



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/CONF.32/PC/SR.38  
26 July 1967  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

---

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL  
CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 19 April 1967, at 3.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Expenses of the Conference (Conference Room Paper No. 12) (continued)  
Agenda of the Conference

67-36001

/...

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SLIM	(Tunisia)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. BEEBY	New Zealand
<u>Members:</u>	Miss FLETCHER	Canada
	Mr. PAOLINI	France
	Mr. PIPARSANILA	India
	Mr. JALILI	Iran
	Mr. FRANZI )	
	Mr. SCOLAMIERO )	Italy
	Miss MARTINEZ	Jamaica
	Mr. FAKIH	Kenya
	Mr. CHEIKH ABDALLAH	Mauritania
	Mr. MOHAMMED	Nigeria
	Mr. CZAJKOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. BEN AISSA	Tunisia
	Mr. NASINOVSKY	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Miss RICHARDS	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. CATES )	
	Mrs. PAULOS )	United States of America
	Mr. BERRO	Uruguay
	Mr. LAZAREVIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. SCHREIBER	Director, Division of Human Rights
	Mr. HOFFMAN	Office of the Controller
	Mr. ROMANOV	Secretary of the Committee

EXPENSES OF THE CONFERENCE (Conference Room Paper No. 12) (continued)

Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretariat) recalled that the Nigerian representative had asked for an explanation of the difference between the preliminary costs estimates relating directly to the Conference if held at Geneva, which appeared in annex II of the first progress report of the Preparatory Committee (A/6354), and the estimates of the corresponding costs shown in Conference Room Paper No. 12. The difference was due to the fact that some of the assumptions on which the original estimates had been based had had to be revised to take into account certain new circumstances and the latest information. Thus the estimates of costs in Conference Room Paper No. 12 took into account the fact that some documents would be translated into Chinese, that the volume of documentation to be published during the Conference would be greater than had been anticipated, that a total of twenty-one rather than fourteen staff members from Headquarters would be needed at Teheran, and, finally, that in the meantime there had been an increase in the salaries of conference staff. The difference between the original estimates of the total cost of the Conference if held at Geneva and the corresponding current estimates was attributable to the same causes, plus the fact that instead of 900 pages of pre-Conference documentation a total of 1,450 pages was now anticipated. Finally, the major factors giving rise to the difference between the estimates of expenses for Geneva and for Teheran respectively were the additional travel costs involved, as the round trip air fare New York-Geneva cost about \$600 and that of New York-Teheran about \$1,100, and the rates of travel subsistence for Geneva and Teheran were \$15 per diem and \$21 per diem respectively.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to section III - post-Conference costs, said his delegation was surprised to note that twenty-one typists were to be provided to type a report which would be only seventy-five pages long. The figure for typists seemed excessive, even considering that the text was to be published in all the official languages.

Mr. FRANZI (Italy), referring to section II - Conference costs, asked if, under the heading "Travel", staff and consultants had been placed in the same category. Who were those consultants? Would they be specially recruited for the

/...

(Mr. Franzi, Italy)

Conference? Where would they come from? Furthermore, he wondered if the work of the Conference would require the presence of sixteen professionals. He would also like to know if it would not be possible to make arrangements for the host Government to furnish the staff required for the reproduction and distribution of documents.

Finally, with reference to the press service, he wondered whether there was really any need to send to Teheran one Chief Press Officer, two press officers and three secretaries from Geneva. How was it that staff for that service would entail no costs at Geneva? Was it because at Geneva there would be nothing for them to do? Also, would it not be possible in that case as well to make arrangements for the host Government to engage the necessary secretaries locally?

Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretariat) said that the observations of the USSR representative would be taken into consideration when the final estimates were drawn up; those estimates would be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which would make recommendations to the General Assembly.

In reply to the Italian representative, he said that the confusion with regard to consultants was due to a typographical error: the words "including consultants" should have been deleted. Originally it had been estimated that the services of two consultants in addition to the professionals would be provided, but that idea had been abandoned. The figures given therefore referred only to travel and subsistence for professional and general service staff.

The cost for press staff had not been indicated for Geneva because if the Conference had been held there the Chief Press Officer and the two press officers would have been permanent staff members. Where the three secretaries were concerned, the press service would need skilled persons accustomed to the work they would be doing.

Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) said that his delegation was surprised not only that twenty-one typists were to be provided for a seventy-five page report but also that the report was to be so short. Could it conceivably have only seventy-five pages? He would like to know how that figure had been arrived at.

/...

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that his delegation would need to know exactly what was the meaning of the figures on which it was to express an opinion before it could decide whether or not to recommend their adoption by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. He was not questioning the validity of the figures put before the Committee, but was simply surprised that they were so high and so much in excess of those given in the first estimate. Also, his delegation would have liked a more detailed breakdown of costs; the document in its present form was not very explicit.

Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation was always in favour of economy but it should be noted that from the outset the Committee had expressed the wish that the Conference should have all the requisite facilities at its disposal, in the conviction that they would be vital to its success. In that connexion, conference services were obviously essential, particularly since the Conference would have an extremely heavy agenda.

With regard to the number of typists required, in addition to the report and the final act, summary records and documents would also have to be typed. In the Fifth Committee his delegation would stress the need for economy, but at the present stage he thought the Preparatory Committee could do no more than take note of the difference between the preliminary estimates and the present estimates and of the information put before it concerning the rise in salaries of conference staff and the increased volume of documentation.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) felt that the Committee's main task was to ensure the proper preparation of the Conference. It was not the Committee's role to recommend a reduction or increase of expenditure; that was for other bodies. Like the Yugoslav representative, he thought that everything possible should be done to make the work of the Conference a success.

Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretariat) observed for the Kenyan representative's information that the seventy-five pages were printed pages, corresponding to 250 pages initially produced in mimeographed form; it was those pages that required typists. In any case, the figure \$22,000 in section III related more to printing costs than to typing.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also believed that the Committee should simply take note of the document which the Secretariat had submitted, it being understood that the views and suggestions put forward by members would be reflected in the Committee's report; the suggestions might be useful to the Fifth Committee and, at an earlier stage, to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in taking a decision on the estimates of costs. The Committee could and should recommend maximum economy, but it was for the financial bodies to decide whether or not to reduce the expenditure.

Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he still wondered whether sixteen professionals, i.e. half of the staff of the Division of Human Rights, were needed at the Conference. He hoped that the matter would be duly considered during the preparation of the final cost estimates to be submitted to the Fifth Committee.

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom), observing that the Committee had not yet taken a decision on the number of main committees which the Conference should establish, asked whether the number decided upon would have financial consequences. As her delegation understood it, the determining cost factor was not the number of committees but the number of meetings a day.

Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretariat) confirmed that the cost estimates submitted to the Committee were based on the number of meetings and not on the number of committees; the exact number of committees would have no financial implications unless it proved necessary to assign additional substantive staff to the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee agreed that it should simply take note of the cost estimates as set out in Conference Room Paper No. 12. It was also the Committee's wish that the Secretariat should prepare a more detailed statement of financial implications for circulation to members, and it had been requested that the summary records of meetings at which the expenses of the Conference had been discussed should be placed before the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions when it took up the question.

Where documentation was concerned, the Committee should give the Secretariat appropriate directives and instructions and authorize it to take the necessary steps.

Mr. FRANZI (Italy) wondered whether account could not be taken, in the detailed statement to be prepared by the Secretariat, of observations which Committee members might make in the near future; he for one would like the statement to provide further information on several points in Conference Room Paper No. 12, but he was not yet in a position to formulate his questions.

The CHAIRMAN observed that not all members were in a position to state their views at the present meeting. The Secretariat would be at their disposal to provide any information desired and to include in the detailed report the replies to any questions they might put.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Italian representative that the Committee had had too little time, a fact that ought to be mentioned in the Committee's report. He did not see the usefulness of a detailed report if the Committee was not going to meet again. Moreover, the Committee was not a budgetary organ. What the Representative of the Secretary-General proposed for 1967 must be passed on by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, for the Preparatory Committee was not competent to take decisions in the matter. The Secretariat must submit estimates not to the Preparatory Committee, but to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which would report to the Fifth Committee.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the reason why some representatives had asked for more extensive information was to be able to submit proposals to the General Assembly or inform their delegations, and it was in that sense that a detailed report would be of use to the Committee's members. In addition, as the Kenyan representative had suggested, the detailed report and the summary records of the Committee's discussions on the cost estimates would be sent for information to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

/...



Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) wondered when the Committee could examine the new document; certainly not before Friday, 21 April. He did not think it necessary for the Committee to take a special decision on the appropriations for 1967, since by taking note of the document submitted by the Secretary-General it implicitly endorsed its contents.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that circulation of the document requested by the Kenyan delegation would be of assistance to the delegations which would like to revert to the question of expenditure during the General Assembly.

Mr. JALILI (Iran) said that his Government had not to date sent him any information on the apportionment of the expenses incurred as a result of the Conference's being held at Teheran. Such supplementary expenses were to be the subject of an agreement between the Secretary-General and the host Government.

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that he fully understood that representatives should wish to obtain as much information as possible on the expenses connected with the Conference and should want the information to be presented in such a form that they would be able to give particulars to other members of their delegations and to their Governments. He stressed that the Secretariat shared their concern for economy. In preparing the estimates of costs it had borne in mind the wishes expressed by the Committee and the General Assembly concerning preparations for the Conference, documents, working languages and publicity. The report submitted was the result of the Committee's own decisions translated into figures. If the Committee did not approve those conclusions, it had only to indicate where economies should be introduced. Mr. Hoffman was certainly prepared to offer explanations on such matters as number of pages, staff, etc. The travel costs were what the Secretariat had deemed necessary for a conference of such importance. As to staff, he believed that the number of professionals was the same as was planned for an industrial symposium to be held at Athens. If it was possible to send fewer staff members, the Secretariat would do so. Conference Services staff would as far as possible be sent from Geneva, as that was less costly than travel from Headquarters; in fact, the estimates in Conference Room Paper No. 12 had been drawn up by the Geneva services.



(Mr. Schreiber, Secretariat)

For the number of pages in the final report, the Secretariat had taken as basis the report of the Commission on Human Rights. That was, of course, an estimate, as it was impossible to foretell accurately how many pages would be required to record the decisions of the Conference. As the Iranian representative had stated, the Iranian Government had undertaken to bear all the additional costs of holding the Conference away from the headquarters of one of the United Nations organs. That Government had not yet studied the detailed figures in the document under consideration, although approximate figures had been supplied to it. It would consult on the matter with the Secretariat, and an agreement would then be concluded between the United Nations and the host country, in accordance with the usual practice. If any major difficulties should arise, they would be put before the General Assembly. Naturally, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and after it the Fifth Committee, would examine in detail the cost estimates, and the General Assembly would approve the 1968 budget. The role of the Preparatory Committee in the matter was to formulate proposals on methods of preparing for the Conference. The figures would be studied by the General Assembly and the Advisory Committee, but since the General Assembly had already adopted the 1967 budget, the expenses to be made in 1967 required special action and the Committee should take a clear stand on the matter so that the Secretariat would be able to submit requests for appropriations to the Advisory Committee. Adoption of the following text, proposed by Mr. Hoffman, would make it possible to begin that procedure:

"The Preparatory Committee, noting that early action is required to initiate the reproduction of pre-session documentation in 1967, asks the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to put this work in process."

The work concerned was the translation, reproduction and printing of some documents mentioned in the documents the Committee has seen and approved.

Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that she had asked for explanations on the cost estimates solely in order the better to understand the document, for she was aware of the difficulties of making such estimates. She associated herself with the Tunisian representative's remarks; the main object was, of course, to make sure that the Conference was a success. Her delegation would do its part in the General Assembly to see that the necessary appropriations were made for the Conference. It was ready to accept the wording proposed by the Secretariat with regard to the expenses to be incurred in 1967.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that he had gathered that the Director of the Division of Human Rights was anxious to have the Committee's approval of expenses to be incurred in 1967. There were two figures given in section I C (a): there would be 1,450 pages of general documentation, and the cost would be \$29,000. He did not quite understand what was meant, for documents reproduced by the United Nations were turned out by Secretariat officials who were paid out of the regular United Nations budget. The sum of \$57,000 for the printing of documents given in section I C (b) was surely an unnecessary expense; there was no need to print those documents, and they could merely be mimeographed. Consequently, neither of those two items of expenditure was justified.

Mrs. PAULOS (United States of America) also wanted some further explanation of what the Committee was being asked to do in connexion with the 1967 expenses for the Conference. She understood that the Committee was not being asked to approve a specific budget for 1967.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) thought that the presentation of Conference Room Paper No. 12 was unsatisfactory. The costs should have been presented item by item, with a clear explanation of what each item related to. While some increases in expenditure, such as those relating to staff, were readily understandable, others - such as air freight shipments - were obscure.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) pointed out that in taking a decision on the documents to be prepared in 1967, it was not the function of the Committee to authorize expenditure. Rather it should give the Secretariat the necessary authority that would enable the matter to be placed before the Advisory Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretariat) explained that no appropriation had been provided for document reproduction in 1967 because the date of the Conference had not yet been set when the budget had been drawn up and it had been thought that the preparation of documentation in its entirety would be undertaken in 1968. Since part of the documents had to be reproduced in 1967, the Secretary-General, under General Assembly resolution 2243 (XXI) relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in 1967, would have to approach the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. However, the Secretary-General could not do so on his own initiative, but only on the express request of the Preparatory Committee. The Preparatory Committee would not be authorizing any expenditure, but would be instructing the Secretary-General to ask for the Advisory Committee's approval,

Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that the Preparatory Committee need not adopt a resolution. It would suffice if it clearly stated in its report that it wished the Secretary-General to prepare some documentation in 1967.

The general documentation mentioned in section I C (a) of Conference Room Paper No. 12 was that which had been discussed during the debate - documents by the Secretary-General, UNITAR, the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations - it being understood that all the organizations outside the United Nations would be urged to submit their documentation in all the working languages. Section I C (b) related to a compilation of the principal instruments adopted by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the field of human rights; the Committee might not wish that document to be printed; but such decision as it took should be clearly stated.

Mr. FRANZI (Italy) thought that it should be specifically stated in the report that the Committee approved the preparation of the necessary documentation by the Secretariat. Financial questions were not within the Committee's competence, and its approval must relate to the documentation and not to the figures.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Italian and Tunisian representatives wished the report to indicate that the Committee would like part of the documentation to be prepared in 1967.

Mr. BEN AISSA (Tunisia) said that, while wishing to effect economies, all the members of the Committee agreed that proper preparation of the Conference was essential; the documents must therefore be ready in time, and there must be some expenditure during the current year. There appeared to be no difficulty in recommending that the Secretary-General should make the necessary arrangements. He therefore supported Mr. Schreiber's suggestion.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Committee's recommendation, which could appear in the report, must be clear and precise; there should be a clear recommendation to the Secretary-General to have 350 pages of documentation printed in 1967. The financial question was a matter not for the Preparatory Committee but for the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

/...

Mr. FAKIH (Kenya), reverting to a suggestion he had made at the previous meeting, formally proposed that the Preparatory Committee should take note of Conference Room Paper No. 12, that the summary records of the 37th and 38th meetings should be transmitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and that the Preparatory Committee should approve the wording suggested by Mr. Schreiber.

He also observed that the wording "initiate the preparation of documentation" restricted the Secretariat's field of activity and that it might be preferable to say "initiate the preparations for the Conference" so that the Secretariat would be able to deal with matters other than documentation.

Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) thought that the Preparatory Committee should take an interest in expenditure despite the fact that the question was not within its competence. The financial implications must not be an obstacle to the success of the Conference, and if there was a gap between the minimum amount necessary to ensure that success and the funds available, it was up to the appropriate bodies to solve the problem. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Secretariat could report to the General Assembly so that a decision might be taken.

The CHAIRMAN said that since there was no objection to the Kenyan representative's first two proposals, they could be regarded as adopted. The third proposal was adopted in principle, the exact wording being left to the Secretariat, the Rapporteur and the delegations concerned.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) noted that the members of the Committee thought that they were not competent to take a decision but should merely take note of Conference Room Paper No. 12. He agreed with the Chairman that the Secretariat and the Rapporteur could be asked to draft the necessary recommendation for inclusion in the report so that appropriate action could be taken with regard to documentation.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Secretariat should not be given a completely free hand and that the Committee should know exactly what was to be recommended.

/...

The CHAIRMAN stated, in reply to the Soviet representative, that the recommendation would appear in the report and would be adopted either by consensus or by vote.

#### AGENDA OF THE CONFERENCE

Miss RICHARDS (United Kingdom) recalled that the Chairman had said that the members of the Committee would be able to make statements on the Conference agenda as a whole at the end of the series of meetings. She therefore wished to state that her delegation had abstained in the vote on inclusion of the item concerning slavery because it had thought the proposed wording tendentious as compared with that used in Economic and Social Council resolution 1126 (XLI). The wording adopted seemed likely to increase the polemical content of the Conference and to blur discussion of the important subject of slavery. The United Kingdom had, however, supported the agenda as a whole, since it was fairly well balanced. She trusted that, despite the difficulties in the Committee over the new item, members remained of the view that the Conference proceedings should be non-polemical.

Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) said that the inclusion of the new sub-item on slavery, which referred again to apartheid and colonialism, made item 11 as a whole repetitive and poorly balanced. His position would appear in the report.

Miss FLETCHER (Canada) associated herself with the reservations of the United Kingdom and New Zealand representatives and also asked for her position to be recorded in the report.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) thought it unfortunate that the same question appeared in two different parts of the agenda and that two distinct questions had been combined into one. He, too, would like the report to reflect the minority view.

Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was surprised that some members of the Committee were objecting to one of the agenda items even though no one had voted against its inclusion. He felt that the wording which had been adopted was perfectly acceptable and balanced.

Mr. SCOLAMIERO (Italy) recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it had felt that the consideration under a single agenda item of two such important questions as slavery and the slave trade in all their practices,



(Mr. Scolamiero, Italy)

and manifestations, on the one hand, and apartheid, on the other hand, would help neither the battle against slavery nor that against apartheid.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) was surprised that members of the Committee were now explaining their votes on the matter. The proposal with regard to which several members were expressing their reservations had been treated as if it were a political manoeuvre, and he wished the report to state that apartheid was the most atrocious form of slavery currently in existence and that those who were expressing reservations were attempting to excuse their cultural or economic relations with South Africa.

Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) said that his delegation, his Government and his country thought that apartheid must be regarded as a form of slavery and wished that position to be recorded in the report.

Mr. BERRC (Uruguay) also requested that the position which he had stated during the debate should appear in the report.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.