



**C O N T E N T S**

Page

Agenda item 62:

Advisory services in the field of human rights (*continued*) ..... 185

**Chairman: Mr. Omar LOUTFI (Egypt).**

**AGENDA ITEM 62**

**Advisory services in the field of human rights  
(A/2956, A/2943, chapter VI, section III, section VI, paras. 667 to 671, section XI, para. 714) (*continued*)**

**GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)**

1. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that after examining the text of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption by the General Assembly (Council resolution 586 E (XX)) and listening with equal attention to the statement of the United States representative and the arguments of the delegations opposed to the draft resolution, the Belgian delegation felt that much good might ensue from the adoption of the proposed draft. The proposal was to set up advisory services in the field of human rights in the form of advisory services of experts, scholarships and fellowships, and seminars. It was explicitly provided that the proposed assistance would be furnished only at the request of Governments and that requesting Governments would, as far as possible, assume responsibility for all or at least a large proportion of the expenses incurred; there was thus no question of giving advice to countries which would not welcome it, or of intervening in any way in the domestic affairs of the States concerned. Moreover, the new type of assistance would not apply to fields in which a specialized agency was already providing adequate assistance or which were covered by existing technical assistance programmes. There would therefore be no duplication and the proposed services would relate only to problems for which no provision had yet been made. Lastly, the resolution was designed to achieve the very desirable end of integrating the programmes approved by the General Assembly in resolutions 729 (VIII), 730 (VIII) and 839 (IX) in a broad programme of technical assistance in the field of human rights.

2. Turning to the objections which had so far been made against the draft resolution, she said that her delegation had not found them persuasive. It was possible that the number of countries requesting technical assistance in such a special field would not be very large but that was no reason to refuse aid to those

countries which desired it and could profit greatly by it. It was natural that a country in the early stages of development should seek to make reforms in its civil or criminal legislation or even in its judicial organization, and that it would wish in so doing to base itself on foreign legislation which had proved good and useful in the light of experience. The process was a familiar one, but the intervention of the Secretary-General, in the form envisaged, could facilitate matters greatly.

3. The Belgian delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution under discussion. However, it felt that the Lebanese representative had been right in drawing the Committee's attention to subparagraph 3 (b). The sub-paragraph might lead to confusion and it would be well to alter the beginning of the sub-paragraph in order to make it clearer.

4. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that at the end of the previous meeting, after listening attentively to the brilliant statements of the United States and United Kingdom representatives, his delegation had felt somewhat at a loss. It was difficult to make any judgement in one direction or another, when, on the same question, the highly qualified representatives of two major Powers which were members of the Commission on Human Rights and of the Economic and Social Council and whose history bore witness to a continuing effort to promote respect for human rights both at home and abroad, reached entirely different, not to say diametrically opposed, conclusions. The choice was made all the more difficult by the fact that the arguments on both sides were undoubtedly weighty. Nevertheless, a decision had to be made, and after considerable reflection the Netherlands delegation was happy to announce that it would vote in favour of the draft resolution, subject to possible alterations in form, for the following reasons.

5. First, the need for advisory services in the field of human rights was widely recognized. It was true that the Secretariat had so far received only one request for assistance in that field, despite the opportunity which already existed for Governments to obtain assistance for programmes for the promotion and safeguarding of the rights of women, the eradication of discrimination and the protection of minorities, and for the promotion of freedom of information, but, as the United States representative had very pertinently pointed out, the General Assembly's decisions on those programmes were quite recent and some time would be needed for States to grasp their practical bearing and gradually to realize the opportunities offered to them. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that General Assembly resolutions 729 (VIII) and 730 (VIII) had been adopted without opposition, one by forty-seven votes and the other by forty-one, and that resolution 839 (XI), which related to technical assistance in the

field of freedom of information, had received the votes of fifty-three delegations. In view of the majorities which had voted in favour of the resolutions relating to the fields of assistance with which the Committee was concerned, it was reasonable to conclude that the States composing them had had in mind not only the needs of others but also their own, and that, consequently, advisory services in the field of human rights would fill a genuine want.

6. On the other hand, the representative of the United Kingdom had said that in questions relating to human rights, it was not so much technical assistance that counted as the goodwill which Governments could show in securing respect for those rights. The importance of goodwill was undeniable, but the argument would seem to be particularly applicable to the provisions of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (E/2573, annex I). It was true that the recognition and protection of freedom of speech, of conscience and religion or, in normal circumstances, of freedom of assembly and association, depended to a large extent, if not entirely, on the goodwill of Governments. The position was quite different in regard to economic, social and cultural rights, because the State must not only be willing to promote them and to guarantee their exercise, but must also be capable of doing so. As all knew, there were many States which despite all their goodwill had not so far been able to secure the exercise of the rights in question as fully as could be desired, and that was why article 2 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/2573, annex I) provided that the parties to it would undertake to take steps to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the covenant. The use of the word "progressively" showed clearly that the difficulties which certain States might, despite all their goodwill, encounter in giving effect to the rights in question was recognized, and the provision therefore implied that there was a need for assistance and advice in regard to the steps to be taken in order to achieve the purpose in mind as rapidly and effectively as possible.

7. He had, of course, some doubts regarding the frequency of requests, but his delegation felt that since the need existed, a way must be found to satisfy it. The draft resolution proposed by the Council was designed to do that and the Netherlands delegation would vote in favour of it, provided no alterations were made in its substance.

8. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) thought that the draft resolution proposed by the Economic and Social Council would make it possible to take an important step forward in the field of human rights because, by widening the field of action of United Nations technical assistance, it would make it possible to supply Governments which so requested with advice on the way to attain one of the fundamental objectives set forth in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter and to fulfil the obligation incumbent upon them under Article 55 c within the framework of international economic and social co-operation. Despite the inadequacy of the fund provided to carry out the new programme and the relatively small number of requests submitted to date, the Guatemalan delegation felt that the programme should be adopted for the benefit of those States which honestly thought that they needed the assistance it

could offer them in order to make the implementation of human rights in their territory more effective. Everybody agreed that in the field of economic, social and cultural rights, no country was completely satisfied with matters as they stood. Any step towards the implementation of those rights was only one stage leading to a higher stage, and Governments which put in requests for assistance would in so doing prove that they aspired to improve existing conditions in regard to the rights in question.

9. The mere enunciation of human rights in national or international legislation was not enough to translate them into reality; only their full and effective realization could have any real value in the life of nations and individuals. The implementation of the rights recognized by the internal legislation of a country required a constant effort of education, to enable the inhabitants to understand them in so far as they and others were concerned. The private organizations which were set up every time new rights were recognized in a country showed how necessary that effort was. That was the case in countries such as Guatemala, for example, where women had only recently acquired political rights and where the promulgation of those rights had had to be followed immediately by an intensive campaign to explain to women what those rights meant, how they were exercised, what obligations they carried with them and how they must be safeguarded.

10. The draft resolution, which provided that the proposed assistance would be granted only at the request of Governments, would promote the well-being of peoples by enabling them to take fuller advantage of their rights; her delegation would therefore vote in favour of it.

11. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that his delegation could support the draft resolution proposed by the Council, with certain amendments. It would like to see the last part of paragraph 3 (b), from the words "which shall indicate", deleted; it also proposed that the end of paragraph 3 (c) should be amended to read: "by making a contribution either in cash, or in the form of supporting staff, services and payment of local costs, for the purpose of carrying out the programme".

12. If those amendments were accepted, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution; otherwise, it would abstain.

13. Mrs. RÖESSEL (Sweden) pointed out that the draft resolution before the Committee was one of the three texts proposed in 1953 by the United States delegation,<sup>1</sup> which had stated that they were not intended as substitutes for the International Covenants on Human Rights. Her delegation had noted that statement; it still believed that the Committee's main task in the sphere of human rights was to consider the draft covenants (E/2573, annex I) with a view to their entry into force at the earliest possible date. The United Nations technical assistance programmes and the work of the specialized agencies could be extended to cover the proposed activities; the new programme would therefore duplicate existing programmes. It could be argued that gaps might appear in those programmes and that the proposed services would then

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 8*, paras. 263, 269 and 271.

be useful; her delegation did not think that it was possible to forecast just what those gaps would be and, although she had listened attentively to the statements of the United States representative and other representatives who favoured the draft resolution, she would abstain in the vote on it.

14. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) was glad to note that the draft resolution was not intended to replace the covenants on human rights. That was particularly reassuring since two years previously a similar problem had given rise to similar fears and the adoption of the resolution on technical assistance in freedom of information (General Assembly resolution 839 (IX)) had resulted in the adjournment *sine die* of discussion of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information. On the other hand, while the resolution was harmless, it was also virtually useless. The assistance required in the field of human rights could not properly be described as technical. Technical assistance was applicable to economic problems and technology proper rather than to individuals or nations. The proposed assistance should be based on the principle that, in matters of human rights, evolution must take place from within and must derive the necessary stimulus from the aspirations of the individuals concerned. The technical aspect of the question was not relevant.

15. With regard to the forms of assistance contemplated, namely, advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships, and seminars, they might be of some use but he wondered whether the programme was not over-ambitious, since the total budget for the programme was a mere \$60,000, of which \$45,000 would be allocated to assistance in freedom of information. Even taking into account the fact that that was only a beginning, the proposed allocations were ludicrously small. Furthermore, as far as freedom of information was concerned, it was a moral rather than a technical problem. It might be possible to improve printing processes and the output of information media through technical assistance but not to ensure that freedom of information was enjoyed by all. That was why his delegation, which hoped that the draft Convention on Freedom of Information would reappear on the agenda, had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution that had been adopted as General Assembly resolution 839 (IX).

16. He agreed with what the United Kingdom representative had said (660th meeting) concerning the fundamental importance of education. Nevertheless he did not wish to stand in the way of those who expected good results from the draft resolution and it might well be adopted, on a trial basis at least, for a year or two.

17. He had listened carefully to the United States representative's statement at the 660th meeting; referring to the passage she had quoted from a statement by President Eisenhower concerning the subjugation of peoples by totalitarian Governments, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that besides the peoples to whom the President of the United States had referred, there were also peoples who were dominated by countries which practised the highest forms of democracy at home but which had not seen fit to apply the same democratic principles to the other peoples for whose destinies they were responsible.

18. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) considered that the United States representative's statement at the previous meeting was eloquent proof of that country's interest in the cause of human rights. She was glad that the United States had sponsored the text before the Committee, the object of which was to promote the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world through technical assistance.

19. Her delegation had always stressed the importance of the technical assistance programmes, particularly for under-developed countries. That was why she had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 729 (VIII), on promoting and safeguarding the rights of women and, at the twentieth session of the Economic and Social Council, in favour of the text before the Committee.

20. According to that text the General Assembly would authorize the Secretary-General "to make provision at the request of Governments" for technical assistance in the field of human rights. That was a new form of technical assistance, of which her Government entirely approved; the results could not but be satisfactory.

21. The draft resolution could not be regarded as a substitute for the covenants. It was a further effort on the part of the United Nations to assist Governments in the important and varied field of human rights and her delegation would vote in favour of it.

22. Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey) noted that the purpose of the draft resolution was to extend technical assistance to the field of human rights. The object of the draft resolution was to promote universal respect for and effective observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms by means of advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships, and seminars. To that end it provided for machinery separate from that set up by the United Nations to carry out the regular programme and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. The funds would not come from the same sources and it would be for the Secretary-General to take the expenditure involved in the new assistance programme into account in preparing the United Nations budget estimates.

23. The resolution on the subject adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its eleventh session<sup>2</sup> had been couched in less general terms than the text under discussion and had specified the fields in which assistance might be given. His delegation had felt at that time that a general formula would be preferable to a restrictive list, and it had therefore been glad to see the Economic and Social Council adopt a text providing for the application of technical assistance to "any subject in the field of human rights".

24. In his delegation's opinion, any assistance which the Secretary-General gave to Governments should be rendered in accordance with the general principles stated in annex I to Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX), of which he quoted paragraph 2, sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (d), and paragraph 3. Assistance in the form of advisory services would certainly promote the recognition and exercise of human rights and would continue to be useful even after the covenants had been signed and ratified. His

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 6, para. 142 and annex I, draft resolution D.

delegation therefore approved of the draft resolution before the Committee.

25. He could not accept the change in paragraph 3 (b) suggested by the representative of Afghanistan; under the terms of resolution 222 A (IX) the selection of persons and of the host country was subject to the agreement of the applicant countries. He had no objection to the Afghan amendment to paragraph 3 (c).

26. Mr. McCLURE-SMITH (Australia) said that his delegation had on a number of occasions expressed its views on the question of advisory services in the field of human rights. The United Nations should devote the limited resources available for the regular programme and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance to those spheres in which the best results might be anticipated. Moreover, in the view of the Australian Government it would be unwise to contemplate giving technical assistance where there might be little demand for it. The Australian delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolutions 729 (VIII) and 730 (VIII). In the past two years the Secretariat had in fact received very few requests for assistance in promoting and safeguarding the rights of women or the prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities.

27. The Australian delegation had also abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 839 (IX) and Economic and Social Council resolution 574 A (XIX), both of which related to the promotion of freedom of information by means of a technical assistance programme, because it had feared that such a new programme might endanger existing ones and have financial implications which could not readily be foreseen. Australia was by no means opposed to the granting of technical assistance in the field of freedom of information, as it had shown by helping certain countries within the framework of the Colombo Plan, but there was a great difference between limited assistance of that kind and a general programme of advisory services such as was proposed in the draft resolution.

28. That being so, it seemed hardly wise to authorize the Secretary-General to render assistance in ill-defined spheres and for vague purposes, especially since United Nations bodies and some of the specialized agencies, such as UNESCO for example, could probably do the work in question. Furthermore, as the Australian delegation had pointed out in the Economic and Social Council, the terms of the draft resolution seemed to be inconsistent with the method that had been used for the past year by the Technical Assistance Board in working out country programmes. Lastly, as various representatives had said, it was doubtful whether the techniques used in assistance programmes could help States to solve the difficulties with which they were confronted in the field of human rights.

29. The objections previously raised by the Australian delegation had therefore lost nothing of their validity. Until the need for a new programme of advisory services was more evident and it could be put into effect without endangering existing programmes, the Australian delegation would not feel obliged to change its attitude. He would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

30. Mrs. HOUCK (Canada) agreed that the United Nations must do its utmost to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental

freedoms. That had certainly been the aim of the Economic and Social Council in adopting the draft resolution. However, although the purpose was clear, it was by no means certain that the contemplated programme would be the most effective means of attaining it.

31. Some speakers had considered that the programme of advisory services would fill a gap. If such a gap existed, she felt that it might more appropriately be filled under the existing educational programmes of specialized agencies such as UNESCO and the International Labour Organisation. The United Nations could co-ordinate all activities designed to further the observance of human rights, and expenses should be met out of the regular budget. The Canadian delegation, however, doubted whether at the current time there were many types of advisory services in the field of human rights which were not already being provided either by the United Nations or by the specialized agencies or under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

32. She recognized the good intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but was sceptical of the practical value of the three forms of assistance contemplated. It seemed doubtful that many Governments would ask for advisory services of experts, since to do so would be to admit that their legislation was inadequate. With regard to fellowships and seminars, the people who benefited by them might not be in a position to disseminate very widely the knowledge they had acquired.

33. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution laid a very heavy responsibility upon the Secretary-General. In particular, it made him responsible for deciding in the last analysis what type of services he thought it appropriate to render.

34. Furthermore, Governments requesting assistance would have to assume all or a large part of the expenditure in connexion with the assistance they received. In view of the financial and economic difficulties experienced by a number of countries, it seemed doubtful whether many Governments would submit requests.

35. She would not vote against the suggested programme, although she did not anticipate any very valuable results. She would consider voting for it if the Economic and Social Council were requested to submit to the General Assembly at its thirteenth session a report containing an evaluation of the projects carried out within the framework of the programme, with particular reference to the extent to which those projects had promoted the purposes and principles of the Charter in the field of human rights. The Economic and Social Council should also be requested to submit recommendations to the General Assembly with regard to the future of the programme. She hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would be able to accept her proposal for the addition of an operative paragraph along the lines indicated.

36. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution both in the Commission of Human Rights and in the Economic and Social Council, since its purpose was to promote respect for human rights in the world, an aim to which the Indian Government attached the greatest importance. Some of the opponents of the draft resolution had said that it would not be enough to establish advisory services in the field of human rights. It should be emphasized, however, that the term "advisory serv-

ices" was used in a very wide sense. A number of delegations had argued that the draft resolution was unnecessary because of the small number of requests that had been received; in fact, however, Governments would only feel the need of those services when they had been established.

37. In Mr. D'Souza's opinion the forms of assistance contemplated were entirely satisfactory; in particular the seminars would permit fruitful exchanges of information.

38. He considered the draft resolution to be of an educational and provisional nature. The system of assistance it established should be replaced at some future time by the machinery envisaged in the draft covenants. He had no objection to the amendment proposed by the Canadian delegation, although he did not think it essential since the contemplated programme would certainly have good results.

39. Mr. CHENG (China) thanked the United States delegation for its excellent suggestion. The draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council proposed a new means of promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms as prescribed in the United Nations Charter. As had been pointed out, the amount provided in the United Nations budget for 1956 was modest, but he was convinced that if the requests received exceeded the amount provided, the Secretary-General would be able to find some way of acceding to them in the hope that a larger sum would be allocated to the programme the following year.

40. The Chinese delegation would support the draft resolution and the Canadian amendment. It agreed that it would be well to make an evaluation in two or three years and to decide whether there was any need to modify the amount allocated to the programme and the methods used.

41. He hoped that the specialized agencies and the non-governmental organizations which were dedicated to the cause of human rights would spare no effort to ensure the success of the programme.

42. Mrs. LORD (United States of America) had some comments to make on the suggestions and amendments put forward. She agreed with the representatives of Egypt and Saudi Arabia that \$60,000 was a small sum but thought that it was advisable to begin on a modest scale and see how Governments reacted and how great their interest was.

43. At the previous meeting, the representative of Lebanon had asked for information on two points, the first of which concerned operative paragraph 3 (a). She took it for granted that the experts would have to be approved by the recipient countries and thought that the Secretary-General would share that view. In regard to the second point, which concerned operative paragraph 3 (d), she agreed that it would be well to be more precise and to say: "in addition to the subjects covered by the resolutions dealing with human rights".

44. She was quite prepared to accept the Afghan amendment to operative paragraph 3 (c), which improved the text, but was not in favour of deleting the latter part of operative paragraph 3 (b), because that clause defined the procedure to be followed. She, too, thought that it would be desirable to provide for a review of the programme and therefore accepted the Canadian amendment.

45. She proposed the addition of a new paragraph, which would become paragraph 8, reading as follows:

*"Requests the Secretary-General to inform Member States of this new programme and of the procedures to be followed in obtaining assistance."*

The Canadian amendment would thus become paragraph 9.

46. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) confirmed that the position in regard to experts was as stated by the United States representative. He could assure the Committee that the Secretary-General would never force an expert on a Government against its will.

47. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said that the draft resolution served two purposes. The first was to fuse the technical assistance programmes already approved by the General Assembly into a single programme, which was a definite improvement from the administrative standpoint. The second purpose was to authorize the Secretary-General to take steps to provide certain forms of assistance in the field of human rights.

48. While he understood the misgivings expressed by some representatives, and by the United Kingdom representative in particular, he would nevertheless vote for the draft resolution, which, in his opinion, would hasten progress towards the universal and effective observance of human rights.

49. He could not support the Afghan amendment to operative paragraph 3 (b), but would support the amendment to operative paragraph 3 (c). He was also in favour of the Canadian amendment.

50. It seemed to him that another way of meeting the Lebanese representative's point might be to substitute the word "relevant" for the word "existing" in paragraph 3 (d).

51. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) thanked the United States representative for supporting his amendment to operative paragraph 3 (c). He regretted, however, that she had not found it possible to accept his amendment to operative paragraph 3 (b) and thought it might be helpful to explain the position more fully.

52. If the United States representative was concerned to ensure that host countries should not be obliged to receive fellows and scholars whom they regarded as undesirable, that concern was unnecessary, since, as the representative of the Secretary-General had stated, there would be no question of forcing anyone on a Government.

53. The United States representative had said that the clause in question defined the procedure to be followed. It was doubtful, however, whether such a definition was necessary, particularly as the new paragraph proposed by the United States provided that Member States would be informed by the Secretary-General of the procedure to be followed.

54. He said he was prepared, if necessary, to give further clarifications with regard to the amendment.

55. Mrs. SHARON (Israel) said that her delegation would support the draft resolution, just as it had supported the draft resolutions the General Assembly had adopted at its eighth and ninth sessions on the subject of the rights of women, discrimination and freedom of information (resolutions 729 (VIII), 730 (VIII) and 839 (IX)).

56. In her opinion, every possible step should be taken to help countries towards a better appreciation of the importance of human rights and to promote the



development of a world climate favourable to the implementation of the covenants.

57. Israel had actively participated in United Nations technical assistance programmes mainly, though not exclusively, as a recipient country; it was therefore in a position to assess the value of the proposed programme. There was no reason to be discouraged at the small number of applications submitted under the three programmes approved by the General Assembly at its eighth and ninth sessions. As the United States representative had pointed out, it necessarily took some time to set a programme in motion and Governments would only gradually become fully aware of all the advantages it offered.

58. She did not see why a country should be deprived of advisory services in the field of human rights if it considered—and it itself was the sole judge—that it was in more urgent need of such assistance than of assistance in the field of industry, social welfare or public administration.

59. It had been asserted that some countries would fear interference in their domestic affairs or would be reluctant to request assistance in the field of human rights. It would be unfair to deprive those who did not share such fears of the benefits of the proposed programme.

60. The programme would in no way compete with existing technical assistance programmes, but would serve as a useful supplement to them. Any overlapping was precluded by the terms in which the resolution was drafted. The appropriation proposed was small, because the bulk of the costs would be borne by the Governments submitting requests.

61. She supported the Canadian amendment. In her opinion it was a sound idea to evaluate the programme in the light of a few years' experience.

62. The United Nations had devoted much time and effort to the question of human rights; it would therefore be logical for it to offer its services to States which wished to take constructive action in that sphere. That might well be an effective, if unspectacular, method of furthering the attainment of the high objectives of the Charter.

63. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that both in the Third Committee and in the Commission on Human Rights her delegation had consistently supported resolutions providing for the establishment of technical assistance services in the field of human rights.

64. She had listened with great interest to the statements of different representatives and particularly to that of the representative of Belgium, who had rightly emphasized the importance of the paragraphs specifying

that assistance would be rendered to such Governments as requested it after they had decided what kind of assistance they desired and after agreement with the Governments concerned.

65. The representative of Saudi Arabia had reiterated the fear, which was shared by a number of representatives, that those measures were designed to replace the covenants. But the representative of the United States had repeatedly stated that that was not her intention; Mrs. Tsaldaris was pleased to recall those statements.

66. She did not share the scepticism of some representatives, who felt that only a small number of requests would be received. In her view, the programme would be of real value and would serve the cause of human rights.

67. She commended the Canadian representative for her valuable suggestion and thanked the United States representative for her proposal. She would consider all the amendments submitted and would vote for the draft resolution.

68. Mr. FERNANDEZ ESCALANTE (Argentina) said that he would vote for the draft resolution, which would extend the benefits of technical assistance to the field of human rights. He was sure that the services proposed would promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and, consequently, human progress and the maintenance of world peace. His delegation was always anxious to avoid unnecessary expenditure, but was bound to admit that, in the case under consideration, the appropriation requested was a very modest one.

69. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Egypt) thought that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities should be included among the bodies mentioned in operative paragraph 4, since discrimination was one of the spheres covered by the draft resolution. He also hoped that it would be possible for the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press to resume its work, in which event it should also receive the reports mentioned in operative paragraph 4.

70. Mr. BAKHTIAR (Pakistan) paid a tribute to the efforts made by the United States delegation and said that, as the representative of a country which had benefited from technical assistance, he would vote for the draft resolution. He must, however, reserve his delegation's position in regard to the amendments submitted.

71. The CHAIRMAN announced that the general debate was closed.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.