

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1370th
MEETING

Friday, 10 December 1965,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 67:</i>	
<i>International Year for Human Rights</i>	475
<i>Agenda item 65:</i>	
<i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights</i>	481
<i>Organization of work</i>	481

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 67

International Year for Human rights (continued) (A/5945, A/6003, chap. XIII, sect. III; A/C.3/L.1300, L.1318, L.1320, L.1322-1325)

1. Mr. ACOSTA (Colombia) said that his delegation had welcomed from the outset the Jamaican delegation's move to have the year 1968 designated as International Year for Human Rights, a move approved unanimously by the General Assembly (resolution 1961 (XVIII)).

2. The Economic and Social Council, by its resolution 1015 E (XXXVII), had recommended to the General Assembly that Member States should be invited to ratify before 1968 the conventions already concluded in the field of human rights. The Colombian Government had so far ratified the following conventions: the ILO Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour, which had been ratified on 7 June 1963 and which had entered into force on 7 June 1964; the ILO Convention concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value, which had been ratified on 7 June 1963 and which had entered into force the same day; and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which had been ratified on 27 October 1959. The constitutional procedure for the ratification of the other conventions would certainly be completed by 1968.

3. The draft declarations of which the Council had decided to complete the consideration and preparation by 1968 included the draft declaration on the right of asylum. His delegation, as it had already stated (1360th meeting) when the Committee had been examining the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, took a particular interest in the preparation of that instrument and hoped it would be completed quickly.

4. The Colombian Constitution guaranteed respect for individual freedoms and its title III provided that

the authorities of the Republic were instructed to protect the lives, honour and property of all persons residing in Colombia. The Constitution also provided for the abolition of slavery, equal civil rights for men and women, the abolition of the death penalty, compulsory education, freedom of the Press and of expression, freedom to own property, and respect for property; it sought to reconcile private interests with the common interest, with the emphasis on the latter. Colombian law thus embodied the principles laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

5. His delegation noted with regret that a convention on the rights of the child and of the family was not listed among the draft conventions to be completed before 1968 because the Commission on Human Rights already had too much to do in the time at its disposal and because it was necessary to complete the instruments already in hand before taking up anything new. However, his delegation attached great importance to the preparation of an international instrument on those rights.

6. For the reasons which had been stated by various delegations in the Commission on Human Rights and repeated by the French representative at the Committee's 1369th meeting, his delegation had made some reservations about the idea of convening an international conference on human rights. However, the Jamaican representative had dispelled the Colombian delegation's doubts when he had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.1318) concerning the establishment of a preparatory committee to make preparations for the Conference. The Colombian delegation was in favour of such a step, subject to the acceptance of the oral sub-amendment proposed by India, (1369th meeting, para. 52) to the effect that, for reasons of economy, the members of the preparatory committee should be chosen from among the permanent missions. His delegation also supported the French representative's proposal (*Ibid.*, para. 32) that the committee should be established after the Commission on Human Rights had completed its work.

7. His delegation supported the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.1323) to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1074 E (XXXIX) to the effect that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights should be mentioned in a new preambular paragraph. It also supported the Venezuelan proposal (A/C.3/L.1325) to the effect that UNESCO might be asked to co-operate in arousing interest in the idea of the International Year for Human Rights among writers and artists throughout the world, so that they in turn might appeal to the conscience of the world. Lastly, his delegation accepted the amendment proposed by Pakistan (A/C.3/L.1300).

8. His delegation had taken note of the interim programme of ceremonies and activities to mark 1968 in the various States Members of the United Nations. In recent years, Colombia had issued postage stamps on international co-operation, the political rights of women and the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In addition a major transmitting station was broadcasting educational programmes for the rural population, which reached the remotest villages in Colombia.

9. He congratulated the Jamaican delegation on its initiative in proposing an International Year for Human Rights; he also congratulated all those who were taking part in the preparations for that Year.

10. Mrs. MAKSIMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) unreservedly approved the idea of designating 1968 as International Year for Human Rights. That celebration would provide an opportunity to redouble the efforts being made to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; to eliminate the violations of those rights and freedoms which were still being committed; and, more particularly, to tackle the causes of those violations.

11. In her delegation's opinion, the main consideration was that the measures adopted in the various countries to celebrate the International Year for Human Rights should be practical and should fit into the over-all programme. There was little purpose in ceremonies, studies and compilations so long as bombs continued to fall on Viet-Nam and acts of aggression of the type committed against the Dominican Republic continued to be perpetrated. As her delegation saw it, the main purpose of the efforts made in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights should be to eliminate apartheid, racial discrimination in all its forms, and colonialism generally.

12. Economic and Social Council resolution 1015 E (XXXVII) contained several useful recommendations, such as the invitation to States to ratify before 1968 the conventions already concluded in the field of human rights and the decision to complete before 1968 the consideration of various other draft conventions and declarations.

13. Her delegation approved the idea of convening an international conference on human rights but objected to the discrimination involved in barring certain countries from the preparations for the conference. The struggle to secure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was a matter for the whole of mankind and should not be approached purely from the standpoint of the United Nations. Consequently her delegation could not support the establishment of a committee composed only of sixteen members as envisaged in amendment A/C.3/L.1318/Rev. 1.^{1/} She failed to see why any attempt should be made to reduce the number of members of the preparatory committee at a time when the membership of the United Nations was on the increase. If such a committee was not representative it would not reflect the views of all Member States. Furthermore experience had shown, to her country's cost, that the views of all were not invariably taken into account in a committee of that kind.

14. Moreover, her delegation considered that there were already too many bodies engaged in preparatory work for the International Year, and so far to little effect. It also doubted the necessity of appointing an executive secretary for the conference since, with the exception of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, all conferences so far had managed perfectly well without such an official.

15. For those reasons, her delegation did not support the eleven-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1). However, it did not approve the draft resolution recommended in resolution 1074 E (XXXIX) of the Economic and Social Council. It did not consider that the statement of the financial implications (A/C.3/L.1320) of the amendments to that draft resolution answered all the questions that might be asked regarding the financial implications of the preparations for the International Year for Human Rights.

16. Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) said that his delegation supported the proposals that 1968 should be the International Year for Human Rights and that an international conference should be held in the same year. It congratulated the Jamaican and other delegations on their initiative and assured them that Canada was prepared to do everything in its power to make both programmes a success.

17. In his delegation's opinion, the proposals before the Committee—that for the International Year and that for the conference—should be of specific and practical help in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Canada, which paid a high contribution to the United Nations regular budget, naturally wished to see the available resources put to the best use and would be happy to assist in setting attainable, specific and carefully prepared objectives.

18. His delegation hoped of course, that Governments would send to the conference qualified experts who normally concerned themselves with human rights in their respective countries. It also hoped that, during 1968, and while the conference was in progress, realistic measures of immediate concern would be given preference over miscellaneous celebrations.

19. It stood to reason that Governments would have to decide for themselves what measures and ceremonies seemed to them most appropriate. Among the various suggestions made, however, there were several which deserved special attention because they were specific and realistic, and also because they faced up to the question of financing; those were the suggestions in which his Government took a particular interest and which he proposed to review.

20. In the first place, his delegation naturally recognized that the conference and related programmes would have to examine and evaluate the objectives aimed at and the techniques and procedures used by the United Nations in connexion with human rights. In its opinion, however, it was more important to perfect those procedures than to clarify the rules; in addition it was necessary to avoid the waste of effort involved in drawing up a complete list of developments relating to human rights in various countries; that was an impossible and thankless task, and a risky one as well.

^{1/} Document A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1 was distributed during the meeting.

21. Secondly, the conference could usefully review the interrelation which would exist between the Universal Declaration, the two Covenants and the related declarations already in existence, with a view to evaluating the unity, direction and pace of implementation of the over-all United Nations programme. The objective would be not so much to make a compilation as to appraise the general approach adopted by the United Nations in that sphere of activity and, perhaps, to study the possibility of co-ordinating the major human rights activities within the United Nations system itself, of harmonizing the policies and activities of the various United Nations organs and bodies concerned with human rights, and of directing them towards common goals.

22. Thirdly, his delegation would like the conference and the programmes to have the maximum public impact, while at the same time laying the foundations for sure and, if possible, lasting progress. In that connexion, advantage should be taken of the educational role which the United Nations played through its agencies. As already mentioned by the representatives of Iran and Venezuela, detailed consideration should be given to ways of enlisting the co-operation of educational institutions, learned societies, foundations, non-governmental organizations, artistic groups, and so forth, and encouraging them to devise study courses in the field of human rights. The energies and resources of intellectual circles should be used more fully than in the past, especially for research and investigations and in order to familiarize the public with the ideals of human rights. Through those circles, new ideas might emerge, without which it was virtually impossible to make any practical progress. The idea of organizing conferences of educators and information media experts certainly warranted further exploration.

23. His delegation was sure that those few ideas could be improved or added to, and it was prepared, in a spirit of co-operation, to give careful consideration to any suggestions which might be made.

24. In the view of his delegation, it would be unwise to expect spectacular results in so difficult and complex a field as that of human relations. Nevertheless, he believed that the most intelligent and clear-sighted reappraisal of the human rights programme could be achieved by throwing caution to the winds and tackling the question with a renewed enthusiasm and energy commensurate with the needs of the situation.

25. Mrs. TILLET (United States of America) said that her delegation had welcomed the Jamaican proposal that 1968, the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, should be designated as International Year for Human Rights. In the view of her delegation, the draft resolution before the Committee, along with the appropriate amendments, provided a satisfactory basis for preparatory work for the International Year and, in particular, for the International Conference on Human Rights.

26. As United States representative in the Commission on the Status of Women, she welcomed the suggestion that one woman member of the Commission,

or perhaps even two, should participate in the preparatory work for the International Year for Human Rights. The presence of one woman in a predominantly male committee might constitute only token representation, and two women could be more effective than one; the financial implications of having two members from the Commission on the Status of Women would, of course, have to be examined. It was true that many of the permanent delegations had no women members but, even so, it might well be possible to find a highly qualified woman who could serve on the Preparatory Committee along with a woman representative of the Commission on the Status of Women. With two women on the preparatory committee, the desirable attention would certainly be given to practical programmes and plans, especially to the important area of the status of women.

27. Her government, which had had a part in the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, thought that the adoption of the draft resolution before the Committee would constitute a fitting observance of the seventeenth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration.

28. Mr. JATIVA (Ecuador) said that his delegation had frequently had occasion to support the idea of the International Year for Human Rights, not only in the General Assembly but in the preparatory committee and the working party, of which it was a member.

29. The Jamaican representative's explanatory memorandum and introductory statement to the Committee at the eighteenth session (1283rd meeting^{2/}) made it clear that, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations and the Governments of Member States should redouble their efforts to secure respect for the rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the Declaration.

30. Although a number of delegations appeared to think otherwise, the discussions at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly and in the Committee on the International Year for Human Rights and the working party had made it clear that the celebration of the International Year should not be limited to purely commemorative acts, but that the United Nations, the specialized agencies and Member States should strive to conduct an intensive campaign for human rights, so that the progress achieved throughout the world could be appraised.

31. As a result of the work of the Committee on the International Year, the Third Committee had before it the two draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council (1015 E (XXXVII) and 1074 E (XXXIX)). Those drafts were not entirely satisfactory to his delegation. Nevertheless, it considered that they served the cause of human rights by providing, *inter alia*, for the ratification of a number of major instruments in that field, and it hoped that the Third Committee would maintain the tempo of its work, in order that the draft conventions and draft declarations listed in the Council's resolution (1015 E (XXXVII)) might be completed.

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 79, document A/5493/Add.1.

32. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolutions 1015 E (XXXVII) and 1074 E (XXXIX), and the amendments relating to preparatory work for the international conference. The Conference would be particularly conducive to the achievement of further progress in the field of human rights, since it would shed light on the problems involved in the practical implementation of those rights.

33. Mr. HERRERA (Costa Rica) said that he was greatly interested in the plan to designate 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights.

34. Since 1945, the United Nations had steadily pursued its efforts to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. Those efforts had consisted primarily in developing rules to be applied in that field and promoting compliance with them. However, while progress had been achieved in the development of rules, the situation with regard to their application was quite different; eighteen years after the proclamation of human rights, mankind was still afflicted by apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination. The statistics which the representative of Madagascar had cited at the 1369th meeting showed that States were in no hurry to ratify or sign conventions relating to human rights. The entire world community was responsible for the implementation of human rights, and it was because of its awareness of that responsibility that his delegation welcomed the choice of 1968 for the international celebration of human rights. It would like that year to be the occasion for establishing direct contacts with the peoples for whom, in the last analysis, conventions drawn up by Governments were intended. The people had little knowledge of what was being done by the legislation, and yet an informed public opinion could decisively influence the outlook of Governments.

35. His delegation therefore welcomed all measures aimed at organizing seminars and conferences and eradicating stubborn prejudices. In its view, provision might also be made for educational programmes for young people and adults, in order to enable them better to serve the cause of human rights. In that connexion, it supported the Venezuelan proposal (A/C.3/L.1325) to enlist the participation of teachers, authors and artists in the celebration of the International Year.

36. Mr. MOMMERSTEEG (Netherlands) endorsed the two draft resolutions submitted by the Economic and Social Council, but said that he would like to see operative paragraph 3 of the draft proposal in resolution 1074 E (XXXIX) replaced by the operative paragraphs of the draft proposal in resolution 1015 E (XXXVII).

37. His delegation considered it undesirable to set utopian targets. In view of the difficulties encountered in drawing up international instruments, he wondered whether it was altogether reasonable to expect the General Assembly to adopt, at its next two sessions, all the documents and international agreements listed in resolution 1015 E (XXXVII). It would be unjust to belittle the efforts of all who were engaged in the preparation of those documents. However, their difficulties were bound up with problems of planning

and co-ordination, and they might be examined at the international conference to be held in 1968.

38. He attached great importance to the international conference, but considered that its terms of reference should be precisely defined and that it should be very carefully prepared and steps taken to ensure that it was not exploited for purposes of political propaganda. He endorsed the comments made by the representative of Madagascar (1369th meeting), who had emphasized that the International Year should not be simply a year of commemoration, but should lead to an awareness of a number of problems and to a stock-taking of the results achieved. In particular, there should be a searching inquiry into the effectiveness of the methods employed by the United Nations in the field of human rights, and special emphasis should be placed on the need for proper co-ordination of the activities and policies of the various organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the field of human rights. His delegation supported the suggestions submitted by the Committee on the International Year for Human Rights in paragraph 166 of its report,^{3/} namely, that the Conference should consider the question of strengthening the executive power of the United Nations in the field of human rights. His delegation also proposed that the Conference should consider the possibility of an expansion of the Organization's functions as a body responsible for carrying out investigations and giving advice in the field of human rights. In addition, it advocated the setting up of permanent machinery to consider cases of violations of human rights, a procedure which would obviate recourse to ad hoc solutions improvised under the pressure of events. It was in that context that the proposal for the establishment of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights should be considered.

39. He favoured the establishment of a preparatory committee but wondered what would become of the working party which the Commission on Human Rights had appointed at its last session. The working party had been requested to take into account the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee of the International Year for Human Rights, which the Commission on Human Rights had been unable to take up. It was also supposed to make recommendations on the terms of reference, and structure of and the nature of participation in the conference, on its agenda, duration and venue, and on the preparation of the necessary studies and documentation, and to prepare estimates of the costs. The preparatory committee would clearly have the same functions as the working party appointed by the Commission on Human Rights. It would therefore be necessary to indicate what might be the relationship between the two bodies.

40. In his view, the members of the Conference should be members of permanent delegations. Since the Commission on Human Rights was already overburdened with work, it would be unreasonable to give it additional tasks and it could not go into the detailed administrative and technical aspects of the preparation for the Conference.

^{3/} Document E/CN.4/886.

41. Mrs. BEN-ITO (Israel) said that her delegation had carefully studied documents A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.1322 and appreciated the reasons why some delegations had proposed the establishment of a preparatory committee. However, she wondered why the Commission on Human Rights was to be dissociated from the preparations for the Conference, which were its responsibility. The establishment of a new organ sometimes detracted from the effectiveness of work by complicating its organization; moreover, the financial implications of such a proposal must be taken into consideration. She suggested that the Commission on Human Rights, if it so desired, might perhaps establish a working group to deal with the technical aspects of the preparation for the Conference. Her delegation would in any event support the view of the majority. It would vote in favour of the resolutions submitted by the Economic and Social Council, the amendment submitted by the Venezuelan delegation (A/C.3/L.1325), the amendment proposed by a group of Afro-Asian countries (A/C.3/L.1324) and the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.1323).

42. Mr. HELDAL (Norway) agreed with the Canadian representative on the need to emphasize the practical aspects of the programme for the International Year for Human Rights. His delegation endorsed the interim programme of activities described in annex II of the Secretary-General's note (A/5945) which contained some very useful suggestions and quite rightly provided for the participation of the non-governmental organizations in the activities planned. Since education was one of the most important means of inculcating respect for human rights, school textbooks should be reviewed in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights with a view to eliminating all passages which might warp the minds of children. In the Scandinavian countries, specialists had already carried out such an examination of school textbooks. The interim programme listed a number of measures intended to eliminate practices detrimental to human rights, which was one of the objectives to be achieved by the end of 1968. Since the practices in question could be eradicated only through education, he wondered whether it was not over optimistic to hope that they could be eliminated in three years.

43. With regard to the first proposal contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 1015 E (XXXVII) —the recommendation that all Member States should be invited to ratify before 1968 a number of conventions concluded in the field of human rights—he formally proposed that, in addition to the three ILO conventions, the text should mention the Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise, which had been concluded in 1948.

44. Mr. SY (Senegal) observed that, even if the proposal to establish a preparatory committee was adopted, that would not take out of the hands of the Commission on Human Rights the task of preparing for the Conference. It was the Commission itself that had suggested the idea of establishing such a committee.

45. In his view, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 1074 E (XXXIX) should be replaced by

the operative part of the draft resolution contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 1015 E (XXXVII).

46. His delegation agreed that the Convention concerning Freedom of Association should be included in the list of conventions which it was recommended should be ratified before 1968, since freedom of association was one of the essential elements in protecting human rights.

47. Mr. GOUDARZANIA (Iran) supported the Norwegian representative's proposal.

48. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) supported the comments of those delegations who considered that the International Year should be an occasion for taking practical measures to promote human rights.

49. With reference to the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1318, he considered it a wise course to entrust the task of making preparations for the International Conference to a special committee. The Conference should not merely adopt symbolic texts, but should rather seek to ensure the implementation, not only of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but also, and above all, those of the Charter itself. It would be illogical to request the President of the General Assembly to appoint five members of the committee while the ten others would be appointed by the Commission on Human Rights, whose powers were more limited and in which not all Member States were represented. It was necessary to take into account the relative importance of the different United Nations organs: the General Assembly, which had been established directly under the Charter, was clearly more representative of the Organization. With those reservations, his delegation would support the amendment in question. It fully approved the Venezuelan amendment (A/C.3/L.1325). The year 1968 should be a milestone in history and should provide man with an opportunity more fully to recognize his responsibilities in the field of human rights. The International Year for Human Rights should therefore be universal in nature and should have the benefit of assistance from all outstanding figures in the various cultural fields. Only in that way would it be more than a mere commemoration and do more than merely symbolize good intentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN asked the delegation of Pakistan whether, in the event that the proposal to incorporate the operative part of the draft resolution recommended in Economic and Social Council Resolution 1015 E (XXXVII) in paragraph 3 of the draft recommended in resolution 1074 E (XXXIX) was adopted, it would maintain its amendment to operative paragraph 3 of the latter draft.

51. Mr. JATOI (Pakistan) said that the sole purpose of his suggestion had been to improve the original drafting of the paragraph. He would support the view of the majority.

52. Mr. MUMBU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his country's Constitution was based on the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the other instruments guaranteeing human rights. He noted with satisfaction the

measures which the Economic and Social Council had proposed for the International Year for Human Rights and would vote in favour of the resolutions submitted by the Economic and Social Council. He endorsed the principle that one representative of the Commission on the Status of Women should take part in the work of the preparatory committee and supported the proposal to combine the two resolutions submitted by the Economic and Social Council. He would vote in favour of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1, but would have to abstain in the vote on the Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1322). The amendments in documents A/C.3/L.1323, L.1324, and L.1325 improved the text and his delegation would support them.

53. Mr. ESPEJO (Philippines) said that, following informal consultations, a new text had been drawn up which took account of the suggestions made by various delegations with regard to the manner of appointing the preparatory committee. The eleven Powers now proposed that a preparatory committee should be established in consultation with the Commission on Human Rights and that the President of the General Assembly should be requested to appoint the fifteen members of the preparatory committee, plus a sixteenth member whom he would select from among the members of the Commission on the Status of Women in consultation with the Commission's Chairman.

54. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) said that since her delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1322) had been incorporated in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1, it was no longer before the Committee.

55. Mr. MOMMERSTEEG (Netherlands) asked what the relationship would be between the preparatory committee and the working party previously appointed by the Commission on Human Rights.

56. Mr. SY (Senegal) said that the reply to that question could be found in document A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.1, which provided that it would be the task of the preparatory committee "to complete the preparation for the International Conference on Human Rights". Clearly the work of the preparatory committee and the Commission on Human Rights would not be parallel. In that connexion he drew attention to the fact that it was the Commission on Human Rights itself that had proposed the establishment of the preparatory committee to take over that work. That did not, however, take the matter out of the Commission's hands. The Commission on Human Rights had always had a very heavy agenda and a preparatory committee would be in a better position than a Committee with a membership of 117 to make effective preparations for the Conference.

57. Mr. COMBAL (France) found the explanations given by the Senegalese representative entirely satisfactory on the understanding that the text put to the vote in the Committee would include the words "in consultation with the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-second session" as proposed by the Philippines representative on behalf of the sponsors. That addition seemed to be in accordance with the Senegalese representative's wish that the preparatory committee should take over from the Commission

on Human Rights, which would have before it in March the report of the working party already established.

58. The CHAIRMAN observed that the changes introduced by the Philippine representative were substantive and therefore of great importance; he asked the sponsors to submit a revised version of their proposal.

59. He further requested the representatives of Senegal and Pakistan to present joint proposals on operative paragraph 3 of the draft proposed in Council resolution 1074 E (XXXIX). He considered that the draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance should be added to the list of instruments given in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution recommended in resolution 1015 E (XXXVII).

60. Mr. COMBAL (France) said that he expected the vote to take place at the present meeting, since he understood the sponsors to have accepted the various changes read out by the Philippine representative.

61. Mr. SY (Senegal) confirmed that those changes had the consent of all the sponsors.

62. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the changes proposed by the Philippine representative on the sponsors' behalf did not allay all her misgivings. In particular, they did not make it clear whether the working party set up by the Committee on the International Year for Human Rights of the Commission on Human Rights would continue to function or not. Furthermore, there seemed to be a contradiction between the text proposed by the sponsors and the Council resolution into which it would be inserted and which requested the Commission on Human Rights to deal with the matter. Lastly, she wondered why provisions should be made for consultation with the Commission on Human Rights if it was not thought desirable that the Commission should consider the matter.

63. Those points were still too vague and her delegation would like to have them cleared up.

64. Mr. SAKSENA (India) endorsed the Chairman's suggestion regarding the circulation of a further revision of document A/C.3/L.1318.^{4/}

65. The CHAIRMAN said that he had certainly not wished to contest the Philippine delegation's authority to speak on behalf of the sponsors; he had merely pointed out that the amendments were important and therefore, in his opinion, should be submitted in writing.

66. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) endorsed the USSR representative's remarks. It was open to question, moreover, whether the decision which the Committee was asked to take was compatible with the need stressed by the Secretary-General in his foreword to the budget estimates for 1966 (A/6005), to exercise restraint in respect of the programme of meetings; he wondered whether there might not be some overlapping in functions between the Committee already established and the committee proposed by the sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1318/

^{4/} Subsequently distributed as document A/C.3/L.1318/Rev.2.

Rev.1. In view of the vital need for economy, it might be advisable to make use of the existing machinery rather than set up more.

67. His delegation was in favour of the draft proposed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1074 E (XXXIX).

68. Mr. CACHAUX (Belgium) endorsed the remarks of the USSR and United Kingdom representatives; the difficult financial situation of the United Nations should be taken into consideration.

69. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) reminded the Committee that he entertained some reservations regarding the method of appointing the proposed preparatory committee. His delegation was opposed to the proliferation of committees. He endorsed the remarks of the USSR representative and would vote in favour of draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council.

70. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further consideration of the item should be postponed until the following Monday.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 65

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (A/5929; A/C.3/L.1321)

71. The CHAIRMAN said that, although the item had not yet been examined, it would be desirable for the Committee to proceed to the vote without debate.

72. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) proposed that, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by her delegation and that of Japan (A/C.3/L.1321), the phrase "with the explanatory paper prepared by the Secretary-General and the observations received from Governments" should be inserted between the words "All Forms of Racial Discrimination" and "so that the twenty-first session".

73. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela), referring to operative paragraph 2, said that his delegation thought it premature to ask the Committee to take a decision on a text which referred to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, at a time when that Convention had not yet been adopted by the Assembly in plenary. Furthermore there were still questions and misgivings in the minds of some delegations regarding the text of the draft Convention, as witness the fact that one of the final clauses had been adopted by a majority of only twenty-five votes.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that, in principle, the Venezuelan representative was quite right. In the circumstances, however, it was essential that the Committee take a speedy decision in order that the General Assembly might complete its work.

75. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) shared the reservations expressed by the Venezuelan delegation. He too thought that it would be difficult at that stage to vote on the text submitted by the Greek and Japanese delegations.

76. The Venezuelan representative had rightly expressed doubts regarding the adoption of the draft

Convention by the plenary Assembly and had aptly pointed out that a clause of vital importance to the effectiveness of the Convention had been adopted with a majority of only twenty-five votes. It would therefore be difficult to consider, let alone adopt, the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1321). On the other hand, matters could be greatly simplified by deleting all reference to the Convention or by taking a separate vote on the phrase in question.

77. The CHAIRMAN asked whether, in the circumstances, it might not be better to defer a decision on the draft Covenants until the draft Convention had been adopted.

78. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that neither his nor the Uruguayan delegation wished to hold up the Committee's work. Their only desire was that the draft Convention—the most important result of the work done at the current session—should be so drafted as to obtain the greatest possible number of votes. Excessive haste must not be allowed to produce a text on which a large number of delegations found it practicable to abstain or to cast a negative vote. It should be borne in mind that, while the Committee could reopen discussion on the text of the Convention only by the decision of a two-thirds majority, that did not apply to the General Assembly in plenary, which might have new proposals placed before it.

79. Consequently, with respect to the draft Covenants, his delegation was prepared to vote immediately on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1321), subject to the deletion of operative paragraph 2, which could always be reintroduced after the draft Convention had been approved.

80. Mr. COCHAUX (Belgium) considered that the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Japan (A/C.3/L.1321) should not be put to the vote until the draft Convention had been adopted.

81. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) proposed, in order to allay the misgivings of the Venezuelan and Uruguayan delegations, that the words "which may be" should be inserted before the word "incorporated".

82. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) suggested that the Committee should not be over-hasty in the matter and should defer its decision until the next meeting.

83. Mr. COMBAL (France) endorsed the suggestions of the Belgian and Mauritanian representatives. The delegations of Venezuela and Uruguay had raised perfectly logical objections, but no purpose would be served by prolonging the discussion. It would be better to wait until the draft Convention was adopted, for after that the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Japan (A/C.3/L.1321) would not present the slightest difficulty. He therefore suggested that the Committee should defer consideration of that text.

84. Mr. FAROUK (Tunisia) associated herself with those delegations which had proposed deferment of the consideration of and vote on the draft resolution.

Organization of work

85. The CHAIRMAN announced that the text of the draft International Convention on the Elimination of

All Forms of Racial Discrimination, incorporating a few stylistic changes made by the officers of the Committee, had just been circulated. He asked delegations to study the text and to submit their comments to the Committee secretariat by 10.30 a.m. on Monday, 13 December. If by that time no comments had been received by the secretariat, the document would be circulated as a working paper on which the Committee would be able to take a decision on the following day.

86. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) asked whether delegations might make additions to the text.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that delegations should not depart from the provisions adopted by the Committee. If the Committee wished to reconsider a provision already adopted, it could do so only by a decision made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.