Mr. SOYLEMEZ (Turkey) recalled that Archbishop Makarios had stated in September 1962 that the task of the Greeks would not be completed unless the small Turkish community, which belonged to the race that had been the greatest enemy of Hellenism, was expelled.

32. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) pointed out that the representative of Turkey had not responded to his proposal, which had been made in the hope of reaching constructive and positive results.

33. Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not been convinced by the representative of Austria that the activities of the Kärntner Heimatdienst were not fascist. Several acts and several statements by the leaders of that organization could be cited which would

(Mr. Mujezinovic, Yugoslavia)

prove beyond a doubt that he was unfortunately right, at least in so far as the attitude of that organization towards the Slovene minority in Austria was concerned. As to the interpretation given by the representative of Austria to article 7, paragraph 3, of the State Treaty, that article was very clear, and if Austria had displayed a little goodwill, there would never have been any doubt that its provisions could be fully applied. Lastly, as to the Austrian representative's assertion that the census would not affect the rights of the Slovene and Croat minorities, the fact that the minorities themselves had boycotted the census gave serious grounds for doubt about the merits of that assertion.

34. His delegation wished to state that the Bulgarian representative's insinuations that Yugoslavia had designs on Bulgaria were entirely baseless and that Yugoslavia was concerned only with the Macedonian minority in Bulgaria. Furthermore, he recalled that the facts and figures he had mentioned at the preceding meeting had been taken, inter alia, from Bulgarian official statistics and from a series of Bulgarian documents relating to the Macedonian minority in Bulgaria which had been approved by the Bulgarian legislative and executive authorities. He therefore asked the Bulgarian Government to restore the rights of the Macedonian minority in the interest of continued good relations between the two countries, which might suffer if that problem was not resolved.

35. Mr. WEISS (Austria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, informed the representative of Yugoslavia that neo-Nazi activities were strictly prohibited by law in Austria. As to the wording of article 7, paragraph 3, of the Austrian State Treaty, he strongly protested against Yugoslavia's accusation that his Government seemed unwilling to apply the provisions of that Treaty.

36. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that there was no obstacle to the development of a co-operative relationship between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria in all fields. Bulgaria therefore felt that, in order to find a solution to the problem, the historical background and the actual situation at the present time must be recognized and that the two countries must establish their future relations and co-operation on that basis.

37. Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the representative of Bulgaria seemed to have misunderstood his remarks and he wished to explain that he had only said that the relations between his country and Bulgaria would be difficult if the problem was not resolved. There was no suggestion that relations between the two countries could not develop; quite the reverse was the case.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/31/3, /chaps. II, III (sects. F, G and L), IV (sect. A), V, VI, (sects. B to D) and VII (sect. D)/, A/31/64, A/31/74, A/31/99, A/31/253; A/C.3/31/1, A/C.3/31/4, A/C.3/31/5, A/C.3/31/6 and Add.1; A/C.3/31/L.19)

38. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the report of the Economic and Social Council was perhaps the most important item on the Committee's

(Mr. Schreiber)

agenda. In accordance with the Charter, the Council acted under the authority of the General Assembly and reported to it annually on its activities. The Commission on Human Rights was one of the functional commissions of the Council, and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was a subsidiary body of the Commission on Human Rights. Thus, when it examined the report of the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly could review all United Nations activities in the field of human rights.

39. Emphasizing the scope of those activities, he said that on becoming Members of the United Nations and accepting the obligations of the Charter, States had committed themselves to promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms and that by so doing they had awakened hopes that were close to the hearts of all human beings. It was therefore natural that peoples, groups and individuals looked to the United Nations for action to fulfil those promises. It was also understandable that the United Nations was criticized for the slowness and the quality of the results obtained, which were often difficult to evaluate exactly. More important than the criticisms, however, were the many, repeated and sometimes desperate appeals, from all sources, calling on the United Nations to use its influence to improve the lot of many persons who appeared to be victims of violations of their fundamental rights. For instance, in 1975 the United Nations had received more than 50,000 such communications, the writers of which had believed in its ability to act.

40. A study of the problems involved in the protection of human rights soon showed how complex that task was. The Organization was based on the principle of the sovereignty of States, their competence in their internal affairs and the equality of Member States; its action was held back by the traditional reluctance to recognize individuals as subjects of international law. In order to assume a genuine role in the international protection of human rights, United Nations bodies had been forced to pick their way by taking advantage of the Charter as fully as possible, following the line of least resistance and combining the system of conventions with that of recommendations, a method which had been called the "methode du cheminement" (roundabout approach). It was in that light that the results achieved should be considered. United Nations action had consisted in adopting norms, on the one hand, and in ensuring their application, on the other.

41. The adoption of norms had been a substantial task, necessitated by the need to define at the global level the nature and limits of human rights. Twenty years of effort had been crowned by the entry into force in 1976 of the two International Covenants on Human Rights, which the Committee would be considering in connexion with another agenda item. Thus, human rights had been codified at the international level by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, numerous international conventions, particularly that on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, and the two International Covenants, most of which had been adopted unanimously by the very highest international organs. The task of codification was still going on today as could be seen from the Third Committee's agenda, which included the problems of freedom of information, religious intolerance, and studies on the effects of science and technology on human rights, the right to self-determination, the self-determination of peoples, and

/...

the problems of indigenous populations, minorities, migrant workers, and persons born out of wedlock. Those problems were gradually becoming better known and better understood, and the United Nations might soon be in a position to propose new norms for observance by its Members.

42. At the present time, however, that did not seem to be the most important part of the work of the United Nations; what was expected of the Organization seemed rather to have to do with its work on the implementation of norms. There had been many changes in that respect in recent years. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination itself provided machinery for implementation. It was the firm opposition of the States Members of the United Nations to racial discrimination and apartheid which had led the Organization to set up various agencies to monitor the discharge by Member States of the obligations they had accepted or the way in which they responded to appeals from the international community. Each of the International Covenants contained machinery for implementation, and the Economic and Social Council indicated in its report how it proposed to discharge, with the aid of the Commission on Human Rights and the specialized agencies concerned, its functions under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. At present, 14 States were parties to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and Zaire had just deposited its instruments of ratification to the two International Covenants and the Optional Protocol, bringing to 41 the number of States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and to 39 the number of parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Complaints had already been made under the Optional Protocol, and the Human Rights Committee established by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the members of which had been elected in September, would begin to deal with them in the spring. Among the other procedures adopted to ensure respect for the provisions on human rights was the system of periodic reports from States to the Commission on Human Rights and the confidential consideration of communications from private sources with a view to determining the existence of grave and persistent violations of human rights, concerning which the Commission could organize in-depth studies or call for inquiries by independent persons.

43. It was also important to note the opportunities which already existed at various levels of the consideration of human-rights problems, for Member States or experts to raise the question of possible violations, engage in exchanges of views and hear the explanations of the Governments involved. That meant not mere accusations but expressions of international concern at information emanating from numerous sources worthy of serious and objective evaluation. Sometimes studies were called for in resolutions, and the report of the Economic and Social Council spoke, for example, of the periodic study, under the auspices of the Commission on Human Rights, of the situation of human rights in southern Africa.

44. The Third Committee was to consider the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Commission on Human Rights on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile, which would be introduced by Mr. Allana, Chairman of the Working Group. In that connexion, he wished simply to point out that, in its resolution 3448 (XXX), the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General and the President of the thirtieth

(Mr. Schreiber)

session of the General Assembly to assist in any way they might deem appropriate in the re-establishment of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile. The Secretary-General had maintained contact with the Permanent Representative of Chile to the United Nations and had, on several occasions, made available his own good offices.

45. He also wished to add to the file on the subject two points of which the Ad Hoc Working Group had been unaware when it had completed its report. On 18 August 1976, the Chilean Minister for Foreign Affairs had informed the Secretary-General, in accordance with the provisions of article 4, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that, since Chile was in a state of siege, the rights referred to in articles 9, 12, 13, 19 and 25, subparagraph (b), of that Covenant were subject to certain restrictions in that country. In addition, the Chilean Government had stated, in a communication addressed to the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, that beginning on 21 September 1976 the passports of all Chileans living abroad could be issued and renewed without restriction.

46. The importance of human rights in the work of the United Nations was not limited to the questions examined within the bodies specializing in that subject. The "human rights" factor was no less apparent in other questions, such as those of population, the human environment and economic development, than in political questions or those relating to the maintenance of peace and security. That importance had been particularly emphasized by various Heads of State or heads of delegation in debates at the current session of the General Assembly. One Minister for Foreign Affairs had said, for example, that the balance-sheet of United Nations action in the field of the promotion of human rights would suffice in itself to justify the Organization's existence. If account was taken of the various sessions of all the bodies active in that sphere and of the seminars and study programmes organized on the subject, the result was a schedule of meetings which covered practically the entire year. Particular attention should be given to the efforts of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Commission on Human Rights to improve their methods of work and the programming of their activities.

47. In addition to the task of considering the report of the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council was responsible for co-ordinating the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, preparing the Accra Conference and ensuring the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

48. The Council would undoubtedly have to take account of those additional responsibilities in reorganizing its activities. Since the Third Committee represented all Member States, it attracted all the problems encountered by the United Nations in the field of human rights. The Committee, in its turn, conferred new duties upon the various subsidiary bodies which he had already mentioned. For its part, the Secretariat must have sufficient resources to be able to help those bodies, as they requested.

49. Much had already been done; given the current structures of international

(Mr. Schreiber)

society, which was experiencing particularly complex problems, the task that remained was huge and difficult. It was also the noblest task. When the time came to assess the results of the current era, a special place would be reserved for the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the implementation of the Covenant and the international community's unprecedented concern for the general protection of human rights.

50. Mr. ALLANA (Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile) introduced the report (A/31/253) which the Working Group had prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3448 (XXX), paragraph 4. That document had been drawn up on the basis of substantial documentation covering the testimony of 91 witnesses, including Chileans who had recently left the country and non-Chileans - nationals of the United States, France, Italy, Switzerland, the Federal Republic of Germany and Finland - who had recently visited it, and hundreds of telegrams about the situation in Chile.

51. Chapter I of the report concerned relations with the Government of Chile. During the period under consideration, talks had been held in New York and at Geneva between representatives of the Government and members of the Working Group, but they had failed, for the following reasons: firstly, the Government of Chile had insisted that individual cases should first be referred to it and that the Working Group must await its reply before incorporating them in its report. That procedure had been unacceptable to the Working Group, which had expressed concern about the safety of witnesses (A/31/253, para. 47). Secondly, it had been impossible to reach agreement on the interpretation to be given to article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, for the Chilean representatives had wished its application to be subject to Chile's sovereign right to judge and regulate emergency situations; the Working Group had been unable to accept that view because it entailed a departure from accepted international standards.

52. With respect to its visit to Chile, the Working Group had not been able to agree that the Government should decide as to which of its members could visit Chile and which could not, since such an approach was not in keeping with the status of the Working Group, which had been established by the Commission on Human Rights on the recommendation of the General Assembly. A compromise had been suggested, whereby initially the Chairman and a selected member of the Group would go to Chile, to be joined there later by the other three members, so that the Group as a whole could assess the situation on the spot. However, the Chilean Government had rejected that suggestion (paras. 67 and 70).

53. Chapter II of the report contained a legal and constitutional study of the imposition of the state of siege. The Group noted that it was difficult to see why, in a situation where any disturbances that might exist were the result of admittedly unorganized opposition, the minimum judicial protection of the peace-time military judicial system was not provided (para. 80) and that there was strong evidence to show that, though, at the present level of the state of siege, peace-time military tribunals should normally be competent, most of the trials in fact were conducted by military courts applying war-time procedures (para. 83).

(Mr. Allana)

The foot-note to paragraph 89 showed that similar cases had already been submitted to the European Commission of Human Rights, which had examined the first Cyprus Case on the one hand and the Lawless Case on the other. Under the circumstances, the European Commission of Human Rights had decided that it was for the Court to determine whether the conditions laid down in the exercise of the exceptional right of derogation had been fulfilled. In the Greek Case, the European Commission of Human Rights had considered that the burden was on the then Greek Government to show that the conditions justifying measures of derogation had been and continued to be met, and had found that the respondent Government had not satisfied it that there was a public emergency threatening the life of the nation. In 1974, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had stated in its report to the Organization of American States that, during its stay in Chile, it had not observed anything resembling a state of war. In 1976, the Working Group had even more reasons to reiterate those findings of OAS.

54. According to paragraph 94, a group of foreign observers who had recently visited Chile had said that they had found no evidence whatsoever which indicated that the Government was fearful of violence or rebellion.

55. However, paragraph 95 gave the written testimony of three members of the United States Congress who had visited Chile in March 1976. On their return to the United States, they had reported that fundamental human rights were still being violated in Chile, that the state of siege imposed by the junta had created a lawlessness and a lack of accountability which prevented a solution of the human rights problem, and that the military leaders of Chile were determined to purge Chile of all political activities and consciousness. The Chilean Government was battling an amorphous internal enemy which it described as part of "the international Marxist conspiracy". In paragraph 98, the Working Group had concluded that it did not have sufficient evidence to affirm that there was a serious danger affecting the existence of the Chilean nation and was convinced that nothing justified the continuation of the state of siege three years after the coup. The far-reaching restrictions on human rights were not required by the exigencies of the situation and were, therefore, in contravention of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Chile was a party. The state of siege, which was unwarranted and unjustified, should be lifted forthwith, since it was the source of the problems underlying the denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms in present-day Chile.

56. Chapter III dealt with constitutional developments. In that connexion, Ambassador Diez, the representative of the Chilean Government, had told the Working Group that his Government was interested in a national security which would be free from totalitarianism and which would not lead to class struggle. However, impartial foreign observers had stated that what was in fact taking place in Chile was an attempt to institutionalize the military junta and its manner of functioning (para. 105). The statements of those impartial observers therefore contradicted those of the Government's representative. In that connexion, it would be noted that the Government had published a decree-law (No. 1220) by which the junta would establish its legal norms (para. 114). The decree-law set up four legislative

committees, the chairmen of which were all members of the military junta, thereby bearing out the fact that, even with respect to the establishment of legal norms, complete control was in the hands of the armed forces. Everything indicated that the Government was not trying to establish conditions which would allow a return to normality, and as long as that trend continued the denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms would remain the Government's declared policy.

57. Chapter IV dealt with liberty and security of person, and in particular with changes which had been made in the constitution and legal processes of Chile after the military coup and which completely denied the liberty and security of the individual. The chapter contained a detailed analysis of new supreme decrees Nos. 187 and 146, dated 28 January and 10 February 1976 respectively, which formed part of the legal framework for detention under the state of siege in Chile (para. 122). The decrees contained provisions for medical examinations, written detention orders, written search orders, places of detention, inspection of places of detention, and judicial inquiries into reported irregularities. Paragraphs 134 and 135 of the report clearly showed that the promises made in the two decrees had not been fulfilled. In January 1976, for example, 61 persons had been arrested and 59 had disappeared; in May, 85 had been arrested and 31 had disappeared.

58. Despite decree-law No. 1009, which limited detention without specific charges to five days, the average period of disappearance of persons arrested and whose custody had later been acknowledged by Chilean authorities had been 14 days in January 1976, 12 days in February, 13 days in March and 11 days in April-May (para. 138). Paragraph 148 gave statistics on violations of decree-laws Nos. 1009 and 187.

59. Paragraphs 194 and 195 dealt with the death of Carmelo Soria Espinoza, a Chilean national who, at the time of his death, had been working as a United Nations official in Santiago. According to the information received by the Group, the circumstances surrounding Mr. Soria's disappearance and death did not lead one to deduce that the case involved an accident or suicide. The Group had also been informed that the Secretary-General had instituted inquiries into the case, but it had not yet been officially informed about the findings of the investigation (para. 195).

60. The Chilean Government denied the allegations contained in paragraphs 236-240 concerning missing persons. However, annex XIX to the report contained a list of 112 missing persons, and on pages 191-193 there were photographs of some of them which had been supplied by Mr. Miller, a member of the United States House of Representatives. In the letter accompanying the photographs, Mr. Miller had said, among other things, that the evidence clearly demonstrated that suppression of human rights had become commonplace in Chile (foot-note 31, p. 71). A book by the former Minister of Justice of Finland, Mr. Soderman, entitled The Disappearance of Arrested Persons in Chile, contained a list of 109 persons who had been arrested by the DINA in 1976 and whose fate was still unknown. The Ad Hoc Working Group, and mankind as a whole, had a right to demand a straightforward answer from the Chilean Government to the question: "What happened to those missing persons?".

(Mr. Allana)

61. From paragraph 289 onwards, chapter IV dealt with the difficulties encountered by lawyers and agencies engaged in defending persons detained in connexion with the state of siege. There had been systematic harassment of those attorneys (para. 292). That was particularly true of four of the five Chilean lawyers who had submitted a signed document to the Organization of American States and who had been arrested, expelled or exiled; one of them, Dr. Castillo, had first of all suffered violent treatment (para. 297).

62. The right of a person in legal jeopardy to have available adequate means to assert his defence was a basic human right; the systematic harassment of persons and agencies who had undertaken to protect and defend accused persons severely curtailed that right (para. 301).

63. He read out excerpts from the letter of 8 June 1976 from the five lawyers mentioned above to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs attending the Sixth General Assembly of the Organization of American States in Santiago (annex XXII). The letter indicated that, under the Fundamental Charter, a state of siege must be declared in the event of internal disturbance, and that the executive could not maintain it against the wishes of Congress. However, the Government had now assumed all powers and simply enacted a legislative decree to renew what was an exceptional measure, thus - despite the claims of the Chilean Government - placing the country in an abnormal situation. The structure of the Dirección de Inteligencia Nacional (DINA) appeared to be established by a regulation which was not known to anyone. The large number of civilians who worked for the DINA had been recruited from the lowest moral and cultural levels of Chilean society, and even included criminals. An impressive volume of testimony supported the charge that torture was practised in Chile in secret places of confinement and also at the Cuatro Alamos camp, and that a large number of persons arrested by military patrols or by DINA groups had subsequently disappeared.

64. In their letter to OAS, the five Chilean lawyers, referring to the Chilean Government's official reply to the charges made against it, had stressed that the Government's argument that the charges were an unwarranted interference in its internal affairs was not valid, since world international organizations, such as the United Nations and regional bodies such as OAS must observe both the principle of non-intervention and the principle of respect for human rights, and those principles were not contradictory but complementary. As for the Chilean Government's argument that the reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group were based on evidence obtained abroad, the five Chilean lawyers had pointed out that it was inadmissible because, by refusing to allow the Group to enter the country, the Chilean Government had prevented it from questioning witnesses inside the country.

65. He next read out excerpts from resolutions of the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union held in Madrid on 1 October 1976. In them, the Inter-Parliamentary Union stressed in particular that human rights continued to be violated in Chile; it also decided to obtain the release of those members of parliament who were still detained, and whose names were mentioned in the Secretary-General's report of 13 September 1976, and to request the national groups to recommend to their respective parliaments that they should refrain from passing

laws aimed at granting military or financial aid to the Chilean Military Junta. He then referred to the Declaration adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo from 16 to 19 August 1976, in which the Conference had expressed its deep concern at the flagrant violations of human rights in Chile and at the fact that the Military Junta had not allowed the Ad Hoc Working Group to visit Chile. The Conference had expressed its solidarity with the resolutions adopted in that connexion by the United Nations General Assembly at its twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions.

66. The Ad Hoc Working Group thus had before it a great weight of unimpeachable evidence from neutral sources, all of which bore witness to the mass violation of human rights in Chile, the extensive practice of torture and the disappearance of persons. If its mandate were extended, the Working Group would continue to study the question on the basis of the documents and evidence recently submitted to it.

67. Turning to chapter V, on torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, he said that torture existed in Chile despite supreme decrees Nos. 146 and 187, which were supposed to have banned it. Moreover, decree No. 187 dealt only with persons arrested under the state of siege, whereas many people were arrested and ill-treated by the security authorities under other powers (para. 309). In June 1976, the Supreme Court of Chile had decided that holding prisoners incommunicado by virtue of the state of siege was not a matter which fell within the scope of the recurso de amparo as defined by the Constitution and the law. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had deplored that attitude.

68. Paragraph 315 concerned methods of torture used in Chile: electric shocks, sexual outrages (which the two previous reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group had dealt with at length), breaking bones in the fingers, feet, arms and legs, pulling nails from fingers and toes, psychological pressure and militarization of prisoners. Further, a climate of mental torture was imposed on those who lived under a constant threat of arrest (para. 321). The paragraphs on the DINA stated that it did not have to account for its actions to the judiciary (para. 343). Paragraph 347 contained a list of 50 detainees who had been forced to work as DINA agents, and paragraphs 359 and 360 gave a list of leading DINA agents and torturers which included Osvaldo Romo; the Working Group suggested that the latter list should be published by the Commission on Human Rights. It should be noted that, according to evidence available to the Group, the number of persons who had disappeared had increased since the Group had submitted its report to the General Assembly (para. 311).

69. In chapter VI, which dealt with the judiciary, the Working Group concluded that a serious and deliberate attack had been launched against the irremovability and independence of the judiciary (para. 374). In such a situation, no citizen could ever expect justice; he was in the hands of the Government. Furthermore, the President of Chile could direct the Supreme Court to take disciplinary measures against a judge if, in his opinion, that judge was guilty. Upon a mere statement by the Ministry of the Interior that a person had been detained under the state of siege, the courts systematically rejected all applications for habeas corpus without even ascertaining whether the formalities for detention had been observed (para. 376). In June 1976, the Supreme Court had decided that

(Mr. Allana)

holding prisoners incommunicado by virtue of the state of siege was not a matter within its jurisdiction; that new principle was a major step backwards in human rights (para. 385). Thus, the misleading impression was given that the judiciary was functioning normally whereas in fact, in cases referred to it by virtue of the state of siege, it deliberately refused to take cognizance of the serious violations of human rights perpetrated in Chile.

70. Chapter VII, dealing with exile, gave statistics of the refugees accepted by some countries (paras. 408-412). In that connexion, a tribute was due to UNHCR, under whose auspices 12,785 refugees had been resettled as at 30 June 1976. A tribute was also due to the countries, listed in paragraph 409, which had offered political asylum to the refugees.

71. The DINA had set up auxiliary offices outside Chile, and in that connexion he recalled the attacks in 1976 on Senator Barnado Leighton in Rome, on Soria Espinoza in Santiago and on Orlando Leteller in Washington. Political assassination, wherever it occurred, posed a serious problem, and the international community appealed to the assassins, wherever they might be, not to play with human life. A murderer might sometimes escape judgement in the material world but he would have to answer for his crimes in the world of the spirit.

72. With regard to chapter VIII, on freedom of association, he noted that there had been no improvement since the Group's last report. In a telegram received the previous week, the World Federation of Trade Unions had denounced with indignation the assassination of the Chilean Professor Marta Ugarate, who had been detained in August 1976 by the Chilean Government. On behalf of the 160 million workers it represented, the Federation had requested the Commission on Human Rights to investigate that crime and to guarantee the life of those detained by the Junta. Another recent telegram from the World Federation of Trade Unions had referred to the assassination on 9 September of Arribal Riquelme, the president of a Chilean trade union.

73. In chapter IX, which dealt with intellectual freedoms, paragraph 443, referred to the profound distress expressed by the Executive Board of UNESCO at the infringements of human rights in the fields of education, science and culture. In a public speech on 29 March 1976, President Pinochet had stated that unrestricted and absolute ideological pluralism must be regarded as abolished once for all, and that the latitude accorded to the universities was necessarily limited at present by the emergency situation facing the country (para. 451). As stated in paragraph 466, 152 journalists had been arrested; about 50 were still in detention, most of them without trial, and about 20 were alleged to have been assassinated.

74. Paragraphs 471-476 referred to the ruthless suppression of the humanitarian activities of the churches, including the Catholic Church. The Peace Committee had been dissolved, and lawyers engaged by the Vicaria de la Solidaridad were constantly harassed, detained and beaten. The Working Group feared that the Vicaria would also be forced to dissolve.

75. On 15 August 1976, three Chilean bishops had been manhandled during a demonstration in which members of the DINA were said to have participated directly. The live broadcast of the statements of the bishops over the church-owned radio had been banned (para. 475).

76. Chapter X dealt with the present situation of women, children, youth and the family. In particular, it indicated that unemployment among women was on the increase, that women continued to be tortured, that the conditions in women's prisons were deplorable, that there had been a marked increase in infant mortality, that minors continued to be tortured, that the situation was having an adverse effect on children's education and that the socio-economic difficulties of the families of detainees had increased in the recent past.

77. In paragraphs 491 to 494 of chapter XI, which dealt with economic, social and cultural rights, it was stated that there had been a recent improvement in certain areas of the Chilean economy. However, that was due largely to the special facilities extended to Chile by the World Bank and to the assistance provided by certain Member States and international bodies, in other words to the efforts of the international community. However, the vast majority of the Chilean people continued to live in conditions of severe hardship.

78. He would respond later, possibly in writing, to the reply of the Government to the Group's report (A/C.3/31/6 and Add.1), if that proved necessary.

79. Chapter XII of the report contained the Group's concluding observations. Those were the conclusions which the Group had reached after evaluating the written and oral evidence which it had gathered since its last report. Since, in its reply, the Government of Chile accused the Group of using its imagination, he would like to give some specific information on the total work done by the five members of the Group. In the previous year, each of the members had put in more than 1,000 man-hours, a total of more than 5,000 hours. If the 5,000 hours contributed by Mr. Schreiber and the staff of the secretariat were added to that figure, then the total working time for the preparation of the two reports was 10,000 man-hours. Since the two reports prepared under the current mandate of the Group had also required 10,000 man-hours, the Group had worked a total of 20,000 man-hours in two years. The Group had devoted itself whole-heartedly to its task. Unfortunately, the problem which the Group had been asked to study in 1975 had not yet been completely solved. The situation was bound to deteriorate and cause further suffering to the Chilean nation if the action of the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights was not continued.

80. The Group had consistently had the impression that there was a total contrast between the declarations and the facts, between the façade and reality. The façade was the normal appearance of daily life on the streets of Chile; the reality consisted of illegal detentions, torture, disappearances and, for those who had been arrested by DINA, the impossibility of finding employment. According to one witness, the apparent peace in Chile was like the peace in a cemetery.

81. The façade was the Chilean Government's high-sounding claims of respect for

(Mr. Allana)

human rights; the reality was the absence of democratic life in Chile. The façade was an outward appearance of freedom; the reality was the methods of indoctrination which led to a new form of totalitarianism reminiscent of régimes that the world would like to forget.

82. The current state of siege must be brought to an immediate end if human rights and fundamental freedoms were to be restored in Chile. The names of torturers who acted in the name of DINA had been given in the two previous reports of the Group. More names were given in the current report since the Group saw a great advantage in revealing the identities of torturers so that they could be punished as they deserved, in the name of human dignity. It was in that spirit that the name of Osvaldo Romo had been mentioned.

83. Since the overthrow of the previous régime, a number of military courts had been set up, of which it was futile to expect justice in the prevailing conditions. In the opinion of the Group, those courts should be abolished and the supremacy of the normal law should be re-established in Chile (para. 512). The courts maintained that the right of habeas corpus was beyond their jurisdiction under the state of siege. The right of habeas corpus should become justiciable by civil courts.

84. In a telegram addressed to the Government of Chile in 1976, the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, Mr. Benites, had requested the release of 13 eminent Chilean personalities. According to the information received, five of those had been released and eight continued to be under detention. The Working Group was convinced that the recommendation which the Commission on Human Rights had communicated to the Chilean Government should be implemented and that the General Assembly might wish to endorse that request. In paragraph 518, the Working Group had observed that, at the current stage, the mere submission of reports and adoption of resolutions would not improve the situation. Those reports and resolutions should be backed by concrete steps that should be taken by the international community in order to promote the speedy restoration of normalcy and the renewed enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile. The Group had made suggestions after careful consideration and mature deliberations on the question.

85. In paragraphs 518 and 519, the Group suggested the adoption of a number of measures, such as the establishment of a United Nations trust fund for Chile, which would provide humanitarian and legal aid to persons prosecuted under the state of siege and to their families. Member States which had trade relations and economic ties with Chile could be encouraged to use their good offices to influence the Chilean Government to restore human rights in the country. In making that recommendation, the Group did not have in mind the adoption of economic sanctions. The United Nations organs which provided technical and economic assistance to Chile could also use their good offices with the Government, with a view to the restoration of human rights in Chile.

86. In paragraph 520 of its report, the Group expressed its satisfaction at the

fact that its work, backed by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights, had to a certain degree ameliorated the situation in Chile and that its efforts had saved thousands of human lives, had secured the release of hundreds from prison and had helped those who so desired to leave Chile and settle in other countries. The Group had been deeply moved to learn that the concern of the international community, as expressed in particular in its reports, had been a source of great moral support for the people of Chile, including those who heard about it in the darkness of their cells and who longed for the world's understanding, help and solidarity. Therefore, the Group suggested that the work done should be continued in the interests of the suffering humanity in Chile.

87. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) thanked Mr. Schreiber for the clear and concise explanation he had given in introducing item 12. However, he would like to have some clarification on the studies mentioned by him during that explanation. He thanked Mr. Allana for his objective and moving introduction of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (A/31/253). The importance of that statement escaped no one, and he therefore requested that it should be reproduced as fully as possible in the summary record.

88. Mr. DIEZ (Chile) said that he had no objection to the statement of the Chairman-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Working Group being reproduced fully in the summary record, provided that his delegation's reply to it would receive the same treatment. He recalled that, the preceding year, the statement of the Chairman-Rapporteur had been reproduced in extenso, while the request of the Chilean delegation for the same treatment had been rejected.

89. The CHAIRMAN said that, because of the lack of time, a reply would be given later to the question raised by the representative of Algeria concerning the studies; as he had proposed, the statement of the Chairman-Rapporteur would be reproduced fully in the summary record.

90. It was so decided.

91. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Chile to display a conciliatory spirit with regard to the statement which his delegation proposed to make, since no decision could be taken on a statement which had not yet been made. However, he was convinced that the Committee would deal with the question justly and fairly.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.