



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/CONF.32/PC/SR.25
26 July 1967
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 7 April 1967, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Organization of work (continued)

Date of the Conference and report on arrangements for the Conference
(continued)

Draft rules of procedure of the Conference (A/CONF.32/PC/6 and Corr.1)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SLIM	(Tunisia)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. BEEBY	New Zealand
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. GRONDIN	Canada
	Mr. OLARTE	Colombia
	Mr. PAOLINI	France
	Mr. GONSALVES	India
	Mr. HOVEYDA	Iran
	Mr. SCOLAMIERO	Italy
	Mr. MARTINEZ	Jamaica
	Mr. NABWERA	Kenya
	Mr. CHEIKH ABDALLAHI	Mauritania
	Mr. MOHAMMED	Nigeria
	Mr. MIRZA	Pakistan
	Mr. RIOS	Panama
	Mr. YANGO	Philippines
	Mr. CZAJKOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. WARSAMA	Somalia
	Mr. BEN AISSA	Tunisia
	Mr. NASINOVSKY	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

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN	International Labour Organisation
Mr. SALSAMENDI	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Dr. THOMEN	World Health Organization
Mr. SCHREIBER	Director, Division of Human Rights
Mr. YAKUSHKIN	Chief, Conference and Meetings Control
Mr. ROMANOV	Secretary of the Committee

Secretariat:

/...

ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting some representatives had asked him to put forward suggestions about the organization of work. With regard to the Committee's agenda and the priority to be given to certain items, he suggested that the Committee should conclude today the first item, namely, the "Date of the Conference and report on arrangements for the Conference". The Committee could then take up as item 2 "Draft rules of procedure of the Conference" and as item 3 "Provisional agenda of the Conference". It would certainly be more normal to consider the question of documentation before that of the agenda but for technical reasons the documents would not be circulated in all languages until 14 or 15 April. He therefore proposed that the Committee should take up as item 3 the "Provisional agenda of the Conference" and as item 4 "Documentation for the Conference". The "Question of participation in the Conference of regional inter-governmental organizations" would be item 5, the "Question of participation in the Conference of non-governmental organizations" would be item 6 and "Expenses of the Conference" would be item 7. He suggested the following time-table: date of the Conference: meetings of 6 and 7 April; draft rules of procedure: two meetings, if possible, those of 7 and 10 April - in any case, part of that item would be reconsidered after item 5; provisional agenda: three meetings; documentation: one or two meetings; participation of regional inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations: one meeting for each at the most - it might be possible to take up both items during a single meeting; expenses: one meeting. The Committee should finish the bulk of its work before 18 April.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was concerned that the item "Provisional agenda for the Conference" was among the first on the list and expressed the hope that items 3 and 4 could be reversed.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had changed the original order for technical reasons. If there were no objections, the Committee might adopt the order he had suggested.

It was so decided.

DATE OF THE CONFERENCE AND REPORT ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONFERENCE (continued)

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) requested clarification of the arrangements which had been made for participants in the Conference. That was an important matter for probably more than 100 countries would be represented.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also requested information about working conditions - for example, the number of participants on which the Iranian Government had based its calculations for the Conference premises and for accommodation - the cost of living, transport, climate and so on.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) asked for details about the arrangements to be made for the Press, the public and non-governmental organizations.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) pointed out, with regard to the Conference premises, that two large conferences had already been held in Teheran. Six hundred persons had attended the World Congress on the Eradication of Illiteracy organized under the auspices of UNESCO and a thousand persons had attended the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Premises were therefore available to accommodate conferences of that size. Mr. Schreiber had pointed out that the new Parliament building would be suitable. The date fixed was 22 April 1968. By that time the construction of the building could apparently be concluded and it could be put at the disposal of the United Nations sufficiently long in advance. The building could house the Press, a large public audience and a reasonable number of representatives. There were enough hotels in Teheran to accommodate a reasonable number of representatives. There were, of course, certain limitations as in the majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries but he felt that it would be possible to arrange suitable accommodation. As for the cost of living, hotel prices varied from category to category. Circulars containing detailed information would be distributed to all participants. As regards international transport, Teheran was served by nearly all companies, flights were very frequent and there was also an international airline run by an Iranian company. As regards local transport, the building which he had just mentioned was situated in the centre of the city near the present Parliament building. It was well served by transport but special bus lines were to be organized between the main hotels and the centre. Furthermore, taxis were very cheap and numerous in Teheran. With regard to the climate, the Iranian spring, which was somewhat hot, began towards the middle of April. He drew

/...

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

the Pakistan representative's attention to the information he had given at the beginning of his statement which was relevant to the question of non-governmental organizations. Teheran was equipped to receive a large number of participants but its possibilities were limited, a fact which would have to be taken into account when deciding upon invitations. On that question he was entirely in the hands of the Committee and his Government would do its utmost to carry out the Committee's decisions. Similarly, in reply to the question asked at the previous meeting by the representative of Jamaica about the Iranian Government's reaction to a possible extension of the Conference, he pointed out that his Government would comply fully with the General Assembly's decision.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that the representative of Iran had already replied to a large extent to the question asked about accommodation. However, he (Mr. Schreiber) had been informed that there were sufficient hotel rooms to enable the participants to spend a comfortable stay in Teheran and to work under good conditions. In assessing the number of participants, the Secretariat had had to make only tentative calculations; it was awaiting guidance from the Committee as to the approximate number of representatives and alternates. The Secretariat had requested that the two conference rooms (one for plenary meetings and one for other meetings) should accommodate 130 delegations. If the premises already mentioned were ready, there would be no problem and both large and small delegations could participate in the Conference. The Secretariat had assumed there would be an average of four or five representatives per country. In reaching a final figure, the Secretariat would take the Committee's decisions into account. The government conference agency at Teheran was planning to contact Governments directly and provide them with information on living conditions in the city. For its part, the Secretariat would certainly circulate in the normal way a publication containing as much practical information as possible. The Secretariat had requested the Iranian Government to ensure that the Conference facilities were the same as those available at Headquarters. There would be a very large room for plenary meetings, another for committees and smaller rooms for working groups and possible meetings of delegations, delegates' lounges, a restaurant, cable-office, post-office, travel agencies and a health service. The technical equipment would be that to which representatives were accustomed. The Secretariat had requested that the Press services of the

/...

(Mr. Schreiber, Secretariat)

United Nations and of other bodies should have the normal facilities, such as work rooms and means of communication. The Iranian Government had an excellent team of cameramen which it could use. If the question of premises was solved, the Conference facilities would be comparable to those to which representatives were accustomed at the United Nations, although some improvisation might obviously be necessary.

DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CONFERENCE (A/CONF.32/PC/6 and Corr.1)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should first hear a brief statement by the Secretariat on the rules of procedure and should then take up the draft, rule by rule.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that he would confine himself to some general observations since he would be able to make more specific comments if the draft rules were examined one by one. There was nothing original about the draft rules: in the light of long experience and of rules of procedure which had proved themselves, the Secretariat had been guided by a set of rules that had operated well, namely that of the United Nations Conference on Consular Relations. With reference to the composition of delegations, it was suggested that there should be one chairman and as many alternate representatives and advisers as Governments thought necessary. In rule 4 there was a blank space to be filled, and it might be borne in mind that the Credentials Committee of the General Assembly had nine members. The General Committee, referred to in rule 6, would of course consist of the President of the Conference, the Vice-Presidents and the chairmen of the main committees. The Secretariat was suggesting three main committees because under General Assembly resolution 2081 (XX) the agenda of the Conference would appear to fall naturally into three parts: first, review of progress made; secondly, evaluation of methods; and thirdly, preparation of a programme of further measures. The Secretariat had therefore assumed that after a series of plenary meetings, the three main committees could meet simultaneously. They would then report to the plenary Conference, which would adopt the conclusions of the Conference, for example, a Final Act consisting of a brief review of the Conference and the conclusions (resolutions, declarations or statements). The rules relating to the conduct of business were well known to United Nations representatives. Also suggested was a

(Mr. Schreiber, Secretariat)

~~Drafting committee~~, which would be useful in the preparation of the Final Act. As to languages, the Committee had already decided that there would be five official languages and four working languages. However, members might refer to the comments in paragraph 4 of the note introducing the draft rules. Nothing final had been suggested concerning inter-governmental bodies, or concerning the kind of participation of non-governmental organizations. There were certain precedents in other United Nations conferences and it was for the Committee to decide that question.

The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to discuss the rules of procedure one by one.

Title of the Conference

Mr. NASIMOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the title should mention the time and place of the Conference. The draft rules to be decided upon by the Committee were rules of procedure relating to a specific conference, and consequently the title of the Conference should be specific. He suggested that the title should be: "International Conference on Human Rights, Tehran, 22 April-13 May 1968".

The CHAIRMAN felt that it would be premature to indicate a specific date for the closing of the Conference, since no final date had as yet been fixed. In any case, it was for the Conference to decide on that matter.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) agreed with the Chairman. The exact closing date was still indefinite, and the title of the Conference might simply indicate the year 1968, and nothing more.

Mr. NASIMOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he failed to see how the question of a possible prolongation could still arise when a decision had already been taken concerning the length of the Conference. The matter was therefore settled and the Preparatory Committee could not reopen it. Moreover, the closing date was not a matter for the Conference to decide. The setting of that date depended on more important considerations, on financial considerations: it was no secret that the Conference would cost several thousand dollars a day and under the circumstances its prolongation could not be envisaged.

/...

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) pointed out that it was still not known whether the closing date was to be 11, 12 or 13 May. Consultations were still proceeding on the question and it was difficult at that stage to say what would be the final date.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) emphasized that his delegation, too, wanted the Conference to complete its work as quickly as possible. However, it did not think that specifying the closing date in the title of the Conference would in any way strengthen a decision concerning that date; to go into such detail in the title did not mean anything in itself.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) also felt that it would be premature to indicate a final closing date. He suggested a simple indication of the general time of the Conference, such as April-May 1968, and hoped that would be acceptable to the Soviet delegation.

Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said he was afraid that the Committee was becoming involved in a purely theoretical and pointless debate. It was not deciding on the time and place of the Conference, since that had already been settled by the General Assembly. It would, however, be unusual to give such details in the title, since it was customary to indicate the date and place of a meeting after the fact and not before it. The unexpected might always occur, and there was nothing to guarantee at that stage that the Conference would be held at the time and place planned; such indications in the title therefore seemed entirely uncalled for. At most, the title might indicate, if necessary, that the Conference was the first International Conference on Human Rights.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the discussion had convinced him that no member of the Committee wished the Conference to last more than three weeks. He suggested the following title as a compromise: "International Conference on Human Rights, beginning at Teheran on 22 April 1968".

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) asked the representative of the Soviet Union whether he would agree, in the same spirit of compromise, to delete the mention of the opening date of the Conference and instead retain only 1968 in the title. The wording of the title would then be simpler and more concise.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the details which the Soviet representative wished to see in the title could be mentioned in the Committee's report, and that the present title might be amended by the addition of the words "Teheran, 1968" as suggested by the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted the suggestion made by Pakistan.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) thought the suggestion excellent. He was wondering why the Conference was called "International Conference on Human Rights" and not "United Nations Conference on Human Rights".

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) pointed out that the event to be marked by the Conference was of interest to the whole world and not only the United Nations. To call it a United Nations conference would be to limit its scope and to go against its objectives.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted the turn just taken by the discussion of the Conference's title. The word "international" corresponded to the universal theme of the meeting, which would have other participants as well as United Nations Members.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) explained that he had not made any proposal, but had simply asked a question.

The CHAIRMAN then suggested that the title of the Conference should be: "International Conference on Human Rights, Teheran, 1968".

It was so decided.

Rule 1

The CHAIRMAN read out draft rule 1 in document A/CONF.32/C.2/6.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) commented that the very complete rules of procedure drafted by the Secretariat followed the lines of those used at previous conferences organized by the United Nations. The International Conference on Human Rights, however, would be very different from the conferences whose rules had been used as a model, for example, the United Nations Conference on Consular Relations, and he wished to know to what extent that difference had prompted changes in the rules appropriate to a conference given the task of drawing up a legal instrument.

/...

Mr. NASIMOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the doubts of the New Zealand representative. The forthcoming Conference would not meet to draft an international convention, but would bring together diplomatic representatives who would make recommendations. Hence a drafting committee, which was needed to prepare the text of an international convention, was unnecessary in the case of the International Conference on Human Rights.

He was surprised that the rules of procedure should mention the holding of several meetings at the same time, when it was agreed that not more than two meetings would be held simultaneously.

He thought it unwise to introduce provisions concerning consultations with non-governmental organizations.

The CHAIRMAN felt that, no matter how special the proposed Conference was, the Committee would be wise to avoid an unproductive general discussion of the principles on which the draft rules of procedure had been based and to take up the text of the rules, for the Committee must give the Conference a working tool in its rules of procedure.

Mr. BOERO (Uruguay) said that while, at first glance, the rules of procedure of one organ might seem inapplicable to another organ discussing different questions, in fact there were similarities in the conduct of debates which was governed by the rules of procedure. A drafting committee was useful in any conference to review the form of the texts adopted and to ensure that they would not be subject to differing legal interpretations.

Moreover, the rules of procedure contained optional provisions, and the Conference would be entirely free to use them or not.

As some conferences had distinctive characteristics, he asked the Director of the Division of Human Rights whether the drafters of the rules of procedure had taken into consideration the special features of the International Conference on Human Rights.

Mr. NABWEERA (Kenya) understood that some delegations were perturbed because the draft rules of procedure were based on the rules of procedure of the Conference on Consular Relations; but he shared the Chairman's view that the draft rules should be considered one by one rather than as a whole, for that could only prolong the discussion.

/...

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) thought that questions relating to human rights were not as different as had been suggested from questions relating to consular conventions, which also dealt with human rights.

He agreed with the Kenyan representative and the Chairman that the Committee should consider the draft rules of procedure rule by rule and should add such rules as might be necessary.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that in fact that procedure would be the best and would permit any additions or deletions that might be required.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) considered that the draft rules of procedure, which the Secretariat had prepared on the basis of a text which had served well at a previous conference, should not be regarded as a proposal to be accepted or rejected but merely as guidance for the Committee, which remained free to modify the rules to meet the requirements of the Conference. They were an excellent basis for discussion, and, as the Chairman had suggested, they should be considered one by one.

The CHAIRMAN, as there was no objection, invited members to consider the draft rules of procedure rule by rule, and asked whether they wished to decide at the present time on the number of accredited representatives which had been left blank in rule 1.

Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) thought that the point should be settled at once because of the problem of housing all the persons participating in or attending the Conference. He asked if the Iranian representative had a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that it would be wise to suggest a figure to the General Assembly, and that the Committee might, in deciding the question, assume that the Conference would have three committees at most.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that each delegation should include "not more than three" accredited representatives, in addition to the chairman of the delegation, or a maximum of four, and that the number of alternate representatives and advisers should be left for each State to decide.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) thought that the Committee should decide on the structure of the Conference, including the number of committees, before fixing the number of accredited representatives. The Committee might provisionally limit the number of accredited representatives to three and consider later whether that figure should not be lowered.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that the Committee should take into consideration Iran's geographical position (for many countries, the travel costs of representatives would not be very high), the number of visitors which Teheran could accommodate, and the fact that the actual number of representatives depended in the last analysis on the Governments themselves.

Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) thought that members should hold informal consultations and should defer the decision on the number of accredited representatives until the following meeting.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with the USSR representative that it would be wise to fix a ceiling; three might be taken as a tentative figure, and the final decision would be deferred until after consultations had been held.

Rule 2

The CHAIRMAN said that rule 2 was redundant, as it was covered by implication in rule 1.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) shared that view and proposed that rule 2 should be deleted.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that almost all rules of procedure contained provisions similar to rule 2. In the case of a delegation consisting of only one representative and two advisers who might normally be assigned to the embassy at Teheran, if that rule were deleted there would be some doubt as to the right of those advisers to replace the representative and to vote. Rule 2 should therefore be retained.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said that he had no objection to the retention of rule 2 if the USSR representative wished it.

/...

Mr. BERO (Uruguay) observed that from the legal standpoint and in the light of rule 4 on credentials, rule 1 and rule 2 did not overlap: the persons entitled to vote were those whose credentials had been confirmed by the Credentials Committee. Rule 2 enabled the chairman of a delegation, who held the credentials issued by his country, to confer the status of representative on an alternate or an adviser. Rule 2 dealt, not with credentials conferred by the State but with powers delegated by the chairman of the delegation. For that reason, he thought that rule 2 should be retained.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) asked the Director of the Division of Human Rights whether the words "upon designation" meant that the chairman of the delegation informally assigned a member of his delegation to sit in his place, or whether he officially advised the President of the Conference that a member of the delegation would sit as representative.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) noted that United Nations practice covered the provisions of rule 2; it was, in fact, customary for the person who occupied the representative's seat to be regarded as the representative, without official designation. It was wise, however, to include that rule in the legal document establishing the rules of procedure of the Conference.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that it was important for the proper functioning of the Conference that the names of the representatives who were entitled to take part in discussions and to vote should be known at all times. Despite the practice mentioned by the Tunisian representative, a number of delegations submitted to the Secretary-General, at each session of the General Assembly, the names of the alternate representatives or advisers accredited as representatives for a given period.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that rule 2 should be retained, with the understanding that, as in the United Nations, written notification should be sent to the secretariat of the Conference.

/...

Rule 3

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said, with reference to the first sentence, that his delegation was surprised at the stipulation that the credentials of representatives and the names of members of delegations should be submitted twenty-four hours "after", and not before, the opening of the Conference, as would seem natural. He also wondered whether that period was sufficient. Rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly stipulated that the credentials of representatives and the names of members of delegations should be submitted not less than one week before the date fixed for the opening of the Assembly session.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) remarked that, while at Headquarters, where all the States had permanent missions, it was possible for them to notify the Secretary-General in advance of the membership of the delegations which were to represent them, that was not so easy in the case of meetings held away from Headquarters, such as the Conference at Teheran, where perhaps not all States were represented. He was therefore in favour of retaining the word "after" in rule 3.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed those comments. Far from being an error, the provision in rule 3 was practical and fully justified by the circumstances. He knew from experience that when non-permanent bodies met away from Headquarters, the delegations brought their credentials with them to the place of the meeting, and, as the possibility of late arrivals could not be excluded, members of delegations were normally allowed the twenty-four-hour respite provided for in the present text. It should, moreover, be remembered that very few delegations would be able to submit credentials before the opening date, and the opening of the Conference might thus be delayed.

The CHAIRMAN said the arguments of the Yugoslav and USSR representatives were borne out by the facts; it was true, as they had said, that not all States were represented at Teheran and that it would therefore be difficult for them to submit the credentials of their delegations to the Executive Secretary twenty-four hours before the opening of the Conference. Moreover, even if the rule was adopted as it now stood in document A/CONF.32/PC/6, it should not be rigidly applied, because some delegations might be unable to arrive until two or three days after the opening. Some degree of flexibility was therefore necessary.

/...

Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that, even in the case of meetings of permanent organs held under United Nations auspices away from Headquarters, the delegations brought their credentials with them. The respite provided was thus both practical and of great importance.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, if the representative of Nigeria raised no objection, he would take it that the Committee was in favour of retaining the word "after".

He suggested that, in the French text of the first sentence, the words "le nom" in the first line should be put in the plural. Also, as it was stated in rule 16 that the Secretary-General of the United Nations was to be the Secretary-General of the Conference, the wording of the two rules should be made consistent by replacing the words "Executive Secretary" by the words "Secretary-General" in rule 3.

Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) saw no contradiction between the two rules mentioned by the Chairman. It was stated in rule 16, paragraph 2, that the Secretary-General should appoint an Executive Secretary of the Conference, and it was to the latter, not to the Secretary-General, that credentials were to be submitted.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that replacing the words "Executive Secretary" by the words "Secretary-General" might mislead Governments into thinking that the credentials were to be submitted to the Secretary-General in New York. In order to avoid any such misunderstanding, it should perhaps be stated that the credentials were to be submitted to "the secretary-general of the Conference", reserving the possibility of making further specifications on the matter later.

Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said he was not sure that he had quite followed the suggestion of Iran and asked whether the Conference was to have a secretary-general other than the Secretary-General of the United Nations. If, on the contrary, the secretary-general of the Conference and the Secretary-General of the United Nations were one and the same person, then the Chairman's suggestion and the suggestion of the Iranian representative had the same object. He asked whether by endorsing the Iranian proposal the Committee would be changing the meaning of rule 16.

/...

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed the Iranian representative's comments. It should be made clear that it was to the secretary-general of the Conference that the credentials were to be submitted. Further specifications concerning the person of the secretary-general of the Conference and his appointment would be given later.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) proposed that the expression contained in the present text of the rule should be retained but should be further defined. The words "Executive Secretary of the Conference" should be used, so that it was clear at once who was meant, and the powers of the Executive Secretary should be defined at a later point.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) admitted that the term "executive secretary" might give rise to a misunderstanding. Although there was no serious inconvenience in the credentials being submitted to the Secretary-General in New York, as the Secretariat could forward them by cable to Teheran immediately, there was every advantage, as the representative of Iran had rightly observed, in avoiding any possibility of confusion and making the necessary provisions to ensure that credentials would be submitted directly to the executive secretary of the Conference.

The statement in rule 16, paragraph 1 that the Secretary-General was to be the Secretary-General of the Conference was merely a traditional formula. In practice - as was clearly stated in General Assembly resolution 2081 (XX) - the Secretary-General would appoint an executive secretary from within the Secretariat to service the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the proposals - firstly, his own proposal concerning the French text and, secondly, that made by the representative of France, so that the first sentence of rule 3 would be amended to read: "The credentials of representatives and the names of alternate representatives and advisers shall be submitted to the Executive Secretary of the Conference if possible not later than twenty-four hours after the opening of the Conference."

Rule 3, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

Rule 4

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) proposed that the number 9 should be inserted in the blank space in the second sentence. The Credentials Committee of the Conference would consist of nine members, like the ~~Credentials~~ Committee of the General Assembly, whose membership was defined in rule 28 of the Assembly's rules of procedure.

The proposal was approved.

Rule 4 was adopted.

Rule 5

Rule 5 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.