



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/CONF.32/PC/SR.39
20 July 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 21 April 1967, at 10.50 a.m.

CONTENTS

Second progress report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Human Rights to the General Assembly (A/CONF.32/PC/L.22 and Add.1-3)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SLIM	(Tunisia)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. BEEBY	New Zealand
<u>Members:</u>	Miss FLETCHER	Canada
	Mr. JLARTE	Colombia
	Mr. FAOLINI	France
	Mr. JHA	India
	Mr. JALILI	Iran
	Mr. SCOLAMIERO	Italy
	Miss MARTINEZ	Jamaica
	Mr. FAKIH	Kenya
	Mr. CHEIKH ABDALLAHI	Mauritania
	Mr. MOHAMMED	Nigeria
	Mr. MIRZA	Pakistan
	Mr. RIOS	Panama
	Mr. YANGO	Philippines
	Mr. WYZNER	Poland
	Mr. BEN AISSA	Tunisia
	Mr. NASLNOVSKY	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Miss RICHARDS	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. CATES	United States of America
	Mr. BERRO	Uruguay
	Mr. LAZAREVIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Representatives of specialized agencies:</u>		
	Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN	International Labour Organisation
	Mr. SALSAMENDI	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. SCHREIBER	Director, Division of Human Rights
	Mr. ROMANOV	Secretary of the Committee

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/CONF.32/PC/L.22 and Add.1-3)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Rapporteur to introduce the draft report.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, said that the main body of the report was contained in documents A/CONF.32/PC/L.22 and Add.1. Two additional paragraphs to be inserted in chapter IV were to be found in document A/CONF.32/PC/L.22/Add.3. The annexes, consisting of the draft rules of procedure for the Conference as recommended by the Committee, the draft provisional agenda for the Conference, and the Secretary-General's note on the estimates of costs, were contained in document A/CONF.32/PC/L.22/Add.2.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there were a number of inaccuracies and omissions in the first part of the draft report, but they were of small importance compared with the biased account of the debate, given in later chapters, particularly those on the participation of non-governmental organizations, the documentation for the Conference and the expenses of the Conference, on which he would have formal amendments to propose.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the report chapter by chapter.

Chapter I. Terms of reference and organization of the Committee's work
(A/CONF.32/PC/L.22, paragraphs 1-24)

Chapter I was adopted.

Chapter II. Date of the Conference and report on arrangements for the Conference
(A/CONF.32/PC/L.22, paragraphs 25-28)

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the date of closure of the Conference, as well as the date of its opening, should be indicated in paragraph 27.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, remarked that the Committee had decided that 22 April 1968 would be a suitable date for the opening of the Conference, but it had not fixed any specific date for its closure. He therefore proposed that the following sentence should be inserted after the second sentence of paragraph 27: "As previously agreed, the Conference would last for three weeks."

That amendment was adopted.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the deletion of the words "as well as the International Year for Human Rights as a whole" at the end of paragraph 28. The present wording did not give sufficient prominence to the Conference. Secondly, that paragraph should include a reference to General Assembly resolution 2217 B (XXI), which called upon Governments to intensify the struggle to safeguard fundamental freedoms and human rights and to ensure the elimination of racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid. As the resolution had been mentioned in the debate, it would be only proper to refer to it in the report.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, recalled that the USSR representative had indeed referred to that resolution during the debate. He therefore proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of paragraph 28: "One representative raised this question in the context of General Assembly resolution 2217 B (XXI)."

Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that he also had referred to resolution 2217 B (XXI) in the course of the debate. The sentence proposed by the Rapporteur should therefore be amended to refer to more than one delegation.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that it would be pointless merely to mention the resolution without indicating its substance matter and its importance in the present context. He therefore suggested that the additional sentence should be reworded to read as follows: "Some delegations drew attention particularly to General Assembly resolution 2217 B (XXI), which called upon Governments...", the rest of the sentence being taken from the resolution itself.

It was so decided.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) suggested that the USSR representative's point might be met, not by the deletion that he proposed, but by rewording the end of the last sentence slightly, to read: "to publicize the Conference as part of the International Year for Human Rights".

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could not accept that suggestion. The Conference was the most important event of the Year and the wording proposed by the United States representative would reduce it to being only one of a series of events. That would be quite unrealistic, for the other events were trivial, and it would detract from the importance of the Conference.

Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) disagreed with the USSR representative. The Conference was very important, but that did not mean that the other events were trivial.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) supported the United States amendment. The decision to hold the Conference had been made in the context of the General Assembly's decision to designate 1968 as International Year for Human Rights. General Assembly resolution 2081 (XX) devoted twelve paragraphs to the other observances of the International Year before recording its decision to convene the Conference; the Conference was, therefore, one event, although an important one, in a year of other observances.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) also supported the United States amendment.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could not agree to the United States amendment or to the contention that the Conference was to be held only as part of a series of other observances. It would be preferable to leave the sentence as it was. He therefore withdrew his amendment.

Chapter II, as amended by the Rapporteur, was adopted.

Chapter III. Draft rules of procedure of the Conference (A/CONF.32/PC/L.22, paragraphs 29-37)

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) proposed that the following words should be added at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 30: "subject to the need to add a further rule on non-governmental organizations". That would cover the point she had raised during the debate.

/...

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United Kingdom amendment was an attempt to tie the hands of the General Assembly and prejudice its decision. He was convinced that the Assembly would decide that non-governmental organizations should not be invited to participate in the Conference, in which case no rule would be necessary.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, agreed that the point had been raised by the United Kingdom representative during the debate, but he felt that the USSR representative was right in saying that the Committee should not prejudice the Assembly's decision. He therefore proposed the addition of the following words after the wording proposed by the United Kingdom representative: "in the light of any decision of the General Assembly on this matter".

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) supported the United Kingdom amendment. The purpose of the report was to inform the General Assembly of the Committee's debates and decisions. It could hardly submit the draft rules of procedure which it was recommending without mentioning a point on which there had been considerable debate. On the contrary, it should give the Assembly as much guidance as possible.

Mr. JHA (India) said that any guidance that the Assembly needed would be found in chapter VII of the report (A/CONF.32/PC/L.22/Add.1) and that there was nothing to be gained by drawing attention to the problem of non-governmental organizations in paragraph 30. He therefore associated himself with the views expressed by the USSR representative.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 30, as sub-amended by the Rapporteur.

That amendment was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) thought that paragraph 31 should indicate where the "full exchange of views" was recorded.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, suggested adding the following words at the end of the sentence: "recorded in the following paragraphs".

It was so decided.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) said that she wished to propose the inclusion of two new paragraphs after paragraph 34 of the present text. The new paragraphs had been drafted with the aim of crystallizing what she and many other delegations felt, after considerable informal consultations, to be a broad consensus regarding the main committees and the agenda items to be assigned to them. On the basis of the Committee's previous decision, recorded in paragraph 52 of its first progress report (A/6354), that there should be four meetings daily, the text had been drafted on the assumption that there would be two main committees, a point on which there was broad agreement. The new paragraphs read as follows:

"35. There was, however, widespread agreement that effective discussion at the Conference of the agenda recommended by the Preparatory Committee could best be achieved by the early establishment of at least two main committees. Members envisaged that item 9 (Review of Progress) would be taken in plenary at the outset of the Conference. Once this discussion was under way two main committees would start work: each would deal successively with certain subjects, initially with respect to item 10 (Evaluation of Methods) and thereafter with respect to item 11 (Future Measures): the subjects enumerated under items 11 (a), (b) and (c) would be allotted to one main committee and the subjects comprised under items 11 (d), (e), (f) and (g) would be allotted to the other. Recommendations of the two main committees would be considered by plenary in the final stages of the Conference.

"36. The Preparatory Committee thought that it might be found necessary at the Conference to establish sub-committees of either of the main committees, to deal with particular questions among the subjects assigned to them. Rule 45 of the draft rules of procedure was therefore formulated so as to provide for the setting up of sub-committees as deemed necessary at the Conference."

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) strongly opposed the United Kingdom amendment. The question of the number of committees had been fully discussed and finally settled in the Committee. By adopting the wording "one or

(Mr. Nasinovsky, USSR)

more main committees" in rule 45 of the rules of procedure, the Committee had decided that the final decision should be left to the Conference. The United Kingdom amendment was an attempt to impose a decision on the Committee on the basis of informal consultations and without discussion in the Committee itself. That was not only an attempt to reopen a debate which had been closed, but was a breach of the rules of procedure. At the present time, the Committee was adopting its report, which was supposed to reflect the debate that had taken place in the Committee, and decisions reached outside the conference room had no place in it.

Mr. JHA (India) was opposed to the United Kingdom amendment, which was totally unnecessary. His delegation had no strong feelings on the number of committees of the Conference, but it felt that it would be inappropriate to decide at the present stage that there should be only two. Furthermore, there seemed no reason to allocate agenda items to those committees in advance, to say nothing of the fact that the Committee had already decided to leave such decisions to the Conference.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether it was in order for the Committee to consider the United Kingdom amendment, part of which related to matters which had not been discussed in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the question of the number of committees, to which the amendment mainly related, had been debated at length.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) agreed that the question had been debated at length in the Committee. His delegation had always favoured the idea of establishing two committees and it had felt that it would be wise for the Committee to take a decision, if possible, on any questions left pending, as it was unlikely to have the opportunity to do so later. Moreover, if it left difficult decisions to the Conference, that would mean loss of time for the Conference. The United Kingdom proposal was the outcome of consultations with a majority of delegations on the Committee and it contained a reasonable proposal which would facilitate the work of the Conference. The Committee should seize the opportunity to clear the ground for the Conference and enable it to get down to work without wasting time.

/...

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) wished to make it quite clear that it was not the purpose of her delegation's amendment to impose a decision on the General Assembly or the Conference. All delegations agreed that it was for the Conference itself to distribute the agenda as it thought fit, but the Committee could usefully lay down certain guidelines. Some delegations believed that many committees would be needed to debate all the agenda items, while others felt that the number of committees should be left open. Following informal consultations with other members of the Committee, she believed it to be the general view that the agenda could be divided into two main sections, to be discussed by two main committees, and that the Preparatory Committee's report should indicate how that division might be effected.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that the United Kingdom proposal was out of place - if not out of order - at the current stage in the debate. It was true that there had been a discussion as to how many committees the Conference should have, but that had been in connexion with rule 45, the final wording of which had been approved without objection. Whereas that rule deliberately left the question of the number of committees open, the words "either of the main committees" in the second paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment suggested that the Committee had agreed that there should be two main committees. That wording prejudged the situation and could only lead to confusion. The Committee had discussed and approved the rules of procedure of the Conference and the issue could not now be reopened. The Committee was discussing its report and could not base it on informal discussions outside the Committee in which several delegations, including his own, had not taken part. He urged the United Kingdom representative not to press an amendment which was not based on the Committee's proceedings. The report might mention the fact that some delegations felt there should be one main committee while others felt that there should be more than one; that would be a true reflection of the discussion. It was now too late to introduce other issues and the Committee should either wait to discuss them at a new series of meetings or leave them to the General Assembly.

Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) stated that she herself had advanced all the ideas in the second and third sentences of the first paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment in the debate (A/CONF.32/PC/SR.36). She would therefore like those sentences to be included in the report.

As to the second paragraph of the amendment, she agreed with the Tunisian representative that the Conference should be given guidance on the question of its agenda, particularly since it had so little time for its work. Moreover, rule 45 of the rules of procedure already adopted by the Committee stated that each committee might set up sub-committees or working groups. Her delegation saw no reason why the United Kingdom amendment should not be included in the report.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that he neither supported nor opposed the United Kingdom amendment. He understood why some delegations should wish the report to be worded as flexibly as possible and why others should wish to give the Conference some guidance. He felt, however, that the Committee should have no fear that its intentions would be misinterpreted. Either it should take the Polish representative's suggestion as the basis for solution, or the United Kingdom amendment should be put to the vote.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland) felt that the Committee would be out of order if it included something in its report which had not been discussed at its meetings but was the result of private consultations. His delegation categorically objected to any such procedure.

Miss FLETCHER (Canada) supported the United Kingdom amendment. Several points in it had been raised in the debate by the Jamaican representative, and the issues had also been discussed informally. It would help the Iranian Government in providing the physical facilities, and the Secretariat in providing the staff for the Conference, if the Committee gave them some indication of the number of committees to expect. She therefore urged that the United Kingdom amendment should be put to the vote.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) also felt that, to avoid prolonged debate, the proposal should be put to the vote.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation strongly objected to the discussion of an entirely new item at the present stage of proceedings, in violation of all rules of procedure. The United Kingdom amendment raised two fundamentally different issues. The Committee had discussed how many committees there should be at the Conference, but it had taken no final decision. The report could therefore include a reference to that; but there had been no discussion whatever of any possible distribution of agenda items among committees, apart from a suggestion by the Director of the Division of Human Rights that items 9, 10 and 11 should be given to three different committees, an idea which had been criticized by the representative of Pakistan. The Committee could not vote on a proposal to insert in the report a reference to the allocation of agenda items, because the matter had not been discussed. He asked the Chairman to give a formal ruling on the issue.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that several delegations wanted a vote on the United Kingdom amendment. He suggested that, in the first sentence of the first paragraph, the words: "There was, however, widespread agreement", should be replaced by "many delegations felt".

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that, in that sentence, the words "at least two main committees" should be replaced by "one or more main committees".

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) said that it would be better to leave the wording as it stood for the sake of clarity.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, proposed that the following two paragraphs should be added to the United Kingdom amendment, the first to reflect the views of the Polish and USSR representatives and the second to reflect those of the Jamaican representative:

"Other members of the Committee did not share the views expressed in the two preceding paragraphs. They continued to believe that the Conference should operate with one main committee and that, in any case, this question should be left for decision by the Conference.

(Mr. Beeby, New Zealand)

"One delegation, while agreeing that the Conference might usefully deal with its agenda in this manner, maintained the conviction that more than two main committees would be needed for this purpose and reserved its position on this particular question."

Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that the Committee's report should be a meticulous account of its proceedings and he could not, in all conscience, vote to include in it something which had never been formally discussed. The report should simply say that the Committee had reached no agreement on the number of main committees at the Conference and had deferred the decision to the General Assembly or to the Conference itself.

Mr. JHA (India) suggested that the references in the United Kingdom amendment to the allocation of the agenda items should be deleted. If it was not, there should be an additional paragraph to record the objections of delegations, such as his own, which did not agree to its inclusion.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that, in addition to the replacement in the first sentence of the words "at least two main committees" by "one or more main committees", separate votes should be taken on the second, third and fourth sentences in the first paragraph and the whole of the second paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment, which he felt should be deleted.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the views of the Yugoslav and Uruguayan representatives. The allocation of agenda items had never been discussed and the Committee was therefore not competent to take a decision on the matter at the present stage in the proceedings. He again asked the Chairman to give a ruling in the matter.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) thought that the Committee should give the General Assembly and the Conference some guidance as to the organization of the Conference. It was important to indicate that the items should be distributed among several committees in order to expedite the work of the Conference by simultaneous discussions.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) proposed that, to meet the objections of the USSR, Yugoslav and Uruguayan representatives, the first sentence of the first

/...

(Miss Richards, United Kingdom)

paragraph of her amendment should begin "When this section of the report was considered, many delegations considered that...". It would then be clear that the paragraph did not refer to the Committee's substantive debate. At the same time, the paragraph reflected the views of several delegations. The two additional paragraphs proposed by the Rapporteur took the opposing views into consideration. She agreed that the words "either of the main committees" in the first sentence of the second paragraph could be replaced by "the main committee or committees", to avoid prejudging the issue.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 52 of its first progress report (A/6354) which showed that there had been some suggestion that the specific agenda items should be distributed among various committees or working groups. His delegation felt that, with the two additional paragraphs proposed by the Rapporteur, the United Kingdom text would reflect the views of the Committee. He appealed to the representatives of the USSR and Yugoslavia not to press their proposals.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that the two additional paragraphs proposed by the Rapporteur certainly did not reflect the views of his delegation which, since the matter had not been discussed, had never had an opportunity to express any views. The United Kingdom amendment should not be put to the vote and the Committee should abide by its rules of procedure.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, said that, to meet the views of the Indian and Polish representatives, he would amend the first paragraph of his amendment to read "Other members of the Committee continued to believe that the Conference should operate with one main committee and that, in any case, the question of the number of committees, as well as of the distribution of work, should be left for decision by the Conference."

The CHAIRMAN stated that the question of the number of committees had been discussed at the Committee's meetings both in 1966 and in 1967. While allocation of agenda items to the committees had not been fully discussed, proposals on the subject had been submitted at the present series of meetings, and, in submitting

/...

(The Chairman)

her amendment, the United Kingdom representative had said that the many delegations she had consulted informally had agreed to her text. The Committee had previously included such proposals in its report, as well as the expressed opposition to them. In his view, the Committee was competent to discuss the matter, especially since the amended version of the first sentence of the United Kingdom amendment made it clear that the view in question was held by many delegations. He asked the Yugoslav representative whether he maintained his proposals.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) replied that he would press his proposals to the vote.

Mr. CHEIKH ABDALLAHI (Mauritania) said that his delegation would be forced to abstain in the vote on the United Kingdom amendment because it had seen the text only in English.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that, since the question of the allocation of items to the committees of the Conference had not been discussed, he wished to speak on the substance of that part of the United Kingdom amendment, with which he radically disagreed. He supported the Yugoslav proposal for a separate vote on the second, third and fourth sentences of the first paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment.

The CHAIRMAN asked the USSR representative to submit a text embodying his views for insertion in the report.

He invited the Committee to vote on the Yugoslav proposal that the words "at least two main committees" in the first sentence of the first paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment should be replaced by "one or more committees".

The amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, recalling that the Yugoslav representative had requested a separate vote on the second, third and fourth sentences of the first paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment, invited the Committee to vote on those sentences in turn.

The second sentence was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The third sentence was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The fourth sentence was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

The paragraph as a whole, as amended orally by the United Kingdom representative, was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) observed, with regard to the second paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment, that the financial estimates of the costs of the Conference submitted by the Secretariat had been based on the assumption that the Conference would hold no more than four meetings a day, only two of them concurrently, with the exception of meetings of small or informal groups, which would not require full servicing. If the implication of the United Kingdom amendment was that more than that number of meetings would be held, the estimates would have to be revised accordingly.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) said that in submitting its amendment, her delegation had merely wished to amplify rule 45 of the rules of procedure adopted by the Committee, not to reverse the Committee's earlier decision, or to call for more than four meetings a day. However, since the matter was covered by rule 45, she withdrew the second paragraph of her amendment.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that a text along the following lines should be inserted in the report:

"Certain delegations strongly protested against violations of the order of work of the Committee and of its rules of procedure, since the question of the allocation of agenda items _____ of the Conference to its plenary and main committees was not discussed at all; it was raised by the United Kingdom representative only in the course of its consideration of the draft report and was illegally put to the vote by the Chairman of the Committee."

The CHAIRMAN observed that, since the USSR text challenged his ruling on the question of the United Kingdom amendment, he would have to put it to the vote.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against the taking of a vote on his text, since it merely embodied the views of certain

(Mr. Nasinovsky, USSR)

delegations, including his own, which indisputably had the right to have their views incorporated in the report. His delegation had not had the opportunity in the debate of explaining its views and expressing its reservations on the question of the allocation of items. He could, however, agree to the deletion of the reference to the Chairman.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand), Rapporteur, felt that, since the first paragraph of the United Kingdom amendment, which expressed the views of many delegations, had been put to the vote, the USSR text should also be put to the vote for the sake of consistency. Naturally, the USSR representative had the right to have his views recorded in the report. He therefore suggested that the sentence "A number of members were unable to agree with the proposed distribution of the items of the provisional agenda of the Conference" should be inserted after the first sentence of the first paragraph of his own amendment.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) said that even if the USSR representative omitted any reference to the Chairman in his proposed text, that text still contained an imputation against the Chairman and the Committee. Moreover, to be accurate, the words "after consultations with ... delegations" should be inserted after the words "raised by the United Kingdom representative". For those reasons, she would vote against the USSR text.

Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) felt that the USSR text should not be put to the vote, since the delegations concerned were entitled to have their views reflected in the report.

Mr. FERRO (Uruguay) opposed any restriction of the right of any member to express reservations or exceptions with regard to any part of the Committee's debates. At the same time, he could not endorse implicit or explicit censure of the Chairman, who had taken no action warranting such criticism.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) felt that the USSR representative's objection might be met by the insertion of the sentence "The USSR and other representatives regretted the mention of the matter in the report on the grounds that it had been insufficiently discussed" in the Rapporteur's text.

/...

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said, in reply to the United States representative, that his objection was not that the question of the allocation of items had been insufficiently discussed, but that it had not been discussed at all. The raising of the matter during a discussion of the Committee's report was a violation of the rules of procedure.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) moved that the Committee should adopt the Rapporteur's amendment and proceed with its consideration of the report.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had three proposals before it: the USSR amendment, the United States amendment and the Yugoslav motion. Since the USSR amendment was censorious of his actions, he invited the Committee to vote on the complete text thereof.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the Rapporteur should include in the report a sentence stating that two delegations had been deprived of their right to have their views recorded in the report.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the discussion of the report had not yet been concluded and that all delegations would have every opportunity to record their views.

Mr. BERRO (Uruguay), explaining his vote on the USSR amendment, said that the drafting of that amendment implied an unjust censure of the conduct of the Chairman, who had always done his best to find ways of reconciling conflicting views. Moreover, the Committee had in fact discussed the issue at its previous session. However, since his delegation believed that the right of any delegation to have its views explained in the report should not be infringed, it had abstained in the vote.

Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that she had voted against the USSR amendment because, although she supported the right of delegations to have their views recorded, the amendment, as drafted, failed to take account of the fact that the Committee had already adopted the words "when this section of the report was considered" at the beginning of the United Kingdom amendment; moreover, it contained an unseemly and unjustified criticism of the Chairman.

/...

Mr. WYZNER (Poland) stated that his delegation had voted for the USSR amendment because it supported the principle that every delegation was entitled to have its views recorded in the report. In his view, the text had not been meant as a censure of the Chairman; in fact, the USSR representative had been willing to delete the specific reference to the Chairman from his amendment.

Mr. FAKIL (Kenya) said that he had abstained in the vote because he felt that the kind of vote that the Committee had just taken was harmful, particularly to small Powers. Each delegation had the right to express its views, whether or not those views were shared by others.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) explained that he had voted against the USSR amendment because no procedurally illegal decisions had been taken. Moreover, while delegations had the right to have their views reflected in the summary records, that right did not extend automatically to the Committee's report, for the Committee itself must decide, either with or without a vote, what should be included in its report.

Mr. JHA (India) remarked that he had taken no part in the vote and regretted that the question had reached such a point. He strongly objected to the distribution of work proposed in the United Kingdom amendment and considered that, as the question had not been discussed in detail in the Committee, it should not have been raised as it had been. He supported the right of delegations to state their views for the record.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) felt, unlike the French representative, that any delegation's views, if pertinent and helpful, should be included in the report. He had voted against the USSR amendment, however, because of its censure of the Chairman.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines) said that he had voted against the amendment because its drafting imputed illegality to the Chairman's conduct of the proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN stated that delegations which wished to have their views recorded in the report were free to submit texts embodying those views, which would always be reflected in the report or in the summary records.