

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records \*



THIRD COMMITTEE  
67th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 5 December 1977  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 67th MEETING

Chairman: Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 76: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS  
SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS:  
REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

OTHER MATTERS

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

77-58580

(12 p.)

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.3/32/SR.67  
8 December 1977  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 76: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1, L.25/Rev.1, L.28, L.32, L.33, L.34, L.35/Rev.1, L.36/Rev.1 and L.44)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members of the Committee to the provisions of rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

2. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that, at the meeting held on 1 December (A/C.3/32/SR.64), the representative of Saudi Arabia had asked a number of questions concerning the financial consequences flowing from certain assumptions which he had explained in his statement. Pointing out that a unit already existed within the Division of Human Rights which processed approximately 50,000 communications or petitions a year, he had first requested confirmation concerning the staffing of that unit. The Communications Unit, which was in the International Instruments and Procedures Section of the Division of Human Rights, consisted of one P-4, two P-3, two P-2 and three General Service staff. Among other things, that Unit processed communications alleging violations of human rights according to the procedures established by Economic and Social Council resolutions 728 F (XXVIII), 1253 (XLII) and 1503 (XLVIII). The following was the breakdown of the costs of the Communications Unit for the biennium 1976-1977: salaries, \$484,100; common staff costs, including home leave and contributions to the Joint Staff Pension Fund, \$125,800; general operating expenses, \$35,100, the total amounting to \$645,000. The item general operating expenses included the costs for office space based on a rate of 200 square feet per person.

3. On the basis of the fact that the Unit handled approximately 50,000 communications or petitions a year, the representative of Saudi Arabia had asked what the total cost would be if that number were to increase to 1 million, 5 million or 10 million. It should be pointed out that the information on that point could not be regarded as a statement of financial implications as provided for in rule 153 of the rules of procedure since such a statement was limited to a calculation of the costs which were estimated to be entailed in the event of the adoption of the draft resolution under consideration, information which was already available to the Committee in document A/C.3/32/L.34. On the basis of the existing costs of \$645,000 for handling 50,000 requests, the costs for handling 1 million, 5 million or 10 million could be estimated at \$13 million, \$64.5 million or \$130 million respectively, although he observed that if the number of requests increased, the petitions would be to some degree repetitive and less time would be required to handle them, as was shown by the fact that,

(Mr. Debatin)

with the exception of a new Professional staff member added in 1976, the staffing of the Unit had remained unchanged for many years despite an increase in the number of communications. Similarly, if the workload increased there would be a greater reliance on mechanization which would permit additional work to be carried out without any increase in resources. It was therefore evident that any cost forecast worked out by multiplication was extremely doubtful.

4. The representative of Saudi Arabia had also requested information on postage costs. Although the precise figure depended on whether letters were sent by air or surface mail, it could be said that for the moment the postage costs incurred by the Unit amounted to \$12,500. Given the nature of that expenditure, it could be assumed that if the volume of requests increased to 1 million, 5 million or 10 million, the postage costs would be 20, 100 or 200 times greater respectively.

5. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that if the establishment of a post of High Commissioner for Human Rights was approved, there would be an avalanche of communications addressed to the Secretary-General, not only in the form of petitions but merely to request explanations on various matters. In that connexion, some clarification was necessary. On the one hand, he knew at least four people who aspired to that post. On the other, there was a genuine concern among all States that human rights should be more strictly observed than they had been to date, but he pointed out that the establishment of such a post would open a Pandora's box with unforeseeable consequences since the policies which governed society would have to be adjusted to various situations and all societies had special interest groups. Moreover, certain Governments would wish to divert the attention of their peoples from the evils which afflicted them and the High Commissioner for Human Rights might perhaps be used to serve selfish national interests.

6. The draft resolution in question had divided the members of the Committee and, in the circumstances, it was impossible to impose a resolution with which all were not in agreement. The other possibility which should be raised was the establishment in all countries of a national committee of eminent persons, or "ombudsmen" as they were called in the Nordic countries, probably drawn from the legal profession, who would act in an honorary capacity. The Secretary-General could keep a register of their names so that they would enjoy complete immunity. Such committees would have a section to which all violations of human rights would be referred for transmission. Some would undoubtedly be considered valid, and then the national committee could raise the question with the Government. The section would register all allegations and the Government, whatever its ideology, would deal with making appropriate reparations. The allegations would immediately be considered by the Regional Committee for Human Rights and, where necessary, that Committee would be able to contact the Secretary-General of the United Nations in that connexion.

7. He did not think that national committees could be imposed in any country but, if it was decided to establish them, the peoples of the various countries could themselves demand the creation of such committees.

/...

8. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) said that he would like to clarify certain points in connexion with draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.25.

9. In the first place, he wished to point out that the reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to the importance of the role of the Secretary-General in providing good offices and other assistance and services was out of place since it was evident, and beyond question, that the Secretary-General had done great work in that field. Moreover, he wished to point out, in connexion with the fifth preambular paragraph, that what was needed was to make full and more effective use of the existing United Nations resources in the field of human rights instead of creating a new mechanism which would only increase the confusion in that field. As an example, he referred to the question of apartheid which had been dealt with successively or concurrently by the General Assembly, the Third Committee, the Fourth Committee, and even at times the Sixth Committee, the Special Committee of 24, the Special Committee against Apartheid, and other bodies.

10. In the sixth preambular paragraph it was stated that those functions could be most usefully combined and carried out by a permanent mechanism mandated with the resources to enhance and co-ordinate human rights activities. What functions did that refer to? The functions of the Secretary-General, those of the post of High Commissioner which it was proposed to establish, or those of the United Nations in general? Another question was the scope to be given to the word "combine" and with what kind of "resources" it was proposed to mandate the permanent mechanism.

11. In operative paragraph 1 it was decided to establish, under the authority of the Secretary-General, a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, who would possess the degree of personal independence, prestige and integrity required for the discreet and impartial performance of his functions. His delegation did not yet understand how the High Commissioner could be under the authority of the Secretary-General and at the same time possess personal independence. It was important that that point should be clarified since immediately afterwards, in operative paragraph 2 (c), it was stated that the High Commissioner would maintain close relations with the Secretary-General, without any clarification as to whether he would effectively be under the authority of the Secretary-General, in which case the reference was unnecessary.

12. His delegation had serious doubts that one person alone could promote and strengthen universal and effective understanding and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as stated in operative paragraph 2 (a). In that connexion, he wished to point out that what was needed was not a new mechanism but conventions and instruments which were universally respected. The time had come to abandon the stage of codification in that sphere and move on to that of the implementation of existing agreements and conventions.

13. There was also some doubt with regard to paragraph 2 (b). That paragraph spoke of the High Commissioner's rendering assistance and services, including good offices, at the specific request of any State; it was not clear what would be the difference between the functions of the High Commissioner and those of the

(Mr. Aboul-Nasr, Oman)

Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, or whether he would confine himself to receiving complaints made by States against States and transmitting them to the General Assembly. That was a very important point which should be clarified. Furthermore, paragraph 2 (b) provided for an annual report to the General Assembly on the High Commissioner's activities and on developments in the field of human rights; that provision seemed to contradict the indication in paragraph 2 (b) that the High Commissioner could submit a report only with the consent of the State concerned.

14. Lastly, paragraph 5 seemed to imply that the Secretary-General would keep the High Commissioner informed of the work of all organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies concerned with human rights; that was a function which the Secretary-General could not always carry out, owing to the independent and special nature of some United Nations organs or specialized agencies, such as ILO, which had always claimed complete independence in its proceedings.

15. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said her delegation regretted that not all of its amendments had been received favourably. Since what was involved was the defence of fundamental principles, she wished to make some remarks concerning document A/C.3/32/L.33, in which her delegation proposed several amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17.

16. Her delegation maintained amendment 2. States should, in fact, promote human rights, and the tenth preambular paragraph of document A/C.3/32/L.17 seemed to disregard the possibility of the promotion of human rights, confining itself to the stage of their realization. For that reason, Morocco had submitted the amendment to insert the word "full" before the word "realization".

17. Morocco also maintained amendment 3. Since reference was made to the Proclamation of Teheran, from which the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17 had drawn their inspiration, it wished to recall that that Proclamation clearly indicated that the members of the international community had the imperative duty to fulfil their solemn commitment to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language and the like. Therefore, in order to reflect that meaning more clearly, Morocco had proposed inserting the words "of individuals" after the words "fundamental freedoms".

18. Further, Morocco maintained amendment 4, proposing that in paragraph 1 (a) the rest of the sentence after the words "urgent consideration should be given" should be replaced with the words "to the implementation, promotion and protection of civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights for all, without distinction as to race, sex, colour, language or religion". The purpose of that amendment was to reflect more precisely the Proclamation of Teheran, which stated that the principal objective of the United Nations in the field of human rights was to enable mankind to achieve the maximum degree of freedom and dignity; the realization of that ideal required that the laws of every country should grant to each citizen, among other things, the right to participate fully in the political, cultural and social life of his country.

/...

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

19. Morocco would not insist on amendments 5, 6 and 7.

20. However, it insisted on maintaining amendment 8, whereby paragraph 1 (e) would be replaced with the words: "Although every Government has the primary role in and the ultimate responsibility for ensuring the social progress and well-being of its people, the implementation of the new international economic order is likely to facilitate the effective promotion of the rights of individuals, particularly their economic, social and cultural rights, and should also be accorded priority."

21. In support of that amendment, she cited General Assembly resolutions 2626 (XXV), 3201 (S-VI), 3281 (XXIX) and 3362 (S-VII).

22. With regard to amendment 9, which her delegation also maintained and which consisted in replacing the words "human rights and fundamental freedoms" with the words "the protection and promotion of human rights for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion", she pointed out that that idea appeared in the second preambular paragraph of document A/C.3/32/L.17 and should logically be confirmed in the operative part. That had not been done in the original draft resolution, and the amendment was intended to correct that omission.

23. Since the amendments proposed by her delegation were consistent with the international documents prepared thus far, she asked for a vote by roll-call on each amendment.

24. Miss ILIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1, introduced the revised draft resolution and said that it was the result of the efforts of its sponsors to reconcile positions in such a way as to make the document acceptable to the majority.

25. To that end, a number of changes had been made. In the first preambular paragraph the words "the observance by all States of" had been replaced with the words "the obligation of all States to observe", a change which the sponsors believed would not create any difficulties. In the second preambular paragraph the words "of the United Nations and" had been inserted. The sponsors had also added a new eighth preambular paragraph which incorporated the first amendment submitted by Morocco in document A/C.3/32/L.33 and was a quotation from the Declaration of Human Rights. As a result of the addition of that new preambular paragraph, the original eighth preambular paragraph had become the ninth, the ninth had become the tenth, and so on. The only change made in those last preambular paragraphs was the deletion of the words "the persistence of" in the tenth preambular paragraph.

26. With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, in paragraph 1 (a) the words "promotion and protection" had been inserted after the word "implementation", so that part of amendment 4 proposed by Morocco in document A/C.3/32/L.33 had been accepted. In paragraph 1 (b) the words "the full realization of civil and political life" appearing in the original draft resolution had been supplemented with part of the text of article 13 of the Proclamation of Teheran. The change made in paragraph 1 (c) reflected suggestions made by a number of

/...

(Miss Ilic, Yugoslavia)

delegations. The original paragraph 1 (c) had become paragraph 1 (d), the original paragraph 1 (d) had become 1 (e), and so on. Changes had also been made in the wording of paragraphs 1 (d), (e) and (f). The new paragraph 1 (d) reflected part of amendment 6 proposed by Morocco in document A/C.3/32/L.33.

27. The sponsors of the draft resolution had been unable to accept any other amendments, since they would have altered the balance of the draft resolution. She regretted that some of the unacceptable amendments had not been withdrawn and thanked Morocco for withdrawing the others.

28. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that his delegation welcomed the thoroughness with which the item had been considered and the extent of participation in the discussions. They reflected the confidence of Member States in the human-rights standards which they had set for themselves.

29. The Committee now had to address some fundamental questions on the future approach to human rights, some of which had been raised by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia in his statement during the general debate. For example, he had referred to the problems inherent in drawing together the different approaches to human rights in different cultural, social and political settings.

30. Those questions were not easy to answer, but the tentative advance made at the current session was a notable achievement. The two main draft resolutions submitted to the Committee opened the way to further efforts to define the area of United Nations work on human rights.

31. His delegation believed that draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17 performed a valuable function in pointing to issues on which the international community must focus in the years ahead. It reflected what many delegations believed to be important new points of emphasis, while at the same time reaffirming the importance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals.

32. The adoption of that draft resolution would be another step in the process of addressing the various parts of the questions referred to by his country's Minister for Foreign Affairs, and his delegation would like to think that adoption of the draft resolution would constitute a commitment by the Committee to address those questions without dogmatism and with the intention of making practical progress in strengthening respect for human rights.

33. The Australian delegation had endorsed and now co-sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.3/32/L.25/Rev.1, providing for the establishment of a senior position in the Secretariat to be occupied by an official who might be termed a United Nations "High Commissioner for Human Rights", and who would perform co-ordinating, advisory and good offices functions in the field of human rights. Some had argued that that person would have nothing to do, others that he would have too much to do or would try to do too much. Some had counselled further time for reflection, and had called for further reports or for the proposal to be put aside until a consensus had been obtained. That had now been replaced by a call for a "general agreement".

/...

(Mr. Harry, Australia)

34. His delegation felt that delegations should allow the proposal to be fairly considered and voted on, since that would be the best test of whether such a general agreement did exist. It would be voting for both the draft resolutions and would like to see them both adopted by consensus.

35. Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation wished to state its position regarding the draft resolutions on agenda item 76.

36. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1, which was based on no less a document than the United Nations Charter, contained provisions which sought to secure international co-operation for the purpose of solving problems arising in the field of human rights, and correctly identified the economic and political obstacles preventing enjoyment of those rights. The draft set out and developed seven concepts to be taken into account when dealing with the subject, and his delegation agreed with those criteria although it did not consider them exhaustive, since, in future, account could also be taken, inter alia, of the adverse impact on human rights of the armaments race and the activities of transnational corporations.

37. A positive feature of the draft resolution was the fact that it recognized the interrelationship and indivisibility of human rights, and also the request made in it to the Commission on Human Rights to undertake an over-all analysis of the alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

38. As for draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.25/Rev.1, the sponsors had chosen a different course, namely the course of undermining the system existing in United Nations bodies, by seeking to impose new machinery that could be used to further a different kind of interest. It had therefore been deliberately worded in a vague manner. It mentioned the struggle against racism and apartheid in order to create the illusion that the office to be established could do something to eliminate racism, whereas in reality the only object was to cover up the policy of co-existence with South Africa practised by certain Powers. Thus no mention was made in the draft of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid or of General Assembly resolutions. That was because the sponsors wanted to replace the efforts of States by the promise of work to be done by an official who would not even have to comply with the relevant United Nations decisions. Moreover, it was impossible to understand how one person could do more effective work than that carried out by all the existing United Nations agencies.

39. The draft also referred to the problem of foreign occupation, a problem which, in the context of the United Nations, had to do with the unlawful activities of Israel in the Arab territories. The delegations that were sponsoring the draft resolution, which included the United States and Costa Rica, were the very ones which refused to support resolution 32/5, adopted on 28 October 1977 by the General Assembly. Similarly, with regard to problems of racism and colonial domination, when it came to taking effective measures to combat those evils, those delegations did all they could to obstruct such measures.



(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

40. The provisions concerning the establishment of a new international economic order and economic co-operation were also worded vaguely, just when the circumstances required, not general statements, but specific and concrete measures to implement the resolutions and decisions adopted at the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

41. Furthermore, although the draft resolution stated that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would have to act within the framework of the United Nations Charter, the latter document made no provision for any such post, and entrusted human rights questions to the General Assembly and, in Article 62, authorized the Economic and Social Council to make recommendations regarding those rights. Besides, the functions to be assigned to the High Commissioner had already been entrusted to other bodies, such as the Commission on Human Rights. Although the draft resolution stated that the authority given to the High Commissioner would not prejudice the functions and powers of other organs competent in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms, it was impossible to reconcile that provision with the provision concerning functions in connexion with such important problems as racism, colonialism and the achievement of civil, political, social and cultural rights.

42. As for the arguments put forward in favour of the creation of the post, namely that the Secretary-General would be too busy to use his good offices at the request of States, he found it unconvincing, since the reference to the Secretary-General covered not only the Secretary-General personally but the United Nations Secretariat as a whole.

43. The draft resolution stated that the High Commissioner would be appointed by the Secretary-General, and paragraph 2 referred to the close relations that should exist between them but did not specify the Commissioner's position vis-à-vis the Secretary-General or what the latter's authority would be if the person appointed as High Commissioner, acting under the influence of certain circles, should become involved in dubious propaganda campaigns. Another short-coming in the draft resolution was that it ran counter to the current trend to expand the role of the Afro-Asian countries in United Nations organs, and especially those dealing with human rights, and thus conflicted with the interests of those countries.

44. Any reports that the High Commissioner might submit could not contribute in any way to the development of international co-operation since they would not have the support of the great majority of States. It was not promises that were needed but efforts and concrete measures.

45. There was every indication, therefore, that the establishment of that machinery lacked any legal and political foundation. His delegation therefore considered that draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.25/Rev.1 should be rejected.

46. Mr. NOTHOMB (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Economic Community, wished to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1.

/...

(Mr. Nothomb, Belgium)

47. In view of the importance of the item, the text should receive unanimous support. The members of the European Economic Community had made some suggestions to the sponsors of the draft, some of which were reflected in the revised version.

48. Like the sponsors, they considered the realization of economic, social and cultural rights of the human person throughout the world to be of fundamental importance, and were aware of the need to contribute substantially to the improvement of the economic situation in the third world countries so as to facilitate full exercise of those rights there. He wished to reiterate that they supported the principle of equal rights laid down in Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter. The policies of the Governments of the countries belonging to the Community fully bore out that statement, since they recognized the indivisibility of those rights, although they rejected the notion that the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights should precede the realization of civil and political rights. Article 2 of the two International Covenants on Human Rights made it quite clear that economic, social and cultural rights were to be achieved progressively, while civil and political rights were a matter of immediate necessity.

49. They also rejected the allegation made by a certain group of delegations during the debate to the effect that the exercise of civil and political rights was peculiar to rich countries. He pointed out that among those making that allegation was at least one representative of a State with a per capita income higher than that of some Community countries. Many States in the third world, in spite of their precarious economic and social situation, unhesitatingly granted full civil and political rights to their citizens and had not waited for the establishment of a new international economic order before doing so. A number of those States were among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1.

50. In declaring that human rights were indivisible, the draft resolution did not place sufficient stress on the need for that indivisibility to be demonstrated in both directions. The United Nations was, in any event, well aware of the "mutual" indivisibility of the two categories of rights, since in investigating cases of flagrant violations of human rights in certain countries, it did not confine itself to deploring violations of economic, social and cultural rights but also regarded as fundamental any violations of civil and political rights. However, draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1 placed on an equal footing the rights of peoples and those of the human person.

51. The countries of the European Economic Community recognized the importance of the rights of peoples and believed that interaction between those rights and individual rights would help to ensure the full exercise of both, but they refused to consider the enjoyment of collective rights an indispensable prerequisite for the enjoyment of human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the two International Covenants. Citing article 5 of the Proclamation of Teheran, he said that whether civil and political rights or economic, social and cultural rights were being defended, and even where collective rights were proclaimed, the sole objective aimed at was indisputably the promotion

/...

(Mr. Nothomb, Belgium)

and protection of the human person. The Community countries were therefore grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1 for including in it a reaffirmation of the inalienable character of those individual rights. Nevertheless, they would have preferred to see the draft also reaffirm the principle of the exercise by the individual himself of his inalienable rights. For that reason, they had proposed the inclusion of a preambular paragraph to read: "Recognizing the role which institutions, organizations and individuals play in the democratic context and in respect for legality and public order, with a view to assisting Governments in their task of ensuring the full implementation of the provisions contained in the International Covenants on Human Rights,".

52. Since the eleventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 (f) of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1 made reference to the new international economic order, he wished to point out that the views of each of the countries of the European Economic Community on that subject had been or would be stated in the Second Committee.

53. Lastly, he observed that draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1 called for the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly at their next sessions to study the problem of human rights in a clearly defined context. Although it was normal to set limits for such a study, it was clear that the study was not exhaustive; outside of it there remained open other fields for reflection and action. For that reason, the delegations of the countries of the European Economic Community reserved the right, both before and after the completion of the study, to submit proposals on the subject of human rights to the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

54. Mr. VINCI (Italy) replying to the representative of Oman, who had requested certain clarifications concerning draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.25, said, first of all, that in paragraph 1 there was no contradiction in the decision to establish, under the authority of the Secretary-General, a High Commissioner who would possess the necessary degree of personal independence required for the performance of his functions. The High Commissioner would, of course, be subordinate to the Secretary-General, but he would be free from pressure by any State or group of States. He also emphasized that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would not interfere with the other organs or specialized agencies of the United Nations system concerned with human rights.

55. With regard to paragraph 2 (c), which referred to the maintenance of close relations with the Secretary-General and all other organs of the United Nations, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations concerned with human rights, it must be borne in mind that, as the representative of Oman had pointed out, it was necessary to proceed to the stage of implementation of the existing conventions and agreements, and for that reason the good offices of the High Commissioner could be extremely helpful, since he would logically endeavour to maintain contact with the competent organs and agencies in that field. Also, in connexion with paragraph 2 (c), he recalled the comment by the representative of Saudi Arabia that what was needed was a co-ordinator; the task of the High Commissioner would in fact be a task of co-ordination. With regard to

/...

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

paragraph 2 (b), relating to the rendering of assistance and services at the specific request of any State, he said that the paragraph referred to all States, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations. Furthermore, the report referred to in paragraph 2 (b) would be submitted by the High Commissioner only with the consent of the State which had requested his assistance or good offices, and the relationship in such cases would be a bilateral one.

56. With respect to paragraph 2 (d), he said that in the proposed annual report the High Commissioner would provide information on the general situation in the field of human rights and at the same time on the assistance and services he was rendering to States, on the understanding that the latter type of information would be given only with the consent of the States concerned.

57. Mr. BOZA (Peru) said that in the Spanish text of document A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1, the words "de los pueblos y de los individuos" had been omitted at the end of the tenth preambular paragraph. He requested that the necessary correction should be made. Furthermore, in paragraph 1 (b) of the Spanish text, there were no opening quotation marks or suspension points at the beginning of the paragraph and no closing quotation marks immediately before the words "como se reconoce en la Proclamación de Teherán".

58. The CHAIRMAN said that steps would be taken to make the necessary corrections to the Spanish text.

59. She then announced that Equatorial Guinea had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.17/Rev.1.

#### OTHER MATTERS

60. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, at the request of a number of delegations which were holding consultations on agenda item 12, the time allotted for the purpose should be extended until 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 6 December 1977.

61. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.