

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1544th
MEETING

Friday, 8 December 1967,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 58:

International Year for Human Rights (continued):

(a) *Programme of measures and activities to be undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (continued);*

(b) *Report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Human Rights (continued)*

Consideration of draft resolution (continued) 451

Chairman: Mrs. Mara RADIĆ (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 58

International Year for Human Rights (continued):

(a) Programme of measures and activities to be undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6687, A/6866 and Add.1; A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1502, A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1511, A/C.3/L.1512/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1513);

(b) Report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Human Rights (continued) (A/6354, A/6670; A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1502, A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1511, A/C.3/L.1512/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1513)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION (continued)

1. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) proposed that the list of speakers should be declared closed in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced an amendment (A/C.3/L.1513) to the revised four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1).

3. Miss ALEXANDER (Guyana) said, in reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, that both the Manila and Helsinki Seminars had dealt with women's rights, which were the subject of item 11 (d) of the provisional agenda for the International Conference on Human Rights (A/6670, annex II). The topic discussed at the Warsaw and Kingston Seminars had been practical measures for the implementation of the economic and

social rights of the individual, which was directly relevant to item 11 (f) and (g) of the provisional agenda.

4. Moreover, the relevance of the subjects dealt with at those Seminars to the International Conference was clear from paragraphs 58 and 66 of the Preparatory Committee's report (A/6670), which provided for the inclusion of the seminars' reports in the documentation to be issued to participants in the Conference.

5. Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) observed that the four-Power draft resolution represented a praiseworthy attempt to find a constructive solution. However, while fully respecting the views reflected in it, her delegation could not support it as a whole, and had accordingly co-sponsored the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1502. Mauritania could not accept the view that the invitation to non-governmental organizations should be restricted to those recognized as having consultative status with the Economic and Social Council since the question of consultative status was now under review and a final decision had not yet been taken. Nor could it agree to the exclusion of non-governmental organizations which were combating such evils as apartheid and whose activities were connected with human rights. It therefore urged the need for a compromise based on mutual concessions, in which political and ideological rivalries would be set aside.

6. As for the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2, while her delegation thought it improper that countries should be excluded because of prejudice, it certainly could not agree to a wording that would permit participation by the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia.

7. Lastly, with regard to the joint amendments of the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), she thought that, if representatives of non-governmental organizations were allowed to speak, it would greatly reduce the amount of time available to representatives of countries. Furthermore, although most non-governmental organizations were international in structure, they had very few branches in Africa and many of them were not thoroughly conversant with the problems of that continent. If they were allowed to speak, African delegations would not have the opportunity to dwell at sufficient length on the problems that concerned them.

8. Mr. MUNDELEER (Belgium) said that two facts emerged from the discussion—first, the desirability of retaining the original four-Power draft resolution and, secondly, the quality of the work done by the Preparatory Committee, particularly in drawing up the provisional agenda for the Conference, which took account of both the broader and the more specific points that might be of concern to Member States.

9. While the Preparatory Committee should not be given too burdensome a task, his delegation felt that the presence at Teheran of non-governmental organizations would be not only advisable but even indispensable, so as to ensure that various shades of opinion were represented at such an important human rights event. He therefore supported the amendments submitted jointly by the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which would afford those organizations an opportunity to make oral statements.

10. Lastly, he emphasized the importance of the International Year for Human Rights, which would culminate in the Teheran Conference, since the promotion of such rights was an essential prerequisite for the preservation of world peace, ensuring that freedom held sway and justice triumphed.

11. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) said that, in general, her delegation supported the four-Power draft resolution. It agreed with the provisional agenda drawn up by the Preparatory Committee and could not accept any proposal that sought to alter it. She was therefore grateful to the delegation of Panama for withdrawing its amendment (A/C.3/L.1509/Rev.1).

12. On the subject of non-governmental organizations, Indonesia favoured participation by those whose activities bore a relation to the items on the provisional agenda, irrespective of their status with the Economic and Social Council. For that reason her delegation was a sponsor of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1502.

13. Prompted by a concern to ensure the universality of the Teheran Conference, her delegation supported the proposal submitted jointly by the delegations of Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) whereby the invitation to attend would not be restricted to certain States. However, it could not agree to the amendments proposed by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1) in view of the comments made by the representative of Jamaica at the 1541st meeting.

14. As for the Soviet proposal to include a reference to the Kitwe Seminar, she thought that it would be improper not to mention the other seminars on human rights.

15. Lastly, she pointed out that the list of sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1513 should include Mali and her own country.

16. Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the revised amendment of the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1). It reflected a commendable effort to achieve a compromise solution by enabling the Conference to establish its own rules of procedure regarding rights of non-governmental organizations attending, based on the appropriate needs of the Conference itself.

17. As for the role to be accorded to non-governmental organizations, he stated that there was ample provision in the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) for such organizations to attend the conference, even if they had not been given consultative status. Criteria were clearly established in paragraphs 9 (a) and (b) of the draft. Those already

in consultative status also had criteria listed in paragraph 8 in order to distinguish those who had a demonstrated interest in human rights. He said it was purely a practical matter, that if the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502) were to be adopted, a heavy burden would be placed on the Preparatory Committee which, as the representative of Sweden had pointed out, might delay the Conference for a year.

18. With regard to the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1513, he would like some information from the Secretariat on the precedents established at other conferences organized by the United Nations. He would also like an explanation of the reasons for the amendment, since there was no evidence in the records of the Preparatory Committee's discussions of any disagreement over the proposal that a two-thirds majority should be required for certain decisions of the Conference.

19. His delegation considered that the latest version of paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) was as unsatisfactory as the earlier version and merely represented a further attempt to reactivate an issue that had already been decided by General Assembly resolution 2217 c (XXI), whereby the "Vienna formula" (see 1540th meeting, para. 21) would apply to invitations to States to attend the Conference. The amendment simply sought to make the Conference serve the political purpose of conferring official status on certain régimes recognized by some Member States. The approval of such a proposal would give rise to serious practical difficulties since the so-called "all States" formula would force the Secretary-General to ask the Assembly to provide a complete list of all entities that could be regarded as States for the purposes of an invitation. For, according to the statement made by the Legal Counsel concerning an earlier version of the amendment, the Secretary-General was in no position himself to decide which entities had the attributes of a State in the absence of final instructions from the General Assembly. He requested the opinion of the Legal Counsel on the revised version of the amendment.

20. Mrs. MIVÉDOR (Togo) said that her Government would take all necessary measures to celebrate the International Year for Human Rights in a fitting and proper manner. Her delegation was not opposed to the participation of non-governmental organizations in the International Conference and could consequently support any reasonable proposal for their participation.

21. Her delegation could support the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1), but considered that the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502) was an improvement and would therefore support it too. She also supported paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). She could not, however, support paragraph 1 of the Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2), because if mention was made of two seminars on human rights questions, reference would also have to be made to all meetings dealing with the subject, and that was clearly impossible. The same consideration applied to the Guyanese amendment (A/C.3/L.1511). On the other hand, she supported the amendments submitted by the

United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), which she considered sensible, and the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1513, which took account of the objections made to the stipulation in rule 34 of the draft rules of procedure (A/6670, annex I) that certain decisions of the Conference should be taken by a two-thirds majority.

22. Finally, she would vote against the other amendments to the four-Power draft resolution.

23. Mr. KALPAGE (Ceylon) said that general agreement seemed to have been reached on the International Conference except in so far as the participation of States and non-governmental organizations was concerned. With regard to the former, he would have preferred the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) to be more specific and to indicate precisely which States should be invited to the Conference. With regard to the latter, Ceylon was opposed to the participation of non-governmental organizations, because, while it recognized the great contribution some of them had made to human rights, there were others which were absurd or pursued dubious aims. The Committee should be realistic; the idea was to hold a Conference for the purpose of promoting respect for human rights, not for rewarding the efforts of any particular organization. Moreover, the non-governmental organizations had themselves planned programmes of activities to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and intended to hold a conference at UNESCO headquarters in September 1968. If they were to be invited to Teheran, it would not be practical to include all of them, since that might hold up the Conference's work. This number would therefore have to be limited and that would in turn raise the problem of how and by whom they should be selected. His delegation felt that the best solution would be to invite none of them. If it was desired that non-governmental organizations should assist the Conference in its work, they could send in communications; that arrangement would make it possible to benefit from their experience without their having to attend the meeting. The countries of the Afro-Asian Group wanted some organizations to be invited; if a satisfactory criterion could be worked out, Ceylon would support those countries but in that case their participation should be limited to sending observers.

24. His delegation considered the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) satisfactory with some of the changes proposed in the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502). His delegation's main interest was that the International Conference should be fruitful and it would do everything in its power to contribute to that end.

25. Mr. PAOLINI (France) welcomed the fact that the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States of America had withdrawn their amendments to the Conference's provisional agenda (A/6670, annex II), which he found acceptable. He wondered whether a reference to the seminars in the four-Power draft resolution was appropriate; the original amendments submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1506) had led Guyana to submit an amendment in document A/C.3/L.1511. The International Conference would be the first to be held on human rights and it

would therefore be inappropriate to mention only some seminars and disregard others which had also been concerned with such matters; the best course would therefore be not to mention any. With regard to the participation of non-governmental organizations, his delegation would vote in favour of operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of the four-Power draft resolution. It also supported paragraph 3 of the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502), which it had supported in the Preparatory Committee.

26. His delegation supported the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1). With regard to the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), it thought it would be unfortunate if the Committee had to vote on so vague a formula whose effects were so difficult to foresee; if it was put to the vote, therefore, he would vote against it. With regard to the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1513, he felt it was somewhat late to reconsider the Preparatory Committee's decision concerning a two-thirds majority, which had been adopted unanimously and was the rule traditionally applied at international conferences held by the United Nations.

Mr. Nettel (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

27. Mr. COULBARY (Senegal) observed that many of the new countries had not been present in 1948 when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had been proclaimed; for them, the International Conference would be the most important event of the International Year for Human Rights. His delegation supported the provisions of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) up to and including operative paragraph 7, but preferred the sixteen-Power text (A/C.3/L.1502) for operative paragraphs 8 and 9. In his view, all non-governmental organizations should be invited to take part in the Conference with the right to speak and he therefore supported the amendments of the United Kingdom and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1). His delegation was disappointed at the tenor of the debate and regretted the ever-widening divisions that existed in the Committee on the subject. It was all very well to speak of the prospects offered by the International Year for Human Rights, but the world situation was far from satisfactory. Even now many human beings throughout the world were dying on the field of battle, or from hunger, or from colonial oppression, and every effort must be made to put an end to that situation.

28. He asked the Director of the Division of Human Rights whether there was any yearbook of non-governmental organizations, which provided information on their activities and organization and which might help to dispel the doubts that had arisen in regard to them. His delegation supported the Conference's provisional agenda (A/6670, annex II), and, like the other sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1513, felt that the Conference should take its decisions on matters of substance by a simple majority. Lastly, he felt that all States, whether or not Members of the United Nations, should be represented at the Conference.

Mrs. Radić (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

29. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) asked the Legal Counsel whether there was anything to prevent the Conference from taking its decisions on matters of substance by a simple majority.

30. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that the text proposed in paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) was another way of expressing the "all States" formula. The difficulty with such a formula was that if it was adopted, and if a particular "entity" expressed a desire to be admitted, a decision would have to be taken as to whether or not it constituted a State. While there were certain rules that could be followed in taking such a decision, it was a political decision and, as such, not within the competence of the Secretary-General, as he himself had explained on earlier occasions. On 18 November 1963 the Secretary-General had made a statement^{1/} in which he had said that the invitation of entities from territories whose status was unclear would place him in a difficult situation unless the General Assembly gave him explicit instructions and, specifically, a complete list of the entities which were to be regarded as States.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked the Legal Counsel whether the Secretary-General would have difficulty if the Hungarian and Ukrainian amendments read: "Welcomes to the International Conference, in addition to the States to be invited under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2217 C (XXI), all other States which may show interest in participating in the work of the Conference". His delegation made that suggestion in order to reconcile the divergent views of other delegations, although his Government had no particular interest in the question, as it had not recognized some of the States to which the text proposed in paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments referred.

32. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) replied that with that formulation the Secretary-General would be freed of responsibility, because he would not be obliged to issue any invitations, and the question of admitting those who asked to participate would be left to the "doorman" of the Conference.

33. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that it would be well to free the Secretary-General of responsibility in that way. However, the "doorman" to whom the Legal Counsel had referred would presumably be the Secretary-General himself, as the servant of the United Nations, and the latter would, of course, be free to tell him what he should do. What he would like to know was whether the formulation he had proposed would leave any legal impediment to the Secretary-General still standing. He asked the Legal Counsel whether, if the formulation "welcomes" was accepted in place of "invites", the "doorman" would have the right to bar the door of the Conference to an applicant.

34. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestion was very interesting, but the decision on the admission of applicants would rest with the Credentials Committee, in accordance with rule 4 of the draft rules of procedure of the Conference (A/6670, annex I).

35. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that, from the legal standpoint, it must be borne in mind, firstly, that there was the question whether the host country would be willing to grant visas to all those wishing to participate in the Conference, and, secondly, that the Secretary-General would not be able to authorize name-plates until the Credentials Committee had taken its decision.

36. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that, when a State decided to be host to an international conference, it more or less committed itself to grant visas to the representatives of participating States, including States with which it had no relations. For example, the United Arab Republic had no diplomatic relations with Iran, yet he was sure that the Iranian Government would not refuse to grant the visas required in order that his country might participate in the Conference. He therefore thought that the problem would be confined to the Credentials Committee.

37. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that the example was not entirely valid, because the United Arab Republic was a Member of the United Nations; the problem would arise in respect of countries which neither had relations with the host country nor were Members of the United Nations. Thus, there might be a visa problem.

38. As to the question of the majority required for the adoption of decisions of substance, he noted that the League of Nations had generally taken such decisions by a simple majority, whereas the United Nations had usually preferred a two-thirds majority. The difference between the two systems was that the simple majority system made it possible to take decisions on many subjects but those decisions had relatively little force, whereas under the two-thirds majority system fewer decisions could be taken but they had more force, because of the greater support they commanded. There was, of course, nothing wrong with the simple majority system, but the decisions taken under that system were necessarily weaker.

39. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that, if the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) was adopted, the General Assembly would have to decide what States would be invited; otherwise, there would be no problem.

40. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked what would happen if the wording "welcomes the attendance ... as observers" was used. On past occasions the United Nations had invited certain States that were not on good terms with some Member States to participate as observers. He asked what difficulty there would be if that wording was used and the Iranian Government had no objection to issuing the requisite visas.

41. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that the use of the word "observers" would not change the situation, since the Secretary-General would in any event have to take a decision.

42. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said it had already been agreed that the use of the word "welcomes" would obviate that problem.

43. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that if the word "welcomes" was used the question would

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1258th meeting, para. 100.

be one for the Iranian Government and the Credentials Committee, and not the Secretary-General.

44. Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that he was somewhat puzzled by the Legal Counsel's replies and the observations of the representative of the United Arab Republic. With that interpretation of the wording proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, it would appear that the illegal racist régime of Southern Rhodesia could apply for admittance to the Conference, and the Credentials Committee would have to decide. Yet only representatives of States could participate in the Conference, and the Credentials Committee was not competent to determine whether or not an applicant was a State. As the change in the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia did not include a list of States, the General Assembly would still be the only body competent to decide which entities were States.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, as he understood it, the United Kingdom still considered Southern Rhodesia a colony; nevertheless, he thought that it should be admitted to the Conference, as a member of the human race. It would be interesting to see what it would have to say. As far as the Credentials Committee was concerned, there were many Members of the United Nations which recognized the very States that they wished to exclude from the Conference.

46. Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) said that there was no intention of excluding any State; it was a question of procedure—in other words, a question of the General Assembly's deciding which States it wished to invite, or which entities were States.

47. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the attempt to equate the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia with other States was unacceptable. The paragraph under discussion was clear; the point was to invite all States, and the General Assembly had already indicated which States it did not recognize and considered illegal. He hoped that there would be no further references to the illegal Southern Rhodesian régime.

48. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to emphasize the need to ensure that the Conference was universal, or that all States desiring to do so should have the right to attend the Conference and to participate in its work. Although his delegation had not asked any questions, it considered that the Legal Counsel, in replying to those which had been put to him, had adopted a political, rather than a legal, approach. When the Legal Counsel was asked what constituted a State he replied that he could say nothing. In those circumstances, one wondered what an Office of Legal Affairs was for if it could not clarify legal questions and instead gave political answers.

49. His delegation considered that the question of universality was of the greatest importance. In the matter of human rights, in particular, there could be no limitation. Some delegations, such as those of the United States, the United Kingdom and New Zealand, had referred to Southern Rhodesia with provocative intent. Everyone knew that Southern Rhodesia was not

a State, but a colonial Territory under United Kingdom administration. Everyone was aware of the decisions on Rhodesia taken by the General Assembly in its resolutions 2012 (XX), 2024 (XX) and 2151 (XXI). Legally, Southern Rhodesia could not act without the consent of the United Kingdom. Moreover, the General Assembly had adopted many resolutions referring to all States, and such resolutions had never, to his knowledge, been sent to Southern Rhodesia. He asked whether the Secretary-General maintained any relations with Southern Rhodesia.

50. His delegation insisted on the need to adopt a text which would invite all States to the Conference, and it would support any draft resolution or amendment designed to achieve that purpose.

51. With reference to the participation of non-governmental organizations, his delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the sixteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1502).

52. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) supported the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2) if amended in the manner proposed by the Guyanese delegation (A/C.3/L.1511), which would insert a new preambular paragraph in the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1.) However, she could not support the new paragraph proposed by the Hungarian and Ukrainian delegations (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), which would be inserted in the operative part of the draft resolution and which the Legal Counsel had said could not be implemented by the Secretary-General.

53. With respect to the participation of non-governmental organizations in the Conference, she was glad that the Secretariat's inquiry concerning possible attendance by organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council had shown that their number was not as large as might at first have been feared, and she would therefore vote in favour of operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, particularly in view of the improvements in the revised text. She would also support paragraph 9, under which it would be possible for non-governmental organizations other than those in consultative status to take part in the Conference, because she thought that that would be conducive to balanced representation. She could not, however, agree to the amendments to paragraphs 8 and 9 in documents (A/C.3/L.1502 and A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2 or to the corresponding sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1512/Rev.1); the original wording adequately guaranteed balanced representation of the organizations mentioned last, by placing the final decision in the hands of the Preparatory Committee, thus making the latter a credentials committee in which, owing to its broad geographical composition and the guidelines suggested during the current discussion, the views of the various Member States would be duly reflected.

54. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that he could not agree to the revised amendments now proposed jointly by the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), which had the same meaning as the previous version, particularly in view of the United Kingdom representative's statements defending

and applauding the possibility that non-governmental organizations would make statements opposing the policies of Member States.

55. With regard to the Soviet Union amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2), he had no objection to the insertion of a new operative paragraph in the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) or to a reference in the preamble to the Kitwe Seminar although he thought that the reference should be expanded as proposed by the Guyanese delegation (A/C.3/L.1511).

56. He supported the first of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) because he believed that the principle of universality should govern the Conference, and he also supported the Ukrainian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1512/Rev.1) designed somewhat to limit participation of non-governmental organizations.

57. Mrs. SORIANO (Philippines) considered the joint draft resolution a balanced and realistic text which would contribute to the success of the International Conference, and said that her delegation endorsed it, subject to certain amendments.

58. She supported paragraph 1 of the Soviet Union amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2) and the Guyanese proposal (A/C.3/L.1511), which drew attention to various seminars concerned with human rights. In the Guyanese proposal, in particular, reference was made to the Manila Seminar which had considered a long-term programme for the advancement of women. Referring to the amendments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), she said that, although her delegation appreciated the principle underlying that amendment, it had doubts concerning its effectiveness and would therefore abstain if it was put to the vote. Her delegation would vote against the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), because they restricted the participation of non-governmental organizations, overlooking the valuable contribution which many of them made to the promotion of human rights.

59. Mr. BASHIER (Sudan) said that, during the general debate, his delegation had opposed the participation of non-governmental organizations in the Conference; however, it had reconsidered its position from a realistic standpoint and would accept the wording in the joint draft resolution, with the changes proposed in amendment A/C.3/L.1502, of which the Sudan was a sponsor. Regarding paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), he had no objection to all States participating in the Conference, since it would not be logical to limit their numbers if non-governmental organizations were invited; he therefore supported that paragraph. He also had no objection to paragraph 3 of those amendments, as he welcomed the idea of the proper representation in the Conference of organizations devoting their efforts to the struggle against colonialism, racialism and apartheid.

60. His delegation supported the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2) because it would like the Conference to devote particular attention to the burning questions of racial discrimination and apartheid.

It was opposed to the proposal of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), since to permit non-governmental organizations to make oral statements would be tantamount to allowing them full participation, which it found unacceptable.

61. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) said that she could not accept the criteria set out in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) for the selection of the non-governmental organizations which would participate in the Conference as observers, since they were too vague, and she therefore fully endorsed the wording used in the sixteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1502), under which invitations would be issued to a limited number of organizations. As the question of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council was under review, no distinction should be made between organizations which were in consultative status and those which were not. Moreover, as the representative of Iraq had pointed out, not a single one of the more than 370 non-governmental organizations in consultative status had as its purpose the elimination of the policies of apartheid. Because it considered that the participation of organizations combating colonialism, racialism and apartheid would contribute to the success of the International Conference on Human Rights, her delegation was in favour of paragraph 3 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). Similarly, it supported paragraph 1 of the Soviet Union amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2), since it considered that the conclusions of the International Seminar held at Kitwe would be of great value to the Conference.

62. Regarding the participation of States, she said that her delegation had always supported the principle of universality of representation in the United Nations and thought that, particularly in such questions as those relating to human rights, there should be no discrimination between States; moreover, it would be incomprehensible to allow observers for non-governmental organizations to participate in the Conference and at the same time to bar States comprising one third of the world population. Consequently, she supported paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments. She was opposed to the proposal of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1) for the reasons stated by the Mauritanian delegation.

63. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1513 sought to change the formula for the adoption of decisions at the International Conference to a simple majority. Decisions of great importance would be taken at the Conference and, if the usual rule for that kind of conference, namely a two-thirds majority, was not applied, the result would be to weaken those decisions. For that reason, her delegation would not support the proposal.

64. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) was fully acceptable to her delegation, and welcomed the withdrawal of all amendments concerning the provisional agenda for the Conference (A/6670, annex II), since it had been carefully studied by the Preparatory Committee.

65. As to the participation in the Conference of States other than those indicated in General Assembly resolution 2217 C (XXI), her delegation would vote against the Hungarian-Ukrainian proposal (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), because it indirectly involved political issues which were not within the competence of the Third Committee. With regard to the participation of non-governmental organizations, her delegation had already expressed itself in favour of inviting all non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. However, since several delegations considered that the participation of a selected group of other non-governmental organizations would contribute to the success of the Conference, it was ready to support the proposals to that effect by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. Her delegation would vote against the proposals on that issue by the sixteen Powers (A/C.3/L.1502) and by Hungary and the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). It would vote in favour of the amendments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), because it considered that the non-governmental organizations participating in the Conference should not be deprived of the possibility of making oral statements.

66. Her delegation would abstain on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1513 concerning rule 34, paragraph 1, of the draft rules of procedure for the Conference (A/6670, annex I), because it thought that the International Conference was not an ordinary conference, since it had to define a work programme of great importance.

67. In conclusion, she said that her delegation welcomed the news-letters on the International Year for Human Rights and hoped that the publication of them would be continued and intensified in 1968.

68. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that he would vote against the proposal for the participation of all States (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). He would abstain from voting on the new preambular paragraph concerning the Seminar on apartheid held at Kitwe (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.2, para. 1), since the representatives of Sweden at that Seminar had abstained with respect to its conclusions. On the question of the majority needed for decisions on matters of substance, he would vote against amendment A/C.3/L.1513, because he wished the principle of a two-thirds majority at important conferences to be maintained. Regarding the question of non-governmental organizations, his delegation had already explained that it could not agree to any discrimination between non-governmental organizations in consultative status.

69. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he would support the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendment proposing a new operative paragraph with regard to the participation of States not invited under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2217 C (XXI) (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). He stressed that the word "universal" expressly indicated that there was no limitation on the applicability of the Declaration of Human Rights. The Members of the United Nations must think more realistically about certain States which were excluded from the Organization; the vicious circle which had been created in respect of those States must be broken.

70. Although it had no objection of principle to the amendments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1), his delegation could not support them for practical reasons, since it considered that the Conference would be too brief for observers for non-governmental organizations to be allowed to speak and that it would be enough to circulate their papers. It would support the sixteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1502) concerning non-governmental organizations. Lastly, his delegation would support amendment A/C.3/L.1513 concerning rule 34, paragraph 1, of the draft rules of procedure if its sponsors would agree to insert in their proposed text the words "unless otherwise decided".

Mr. Nettel (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

71. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said he appreciated the Yugoslav representative's concern and, on behalf of the sponsors of amendment A/C.3/L.1513, accepted his proposal.

72. Miss ALEXANDER (Guyana) withdrew her amendment (A/C.3/L.1511) because the USSR delegation had decided to include in its amendment (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.3) a mention of the Manila, Kingston and Helsinki seminars.

73. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that in paragraph 1 of amendment A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2, the word "Invites" should be replaced by "Welcomes".

74. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1 was on the whole acceptable to her delegation; she nevertheless thought that operative paragraphs 8 and 9 should provide for the same treatment for all non-governmental organizations, whether or not they had consultative status. She also supported paragraph 2 of the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502). She would abstain on the amendments submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1).

75. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) thought the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.3) acceptable, as it incorporated the amendment of Guyana and the conclusions of the seminars it mentioned were of great value. Since his delegation had always defended the principle of universality, he would vote for the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2). He would, on the other hand, vote against the Congolese-United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.1507/Rev.1) because they dealt with a controversial question and would cause the Conference difficulties from the outset. Lastly, he supported the Ukrainian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1512/Rev.1), which placed the emphasis where it belonged.

76. Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat), with reference to the Senegalese representative's question concerning non-governmental organizations, stated that the Secretariat had in its archives a list of those non-governmental organizations which had consultative status and some documentation about them. It also used a year-book of non-governmental organizations, a useful and reasonably authoritative publication, which it could not, however, guarantee, as it was produced outside the United Nations.

77. The representative of the United Arab Republic had asked for a definition of non-governmental organizations; the only one he knew appeared in Economic and Social Council resolution 288 (X). In case of doubt, the Secretariat submitted the matter to the Council's Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. In the present case, it would certainly be submitted to the Preparatory Committee of the Conference.

78. With regard to the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1, it was estimated that the information booklet on the International Year for Human Rights and its continuation, which as proposed would be mentioned in the report, would cost \$28,000. If that amount could not be wholly covered out of Office of Public Information funds, the work could not be carried out unless the General Assembly voted additional funds. As to the meetings of the Preparatory Committee, he had been assured that their cost could be absorbed by the United Nations budget if they were held in February and March 1968 on available dates, as also the cost of translating that Committee's documentation. Within the limits of its financial and staff resources, the Secretariat would also endeavour to translate and circulate the documents of non-governmental organizations, mentioned in operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, although those documents could not be given priority. The Secretariat could also not guarantee that they would all be circulated. The Secretary-General would try to do as he was asked in operative paragraph 11, to the extent permitted by the budget approved by the General Assembly.

Mrs. Radić (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

79. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) asked for a separate vote on the words "all other States which may show interest in participating in the work of the Conference" (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2).

80. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) withdrew his delegation's oral sub-amendment.

81. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1501/Rev.1) and the amendments thereto.

Preamble

Paragraph 1 of the USSR amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.3) was adopted by 75 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

The preamble as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Operative part

Paragraphs 1-6

Paragraphs 1 to 6 were adopted by 88 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Proposals for additional operative paragraphs

82. After a procedural discussion, in which Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. RÍOS (Panama), Mrs. DE CATTAROSI (Uruguay), Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) and Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) took part, Mr. SANON (Upper

Volta) withdrew his request for a separate vote on the words "all other States which may show interest in participating in the work of the Conference" (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2).

At the request of the Australian representative, a vote was taken by roll call on paragraph 1 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2).

India, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary.

Against: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland.

Abstaining: Iran, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Madagascar, Niger, Pakistan, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

The amendment was rejected by 45 votes to 35, with 15 abstentions.

At the request of the USSR representative, a vote was taken by roll call on paragraph 2 of his delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.1506/Rev.3).

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Canada, Chad, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

The amendment was adopted by 71 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

The fourteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1513), with the oral sub-amendment accepted by the sponsors, was adopted by 47 votes to 38, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 7

At the request of the Austrian representative, a vote was taken by roll call on the words "the Council of Europe", on which a separate vote had been requested by the USSR representative.

Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Yugoslavia, Burma, Ceylon, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

The words "the Council of Europe" were adopted by 78 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions.

At the request of the Brazilian representative, a vote was taken by roll call on the words "and the Organization of American States", on which a separate vote had been requested by the Cuban representative.

Malawi, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States

of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar.

Against: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria, Burma, Ceylon, Guyana, Iran.

The words "and the Organization of American States" were adopted by 76 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 as a whole was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 8

Paragraph 1 of the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1502) and paragraph 2 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2), calling for the deletion of paragraph 8, were rejected by 46 votes to 40, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 48 votes to 32, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 9

Paragraph 3 of the Hungarian-Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1505/Rev.2) was rejected by 47 votes to 30, with 10 abstentions.

83. Mrs. MIVÉDOR (Togo) stated that she had voted against the amendment by mistake.

The USSR representative's motion for adjournment of the meeting was rejected by 52 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.

The Ukrainian representative's motion for suspension of the meeting was rejected by 68 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions.

84. After a procedural discussion, in which Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia), Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mrs. EMBAREK WARZAZI (Morocco), Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), Mr. PIPAR-SANIA (India), Miss FERRINGA (Netherlands), Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria), Mr. SQUIRE (United States of America) and Mr. LAVALLE (Guatemala) took part, and in the course of which Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) withdrew the sixteen-Power amendment to operative paragraph 9 (a) (see A/C.3/L.1502, para. 2), the CHAIRMAN, invoking rule 108 of the rules of procedure, said that, if there was no objection, he would adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 9.40 p.m.