

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING  
held on Thursday, 9 May 1968, at 10.35 a.m.

Chairman:  
later, .

Mr. AGUILAR  
Miss GICHURU

Venezuela  
Kenya

Rapporteur:

Mr. PAHR

Austria

FORMULATION AND PREPARATION OF A HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAMME TO BE UNDERTAKEN SUBSEQUENT TO THE CELEBRATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNIVERSAL RESPECT FOR, AND OBSERVANCE OF, HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS FOR ALL WITHOUT DISTINCTION AS TO RACE, COLOUR, SEX, LANGUAGE OR RELIGION, IN PARTICULAR (agenda item 11) (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.4, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.14, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.15/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.18, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.22 and L.23, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.26/Rev.2, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.28, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.29 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.31, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.33-L.39, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.40 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.44, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.45/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.46-L.48, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49 and Corr.1 and 2, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.50, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.52 and L.53, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.55-L.58, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.62 and L.63, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.68-L.70)

- (e) MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN THE DEFENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF INDIVIDUALS (continued);
- (f) INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (continued);
- (g) OTHER MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN PROMOTING THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF POLITICAL, CIVIL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE METHODS AND TECHNIQUES AND SUCH INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AS MAY BE REQUIRED (continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the decision taken at the 9th meeting, the following draft resolutions would be considered first: A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49 and Corr.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.45/Rev.1, A/CONF.32/C.2/L.47 and A/CONF.32/C.2/L.23. Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.45/Rev.1 had still to be introduced.

Mr. SHAHABUDDIN (India) said that that draft resolution was self-explanatory. Its purpose was to draw the attention of the international community to the inadequate implementation of the existing humanitarian international conventions and rules in armed conflicts and to study the need for additional conventions in that field or for revising existing conventions, so as to ensure the better protection of civilians, prisoners and combatants in all armed conflicts and the prohibition and limitation of the use of certain methods and means of warfare.

In the mid-twentieth century, for the first time in human history, man had the choice between peaceful co-existence and total annihilation. He had at his disposal new and devilish weapons of mass destruction which did not discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Side by side with that technical development, man's moral sense had been dulled so that man's inhumanity to man no longer evoked horror: it was taken for granted.

The most recent codification of the laws of war dated from 1907, when the new techniques of warfare had not been perfected. Those laws did not seem adequate to cover the situation of the mid-twentieth century. The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 had, indeed, envisaged the drawing up of "a more complete code of the laws of war", but that code had not yet seen the light of day.

Furthermore, up-to-date and comprehensive international safeguards for civilian populations and other victims of armed conflicts were needed. Civilian populations especially were increasingly exposed to the dangers and consequences of hostilities, while provision must be made to put an end to the torture and execution of freedom-fighters at the hands of colonial and racist regimes. The sponsors of the draft resolution considered that such persons should be treated as prisoners-of-war or political prisoners.

The draft resolution proposed that the General Assembly should be requested to invite the Secretary-General to set up a committee of experts to study the problem in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross. The attention of all Member States should be drawn to the existing conventions and rules of international law on the subject in question and they should be urged to respect them. Above all, the United Nations, which represented the collective conscience of mankind, should seek a solution of the problem.

The sponsors of the draft resolution wished to make it clear that they had no intention at the present stage of suggesting implementation procedures.

The sponsors wished to make a slight change in the text. In operative paragraph 1(b) the words "a revision of" should be replaced by the words "for revising".

An urgent solution to the problem was needed before the increasing frequency and horror of armed conflicts engulfed all mankind and before human conscience was paralyzed by the prevailing violence. No other species of life inhabiting the planet was as cruel to its own species as man. That shame must be removed by collective effort and by putting brakes on man's power to bring about his own destruction.

The CHAIRMAN said that all the draft resolutions before the Committee had now been introduced. He therefore invited the Committee to discuss them in the order agreed upon.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5/Rev.1

Miss MUTER (Indonesia) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution, for it considered that it was indeed imperative to implant in the conscience of youth at all stages of education the ideas of human dignity and the equal rights of all people without any discrimination. It was appropriate that the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other agencies concerned should be asked to prepare a programme in that field.

In Indonesia, the Department of Education co-ordinated programmes of activities for youth in both the mental and the physical domain, for it was convinced of the need for intellectual and physical growth to go hand in hand.

Mr. MOMMERSTEEG (Netherlands) said that his delegation attached particular importance to a resolution on the education of youth in the spirit of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, for it went without saying that the younger generation had the future in their hands. The Netherlands delegation therefore supported the draft resolution with particular emphasis on the sixth preambular paragraph. The involvement of youth in the defence of human dignity needed a basis of information and free discussion. A resolution on youth should therefore also stress the need to foster among young people a broad dissemination of ideas and knowledge, based on objective information and free discussion. His delegation had therefore proposed the addition of a new paragraph to the draft resolution (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.55). He hoped that it would meet with general agreement.

Reverend Father de la CHAPELLE (Holy See) said that his delegation was particularly interested in the question of youth, in whose hands lay the future of the world, and therefore supported the draft resolution. He wished, however, to make a few comments on the text.

With regard to operative paragraph 2, he doubted whether it was necessary to stimulate the interest of the young in "all that is new and progressive" for the young seemed to him to be always ready to accept what was new and progressive. He suggested the replacement of the phrase "for all that is new and progressive" by the phrase "in the problems of the changing world". He thought it was wiser to stress the need to appreciate human values, as operative paragraph 3 did. Concerning operative paragraph 6, he sometimes wondered whether meetings and international exchanges were encouraging to youth. For example, at the present Conference the problem of minorities had not been discussed and yet that was a most important problem for the young. The

international community should be wary of giving the young a frustration complex. If the United Nations did not give them a more definite lead, the young people of the world would ignore it. With regard to operative paragraph 7, he had doubts about the expression "for the development of its personality" and thought it might be better to say "for the development of spiritual, cultural and human values". In operative paragraph 8, he suggested the addition at the end of the sentence of the phrase "in full consciousness of its responsibilities", for the use of freedom without responsibility was to be deprecated.

His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but would like the improvements he had suggested to be incorporated in the text.

Mrs. HENRION (Belgium) said that her delegation wished to see the youth of the world, in all countries, better informed of United Nations activities. It hoped that the United Nations would be able to provide a bridge between the older and younger people and it therefore suggested the addition of a final paragraph to the draft resolution, to read:

"Suggests that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should make provision for a study group to be organized every two years within the framework of the advisory services in the field of human rights, reserved to young people and on subjects of special interest to them."

Her delegation supported the Netherlands amendment.

Mr. POPESCU (Romania), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they accepted the Netherlands and Belgian amendments. They also agreed to alter the wording on the lines suggested by the representative of the Holy See. He thanked all those who had spoken in support of the draft resolution and hoped that it would be approved unanimously.

Mrs. AHMED (Pakistan) proposed that, to enable the Committee to make faster progress, one of the sponsors should introduce a draft resolution and that only those opposed to it or to certain paragraphs should speak on it. She further proposed that a vote should be taken without discussion on any draft resolutions on which no one wished to speak in opposition.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to that proposal, provided that it was restricted to draft resolutions which it had been agreed were not controversial.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) and Mr. SOKO (Zambia) supported the Pakistan proposal.

Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation had made a similar proposal earlier and therefore supported the Pakistan proposal. She suggested that one of the sponsors should deal with any amendments.

Mr. UY (Philippines) suggested that at least one of the sponsors should be allowed to rebut any criticisms.

In the absence of any objection, the Pakistan proposal was adopted.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5/Rev.1. He would like, however, to suggest a few changes in the wording. In the sixth preambular paragraph the words "absolutely necessary" should be replaced by "the hope of humanity". In the seventh preambular paragraph the definite article should be omitted in front of the word "youth". Similarly, the definite article should be deleted before "human dignity" and before "peoples" in operative paragraph 1, and before the words "young people" in operative paragraph 2.

Mrs. CHENG (China) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution, but agreed with the comments of the representative of the Holy See concerning operative paragraph 2.

Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that the sponsors accepted the United Kingdom amendments.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) moved the closure of the debate in accordance with rule 26 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for closure was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that those who had made drafting suggestions should submit them to the drafting committee or to the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.5/Rev.1, as orally amended, was approved unanimously.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1

Mr. SZABO (Hungary) said that it had not been feasible to combine draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1 with other draft resolutions on the same subject, since it dealt with the general legal implications of the realization of full economic rights by everyone. The draft resolution emphasized the crucial importance of achieving economic rights along with political and civil rights.

Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) pointed out that the revised version of the draft resolution had been produced after an exchange of views with various delegations, in particular the United States. It would be noted that the third preambular paragraph had been drafted in weaker terms and that a new sixth preambular paragraph had been added.

Mr. SISUEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked to be added to the list of sponsors.

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) thanked the sponsors for working out an agreed text which the United States Government could support. He took it that operative paragraph 1 referred only to those States which were eligible to sign and ratify the Covenants as specifically provided for in the texts themselves.

Mr. SHAHABUDDIN (India) proposed the following amendments: (a) the end of the third preambular paragraph should read: "... and that these human rights and fundamental freedoms are closely interconnected and interdependent"; (b) the sixth preambular paragraph should read: "Noting the close relationship between public administration, the participation of citizens in the decision-making, planning and programming process and the fulfilment of economic and social rights"; (c) the end of the seventh preambular paragraph should read: "... in national constitutions and towards providing means of defence against violations of these rights"; (d) the end of operative paragraph 2 should read "... measures in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in view of the increasing importance of realizing these rights in the modern world"; (e) in operative paragraph 3 the words "with a view to formulating and studying" should be replaced by "in the field of formulation and study of"; (f) operative paragraph 6 should read: "Calls upon all Governments to focus their attention on developing the material means for protecting, promoting and realizing economic, social and cultural rights, as well as on developing and perfecting legal procedures for the prevention of violation and defence of these rights"; (g) in operative paragraph 7 the words "decisions affecting national development" should be replaced by "the decision-making process"; and (h) operative paragraph 8 should read: "Calls upon the United Nations to take measures, within the framework of the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, so that States could share their experience of effective methods and means adopted for the realization of economic, social and cultural rights".

Reverend Father de la CHAPELLE (Holy See) and Mr. van BOVEN (Netherlands) suggested that a reference should be made in operative paragraph 1 to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) proposed that the fifth preambular paragraph should refer to the Kabul and Dakar Seminars on economic and social rights in the developing countries before the Warsaw Seminar, which had been attended by European countries only.

Mr. de MEYER (Belgium) suggested that operative paragraph 5 should mention the Commission on the Status of Women and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Miss Gichuru (Kenya), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) supported the Indian amendments and pointed out that the words "are enjoyed" in the third preambular paragraph should be deleted. He agreed that a reference should be made to the Optional Protocol in operative paragraph 1 and proposed that in operative paragraph 4 the words "the efforts made by" should be replaced by "the action of" and the words "to study" by "in studying".

Mr. LUGOE (United Republic of Tanzania) did not think the words "affecting national development" in operative paragraph 7 should be deleted, as the representative of India had suggested.

Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) agreed with the Belgian representative that a reference should be made in operative paragraph 5 to the Commission on the Status of Women. She suggested that the Commission for Social Development, too, should be mentioned.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) thought that the Indian amendments represented a great improvement. He hoped that the sponsors would accept them. He asked for an explanation of how operative paragraph 7, as amended, could be implemented.

If the Indian amendment to operative paragraph 8 was accepted, a heavy additional burden would be placed on the programme of advisory services, whose current budget amounted to only \$220,000. He therefore wished to propose a new operative paragraph 9: "Recommends to the General Assembly of the United Nations, for the purpose of strengthening the defence and awareness of human rights, to expand the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights and to ensure adequate budgetary provision necessary to satisfy the increasing demands on the programme".

Mr. FERRARI BRAVO (Italy) supported the proposed amendments and suggested that a reference to programming should be included after planning in the sixth preambular paragraph.



Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) appealed to the Nigerian representative to withdraw his proposed new paragraph, since the Conference was not the proper place for such a proposal.

Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, on behalf of the sponsors, he was ready to accept nearly all the proposed amendments. In particular, the Indian proposals greatly improved the text, although he agreed with the representative of Tanzania that the words "affecting national development" in operative paragraph 7 should be retained.

He asked the Belgian representative not to press for the addition of a reference to "inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations" in operative paragraph 1 and he appealed to the Nigerian representative to withdraw his proposed new paragraph. In reply to that representative's request for an explanation concerning operative paragraph 7, he said that the purpose of that paragraph was to involve the whole population more closely in decisions affecting national development.

Mr. Aguilar (Venezuela) resumed the Chair.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that he was not satisfied with the explanation given. He asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 7 so that he might abstain.

He maintained his proposal for a new paragraph, since he felt that the problem of financing the expanded operations of the programme of advisory services was too important to be ignored.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the proposal to include in operative paragraph 1 a reference to the Optional Protocol, which he opposed.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new operative paragraph proposed by Nigeria.

The proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 8, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to add the words "and the Optional Protocol to that Convention" to the end of operative paragraph 1.

The proposal was approved by 36 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put operative paragraph 1 as a whole, as amended, to the vote.

Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was approved by 51 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put operative paragraph 7, as amended, to the vote.

Operative paragraph 7, as amended, was approved by 59 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended, to the vote.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.11/Rev.1, as amended, was approved unanimously.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49 and Corr.1 and 2

Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) said that the draft resolution represented a combination of draft resolutions A/CONF.32/C.2/L.17 and A/CONF.32/C.2/L.24, which could be considered to have been withdrawn.

Its aim was to stress the need for recognition in the field of human rights of the idea of universality. The preambular paragraphs were a combination of the two original draft resolutions. The sponsors were willing to accept the Swedish amendment (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.56) only to the second preambular paragraph; so far as operative paragraph 2 was concerned, the sponsors had presented a new formulation in A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49/Corr.2.

Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that, in view of the correction to the draft resolution (A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49/Corr.2), he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that he would have preferred the Swedish amendment to stand, since he considered the text as given in the correction ambiguous. It put the General Assembly in the position of receiving a recommendation from the Conference which it could not possibly understand. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to incorporate the words of the former Swedish amendment. Otherwise he would be obliged to abstain from voting on a draft resolution whose spirit his delegation strongly supported.

Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) regretted that he was unable to comply with the request, since the text of the correction was the one upon which the largest number of delegations had agreed.

Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that he shared the views of the United States representative. The correction appeared to request the General Assembly to do two things, firstly to ensure the widest possible accession to the agreements - a request which no one could dispute - and, secondly, to ensure the principle of universality of human rights. His delegation could not understand the precise meaning of that phrase and would be unable to vote in favour of a paragraph the meaning of which it did not understand. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to reconsider the matter so that his delegation would not be obliged to abstain from voting on a draft resolution the fundamental principles of which it approved.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) moved the closure of the debate on the question unless the sponsors wished to reply to the United Kingdom's appeal.

The CHAIRMAN said that, there being no objection, he would close the debate, in accordance with rule 26 of the rules of procedure, and proceed to the vote.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.49 and Corr.1 and 2 was approved by 39 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.45/Rev.1

Mr. QUINCHE (Switzerland) said that the draft resolution mentioned the International Committee of the Red Cross, which was to be consulted by the proposed committee of experts and by the Secretary-General. As everybody knew, that Committee was an independent organization engaged in purely humanitarian activities. Since it had not been possible to consult it on the draft resolution, he wished to make reservations concerning the position which the International Committee might subsequently take.

Mr. SHAHABUDDIN (India) said that, since their submission of the draft resolution, the sponsors had had further consultation with several delegations. He therefore wished to submit some amendments based on their suggestions. In the seventh preambular paragraph, the word "may" should be inserted before "need"; operative paragraph 1 should read: "Requests the General Assembly to invite the Secretary-General to study: (a) Steps ..."; the word "possible" should be inserted before "revision" in operative paragraph 1 (b); and an operative paragraph 3 should be added, reading: "Calls upon all States which have not yet done so to become parties to the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Geneva Convention of 1949".

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that the amendment to operative paragraph 1 would make it easier for his delegation to vote in favour of the draft resolution. He took it that the new operative paragraph 3 took into consideration the eligibility of States, in accordance with the provisions of the instruments mentioned.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.45/Rev.1, as amended by the sponsors, was approved by 53 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.47

Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that, although the year 1969 was not far away and his delegation had not had time to consider what effect the recommendation in the draft resolution would have on the United Nations work programme for that year or its financial implications, he thought the idea in question worth considering. He therefore proposed

certain amendments to the text: operative paragraph 1 should read "Urges the United Nations General Assembly to consider the possibility of declaring 1969 the International Year ..."; and operative paragraph 3 should read: "Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in consultation with Member States, to prepare for consideration at the twenty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly an outline of the programme of measures ...". He felt that, with those changes, all delegations would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. UY (Philippines) said that his delegation would be prepared to support the draft resolution with those amendments.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) said that, while his delegation would have been in a position to support the draft resolution as it stood, the changes proposed by Sweden were perfectly acceptable.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too could accept the Swedish amendments.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.47, as amended, was approved unanimously.

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) felt that every year should be a year for action to combat racism and racial discrimination and that too many International Years would render the idea meaningless. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to support the principle of combating racism and racial discrimination but he reserved his delegation's position on the item when it was discussed in the General Assembly.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.23

Mr. LUGOE (United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that the words "every Government" in operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by "Member States".

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that he preferred the wording "every Government", since it had wider implications.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the draft resolution should call for implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and not merely a wider circulation of the document. It should also refer to the important documents on human rights other than the Universal Declaration.

Mr. LUGOE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he must maintain his amendment, which he considered important. The same wording had been used in the other draft resolutions submitted.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) suggested that the paragraph should be reworded to read:

"Urges States Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies ...".

Mr. LUGOE (United Republic of Tanzania) accepted that amendment.

The Tanzanian amendment, as amended by Iran, was rejected by 16 votes to 11, with 20 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.23 was approved by 57 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said that, since the programme of work agreed upon at the ninth meeting had been completed, the Committee should discuss its future work.

Mr. UY (Philippines) was strongly in favour of the Committee holding at least one more meeting to enable it to consider the remaining draft resolutions submitted, one of the most important of which was draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.52 on freedom of information. If the Committee decided to hold another meeting, he suggested that that draft resolution should be one of the first to be considered. If it did not, he requested that the draft resolution should be taken up before the meeting was adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN called on the Rapporteur to present a statement of the draft resolutions still to be studied by the Committee.

Mr. PAHR (Austria), Rapporteur, said that, in addition to the nine draft resolutions under consideration by the working party because their texts overlapped or were identical, eleven other draft resolutions had yet to be discussed by the Committee. If it were not possible to discuss them, he suggested that the Committee should accept the proposal in draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.68 that the draft resolutions which had not been considered for lack of time should be transmitted to the competent United Nations organs for consideration.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that the hopes of many people all over the world lay in the International Conference on Human Rights. The Committee had approved a large number of useful resolutions but those which remained were among the most important. The Committee had been entrusted with the task of recommending future measures to be adopted in the field of human rights and if its work were curtailed in any way it would not feel that it had completed its task satisfactorily.

The working party set up to combine the overlapping draft resolutions had made a certain amount of progress but had not yet been able to complete its work. The

solution of referring the remaining draft resolutions to the relevant United Nations organs was not satisfactory because those drafts had initially been submitted to the Conference on Human Rights rather than to the United Nations organs concerned.

Mr. GOUSSE (Haiti) stated that it was doubtful whether four or even five additional meetings would be sufficient to deal with the work in hand. It had been suggested that the most important draft resolutions could be singled out, but every delegation sponsoring a resolution considered that resolution important. The draft resolutions on which it had proved impossible to reach a decision should therefore be referred to the General Assembly.

Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) expressed his pleasure and surprise at the excellent work which had been accomplished. The constructive resolutions which had been adopted with large majorities would provide a useful basis for further action.

Any further meeting which it was decided to hold, however, would be devoted merely to deciding what should be discussed. If any draft resolutions were considered at all, they would be examined with undue haste.

The draft resolutions already adopted should be transmitted to the plenary Conference, while the others should be referred to the General Assembly, which in turn would decide which bodies might most suitably be approached for taking further action.

Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although tremendous progress had been achieved, he was disappointed that no agreement had been reached on certain important controversial draft resolutions. No purpose would be served, however, by holding a further meeting and the draft resolutions which had not been considered should be referred to the General Assembly.

Mr. NOUAMA (Ivory Coast) said that, in spite of the progress achieved by the Committee, time should be found to discuss the draft resolutions which suggested means of ending violations of human rights.

Mr. GANJI (Iran) said that the Committee now had before it twenty draft resolutions and twenty amendments. All the delegations were involved either as sponsors or co-sponsors and some of the draft resolutions on which no decision had been taken were of vital importance. He agreed, however, with previous speakers that a further meeting would probably be devoted entirely to deciding the order of priority. The remaining draft resolutions should therefore be transmitted either to the General Assembly or to the plenary Conference, for discussion if any time was available after its own business had been completed.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Executive Secretary of the Conference) said that the Conference had to be supplied with the main documents in all the working languages and it was to be feared that the Secretariat would be placed under an undue strain if called upon to service an extra meeting. In any case, the report of the Committee would contain not only the texts of the resolutions adopted but also the draft resolutions on which no agreement had been reached or which had not been discussed, together with an account of what action it was proposed to take on them.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal that no additional meeting should be held.

The proposal was adopted by 36 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that he wished to record his delegation's dissatisfaction at the result of the vote. A great opportunity had been missed of helping the international community to devise really effective means of implementing human rights.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.68

Mr. FERRARI BRAVO (Italy) proposed that a new preambular paragraph should be inserted in draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.68, reading "Fully aware of the importance of the aforementioned draft resolutions and amendments", and that the words "while expressing the hope that they will be considered at the first opportunity" should be added to the operative paragraph.

The Italian amendments were adopted by 40 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/CONF.32/C.2/L.68, as amended, was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.