



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 62:</i>	
<i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued)</i>	
<i>Draft resolution on the establishment of national human rights commissions (continued)</i>	475
<i>Statements in explanation of vote on the draft International Covenants on Human Rights</i>	476

Chairman: Mrs. Halima EMBAREK WARZAZI (Morocco).

AGENDA ITEM 62

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued)*

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONS (continued)* (A/C.3/L.1408/REV.1)

1. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) observed that the revised draft resolution submitted by his delegation and the delegations of Jamaica and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1) differed substantially from the original, much more strongly worded text submitted by the Jamaican delegation (A/C.3/L.1408). In keeping with the wishes of his delegation, the new text called for the Economic and Social Council to transmit the proposal to establish national commissions on human rights to the Commission on Human Rights for its consideration and recommendations before it was taken up by the General Assembly itself. He thanked the Jamaican delegation for the spirit of co-operation it had shown.
2. Some delegations had said that it was contrary to normal practice to refer in the text to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1407. He asked the Secretariat to clarify that point. In any event, the draft was purely procedural in nature, since its purpose was merely to refer a question to the Commission on Human Rights.
3. He also wished to know whether or not the proposal to mention the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the text was a formal amendment.
4. Mr. SAKSENA (India) felt that the draft resolution under consideration—the provisions of which were most important—should, if possible, be thoroughly discussed. In his view, the text suffered from a basic defect in that the draft resolution to which it referred (A/C.3/L.1407) was in effect an amendment to the

*Resumed from the 1453rd meeting.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and any amendment must conform with the procedure defined in article 51 of the Covenant. Hence, in view of the reference to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1407, the Committee should regard the text as one which it could not properly consider. It should also be noted that the proposal referred to was designed to establish a remedy already provided for in article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was quite possible, following normal procedure, to suggest that the Commission on Human Rights should take up the question of establishing national commissions, but the matter could not be referred to it through the draft resolution now under discussion. In that connexion, he wished to congratulate the delegation of the United Arab Republic for the pertinent amendments it had proposed. In view of the limited time available, the Committee should not take any action on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1.

5. Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said he would like to reply to the question put by the Pakistan representative, who had asked whether it was in keeping with the practice of General Assembly Committees to refer to a proposal contained in a draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly and whether it was essential to indicate the symbol of the document in which the proposal was presented. The Committee was free to formulate any question submitted to it in whatever terms it considered suitable and, thus, to recast the original wording so as to broaden or limit its scope. However, the original wording of a proposal should obviously be retained in any specific references to it.

6. Therefore, the Committee could refer specifically to the text embodying the proposal (A/C.3/L.1407) in the preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1) in which case it should follow the language of the proposal, or it could choose not to refer specifically to the text and define the scope of the question as it saw fit.

7. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) thanked the Director of the Division of Human Rights for his clarifications, from which it appeared that the present wording of the preamble in no way departed from accepted practice.

8. Referring to the Indian representative's remarks, he said he failed to understand why the question could not be referred to the Commission on Human Rights through a resolution, nor could he understand on what grounds the Indian representative based his fundamental objections. Since draft resolution A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1 was a Committee document, it was not for a delegation to state that it could not properly be

considered. The Committee alone could decide the matter.

9. He challenged the Indian representative's statement that the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1) was in effect an amendment to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The sponsors were merely taking the position that the proposal to establish national commissions on human rights required more extensive study on the part of Governments and should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights, which could then offer its view that such commissions could not be established, that the proposal went beyond what article 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights permitted, or that such commissions could be established under certain conditions. Three or four years later, the Third Committee could take up the question again and reject or approve the proposal, either as an amendment or as a separate protocol.

10. States would not really be committing themselves in any way by referring the matter to the Commission on Human Rights, since they would make the final decision. The draft resolution was therefore purely procedural in nature.

11. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) replied that the proposal under consideration nevertheless raised certain problems and, in view of the limited time available, the Committee could not afford to discuss it any further. He therefore proposed that the Committee should adopt the following motion:

"The Committee decides to take no decision on document A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1 and to proceed to the explanations of vote on the International Covenants on Human Rights."

12. Mr. RIOS (Panama) moved the close of the debate,

13. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said it should be fully understood that the vote on closure of the debate did not prejudice the question whether the Committee would take a decision on the Bulgarian motion on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1.

The Committee decided by 51 votes to 16, with 19 abstentions, to close the debate.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the question whether priority should be given to the Bulgarian motion.

The Committee decided by 37 votes to 33, with 14 abstentions, not to give priority to the Bulgarian motion.

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on document A/C.3/L.1408/Rev.1.

16. Mr. ABOUL NASR (United Arab Republic) read out his amendments making changes in the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and deleting the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

17. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) asked the representative of the United Arab Republic not to press for the deletion of operative paragraph 2. His delegation attached great importance to the paragraph in ques-

tion, which was in keeping with the practice followed by the Commission on Human Rights.

18. Mr. ABOUL NASR (United Arab Republic) said he would accede to the Pakistan representative's request. He would, however, ask for a separate vote by roll-call on the words "and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" in the preamble.

19. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, agreed to the proposed amendments, but asked the representative of the United Arab Republic not to press his request for a separate vote.

20. Mr. RIOS (Panama), supported by Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), proposed that the Committee should proceed with the explanations of vote on the draft Covenants until it had before it the revised version of the draft, incorporating the amendments of the United Arab Republic.

It was so decided.

STATEMENTS IN EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON THE DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

21. Mr. AKPO (Togo) said that he had voted against the Optional Protocol and the amendments to it. Naturally, all States tried to ensure the well-being of their citizens, but they were guided in their decisions by the broader interests of their countries, which might not coincide exactly with individual interests. To allow the right of individual petition was to impair the authority of Governments; yet States which had recently become independent needed strong Governments, in order to consolidate their new structures and combat under-development. The national interest must take precedence over individuals' interests, and his delegation had voted against a principle which perhaps was excellent in itself but whose application might lead to a kind of blackmail and might undermine the authority of Governments.

22. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) said that she had voted in favour of both the draft Covenants and the Optional Protocol. Her delegation's position was too well known to require further explanation. The adoption of those instruments, which advanced the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by giving them binding force, was an important step forward in the effort to codify human rights. In view of the fact that some countries had not yet been Members of the United Nations when the earlier articles had been adopted, her delegation had voted in favour of the right to make reservations, but it hoped that that right would be exercised sparingly. It also attached great importance to the measures of implementation and was pleased that provision had been made for the right of individual communication. It earnestly hoped that the Covenants would be ratified by as many countries as possible.

23. Mr. RESICH (Poland) stressed the importance of the work on the International Covenants on Human Rights, the adoption of which marked a turning-point in the development of the international community. The Covenants were an extension of the Universal Declaration and a consummation of it on the juridical plane.

Together, they formed a kind of international code of human rights which would serve as the basis for drawing up a body of international law. They should be given universal application, and the final clauses were therefore vitally important. However, two schools of thought had emerged in the Committee. Some delegations had voiced support for a procedure involving very far-reaching interference in the domestic affairs of countries, while others had expressed the view that such a system would make it impossible to implement the Covenants and had advocated more flexible and liberal supervision which would take account of the sovereign will of States. The Committee had opted in many instances for a compromise between the two viewpoints, and the spirit of conciliation shown by all members had enabled the work to be completed, to the benefit of future generations.

24. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that she had voted in favour of both the draft Covenants on the Optional Protocol, which her delegation regarded as documents of the highest importance. Their adoption was a mark of the concern of the international community to promote the advancement of human rights in the largest sense. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights encompassed all those rights the protection of which must be regarded as a fundamental necessity in any society. The best protection of human dignity that any individual could have was the ability to speak and act without fear in defence of his own rights, regardless of race, caste, religion, sex or colour. For that reason, her delegation would have hoped for the most unequivocal and precise statement of civil and political rights and for the most effective machinery for their implementation.

25. Her delegation also attached great importance to economic, social and cultural rights, which her own country had made a signal effort to promote and protect. It was now universally recognized that those rights were quite as essential as civil and political rights to the dignity and well-being of the individual.

26. The texts which had been adopted by the Committee had, however, some weaknesses. In places they were vague or generalized, and in others dogmatic or unduly specific. Moreover, there were some areas in which her delegation believed that higher minimum standards might have been set. Of course, all countries would have some criticism of the texts and, like New Zealand, would need to study them with care before being able to become parties.

27. The Committee's principal effort of the session had been the elaboration of machinery for implementation. The Committee had settled for implementation procedures less rigorous than those it had adopted in 1965 in the case of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. While New Zealand had been ready to accept stronger procedures it had been able to support those which had been devised because they allowed room for development. Her delegation had noted that it had been argued in that connexion that the International Convention was a special case. In a sense it was, yet if civil and political rights were granted and protected on a basis of equality, that would go a long way towards dealing with the problem of discrimination, since individuals

and groups would thereby be afforded a powerful weapon for fighting discrimination by their own efforts. It would be short-sighted to display partiality in matters of human rights or their protection, and it was in that spirit that her delegation advocated the drafting of other instruments on human rights.

28. Mrs. HARRIS (United States of America) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft Covenants and welcomed their adoption because it believed that after twenty years of arduous work, the United Nations must in 1966 move forward in promulgating a broadly acceptable codification of human rights. The Covenants testified to its efforts to translate the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into rights recognized by law.

29. Unfortunately, the formulation of certain ideas in the Covenants caused her delegation grave concern.

30. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights spoke of "rights" which, in fact, were objectives that no Government could implement immediately. That was recognized in article 2, paragraph 1, which provided that States parties were "to take steps . . . with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant by all appropriate means . . .".

31. However, article 2, paragraph 1, also provided that each State party should take steps "individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources. . .". The United States Government participated actively, under the Charter of the United Nations, in efforts at international economic and social co-operation, particularly with the developing countries, but article 2, paragraph 1, might be construed as imposing a formal obligation upon the States parties to give economic, technical or other assistance. Her Government rejected such an interpretation; it was not appropriate to specify in a covenant on human rights the forms which international co-operation might take.

32. Article 2, paragraph 3, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which had been adopted by the Committee by 41 votes to 38, with 21 abstentions, provided for discriminatory treatment of non-nationals by a certain group of States parties, and established a vague double standard between developed and "developing" countries. That provision was contrary to the spirit of universality of the Universal Declaration and to accepted principles of international law; it also ran counter to the provisions of paragraph 2 of the same article, under which the States parties to the Covenant undertook "to guarantee that the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind. . .". Furthermore, paragraph 3 might be construed as prohibiting developed countries from distinguishing between their own nationals and aliens, whereas it was a generally accepted international practice of all States to make certain distinctions between nationals and aliens, with due regard to international law. If such a provision was to be included in the Covenant, it should have recognized that the right belonged to all States, and not merely to "developing

countries"—a term which, incidentally, was not defined in the Covenant. Her delegation had, therefore, voted against that paragraph, and continued to find it unacceptable.

33. Article 25 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which was identical with article 47 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, was out of place in the implementation clauses. Her Government fully supported the principle expressed in article 25, but article 1, paragraph 2 of the Covenant provided the effective substantive formulation on that question, and it could not be impaired by article 25, as other delegations had said, including some of the sponsors of article 25.

34. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights defined rights and obligations which States undertook to respect and ensure immediately upon becoming parties.

35. Her delegation had voted for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and for the Optional Protocol to that Covenant. It felt that States parties to the Covenant which were prepared to grant their nationals the right to submit individual communications should have the opportunity to do so.

36. She emphasized the value of many of the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, particularly the confirmation of the right to liberty and security of person, the right to a free and fair trial, and freedom of association. However, article 20 provided that "any propaganda for war" and "any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence" were to be prohibited by law. One of the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Covenant itself was freedom of speech. Her Government took the view that article 20 did not obligate a State to take any action that would prohibit its citizens from freely and fully expressing their views on any subject, however obnoxious they might be, and regardless of whether they were in accord with Government policy. The United States Supreme Court had drawn a distinction between advocacy of abstract doctrine and advocacy directed at promoting unlawful action. Her delegation therefore considered that States parties should not act under article 20 unless the dissemination of the obnoxious ideas mentioned therein was accompanied by, or threatened imminently to promote, illegal acts. Articles 19 and 21 created similar problems, and they fell below the standards established by the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

37. Article 5, which was common to both Covenants, provided that there should be no restriction upon or derogation from any of the fundamental human rights recognized or existing in any State on the pretext that the Covenant did not recognize such rights or that it recognized them to a lesser extent. Her Government was particularly pleased at the inclusion of that provision, since the legal protection of human rights in the United States was more extensive than that afforded by the Covenant. No action under the Covenant could restrict the enjoyment of any rights in the

United States. The Covenants did not impose obligations on States inconsistent with their constitutional guarantees or with the established constitutional framework of federal-state relationships.

38. Her delegation's concern was that the Covenants did not go far enough in protecting rights of all individuals, and it feared that some might see opportunities for and support of discriminatory action detrimental to the exercise of the very rights guaranteed in the Covenants. She wished to state in conclusion that although an affirmative vote did not carry any implication for any State with respect to signature or ratification of the Covenants, her delegation hoped that they would quickly enter into force and thus add a new dimension to the protection of human rights.

39. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) said she wished to join in the expressions of satisfaction at the adoption of the International Covenants on Human Rights, which was an historic event. It was gratifying that the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a cornerstone of the philosophy of the United Nations, were now embodied in instruments having binding force.

40. No one would contend that the Covenants were perfect. Perfection was not to be expected in instruments which had been so long in the making and which were, in their final formulation, the result of compromises among the representatives of countries with very different civilizations and at very different stages of development. Although her delegation did not find all the provisions of the Covenants equally acceptable, its objections had not prevented it from voting for both of the draft Covenants and the Optional Protocol.

41. Ireland's history had been such as to make that country particularly attached to the cause of human rights and fundamental freedoms, which were guaranteed in its Constitution. It was therefore not surprising that Ireland had been among the first to welcome the extension to the international plane of principles which were fundamental to its domestic legislation or that it was a party to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and to the European Social Charter.

42. Her delegation was glad to have been associated with the adoption of the Covenants, which would, it hoped, give new impetus to the efforts being made to promote human rights under the auspices of the United Nations.

43. Mr. BABAA (Libya) said that the Covenants were as fundamentally important as the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and that their adoption marked a significant advance towards universal respect for the fundamental freedoms and the dignity of the human person.

44. Although there had been criticism of some provisions, that was not surprising in view of the fact that many of them were the result of a series of compromises.

45. The Libyan Constitution, which had been drafted under the auspices of the United Nations, already contained guarantees of all the political, social and economic rights enumerated in the Covenants. He had therefore had no hesitation in voting for the two draft Covenants. In a spirit of goodwill, he had also voted for the Optional Protocol, even though there was some question as to whether an individual could be regarded as a subject of international law.
46. Mr. OUSSEINI (Niger) expressed regret that he had been unable to attend the last meetings which the Committee had devoted to consideration of the Covenants. He noted that he had always opposed the establishment of a committee authorized to receive petitions from individuals, since, in his opinion, such a committee would inevitably interfere in the domestic affairs of States and might even be used for that purpose by the great Powers. His Government was extremely jealous of its independence and felt that no one was better able than it was to defend the interests of its nationals. All the principles enunciated in the Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789 and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 were embodied in his country's Constitution. Despite the improvements made in the text, he would have voted against recognition of the right of individual communication and had voted against the Optional Protocol as a whole, but he had voted for the two draft Covenants.
47. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly stated that it favoured a single system of implementation that was common to the two Covenants. It had also consistently opposed recognition, in the Covenants or in any related instrument, of the right of individual petition. It had a number of reasons for maintaining its position. From a political standpoint, it could only be harmful to international understanding if a committee responsible for considering petitions was permitted to interfere in the domestic affairs of States. In a legal sense, recognition of the right of petition gave rise to difficulties inasmuch as individuals were not subjects of international law. Finally, from a standpoint, it must be recognized that an international instrument was not intended to guarantee the rights of individuals. He would therefore have voted against the inclusion in the Covenant of an article guaranteeing the right of individual petition. He had abstained in the vote on the Optional Protocol in deference to the wishes of certain African and Asian countries. He was, in any case, glad that the Protocol—which was unacceptable and, moreover, of secondary importance—was not contained in the body of the Covenant.
48. It was now to be hoped that the future signatories would make the necessary changes in their legislation, since the Covenants would otherwise remain a dead letter.
49. Mr. PAOLINI (France) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of both draft International Covenants on Human Rights, in whose preparation it had taken part from the outset. It was glad that that work had been concluded during the present year in the Third Committee and congratulated the Chairman personally and paid a tribute to her untiring industry.
50. His delegation regretted, however, that, through lack of time, diplomatic documents of such importance had not been submitted in their entirety to Governments before their final adoption. As a result, national authorities had been unable to examine all the provisions with all the necessary care.
51. In those circumstances, the affirmative vote of the French delegation really amounted to approval in principle and did not prejudice the ultimate decision of the French Government. Like all the Governments represented in the Committee, his Government was compelled to reserve the right to make, upon subsequently signing the instrument, such declarations or reservations it deemed necessary.
52. His delegation had also approved the draft Protocol on communications from individuals. In order not to delay the adoption of the two draft Covenants on human rights, it had voted for the text as a whole and for the different articles of the Protocol although that international instrument had not been communicated in advance to Governments, even in the form of a simple draft.
53. During a partial vote on article 5, paragraph 4, the Committee had been invited to take action on a text of the draft in English in spite of the objections raised. In those circumstances, his delegation, together with the others, had been unable to take part in that particular vote.
54. It wished to state again that the rules concerning the use of the official and working languages set forth in rule 51 *et seq.* of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly constituted basic provisions for the organization of work of the United Nations. It was the responsibility of the Secretariat to ensure at every moment that the texts submitted for the Committee's approval were in perfect concordance in all the official languages. It was also the responsibility of delegations to reach final agreement in their respective languages on the drafting of the texts to which they subscribed. Those rules were all the more important in the case of a protocol to a diplomatic instrument of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts were equally authentic, as stated in article 14 of the draft Protocol.
55. His delegation had abstained on article 15 of the draft Protocol because of the reference it contained to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on which his delegation's position remained unchanged.
56. Finally, his delegation wished to refer to the title "Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights". When his delegation had suggested that title, it had not made a substantive proposal but a mere suggestion concerning grammar and drafting. The Chairman herself had approved of that suggestion.
57. Mr. OSBORN (Australia) said that his country was deeply concerned to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction as to race, sex or religion, in the spirit of the Charter. It was for that reason that his delegation had cooperated in the work of the Committee and had voted in favour of both Covenants and the Protocol. However, a vote cast at that stage was not an expression of a

State's agreement to be bound by the provisions of the text. A further expression of consent, involving signature and ratification was necessary before the text became binding. Several points of detail in the Covenants would require further study by the Australian Government. As an example, there was a lack of definition in the reference to a right to self-determination in article 1 of both Covenants.

58. Mrs. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the time which the Committee had devoted to the Covenants had been well spent, for provisions concerning human rights should be examined critically and objectively, especially when, as in the present instance, they had been drafted by bodies which would no longer be regarded as representative of the United Nations. The Committee could therefore be proud of the work it had done.

59. With regard to the implementation of the Covenants, she said that the problems faced by the newly independent States were not only different from those of other countries, but were sometimes the heritage of a colonial past. For example, the colonizers had taken for themselves the highest posts in government without taking into account the interests of the indigenous people. It was for that reason that "Africanization" was necessary. Furthermore, while the newly independent countries had to ensure respect for the rights of the individual, what they had to ensure above all was the security of the State, for Africans had learned from bitter experience that human rights could not be guaranteed unless the security of the State was guaranteed. That was why the African countries were primarily concerned with the security of the State, in other words, the security of the greatest number, sometimes at the expense of the individual. She recalled, in that connexion, that during the discussion the Committee had been divided on the question whether the human rights of an individual should take precedence over the security of the State, or vice versa. She wished to point out that human rights had been the inspiration for her country's struggle for independence and had been embodied in the Tanzanian Constitution when independence had been achieved. She quoted, in that connexion, a statement by President Nyerere in which he had proclaimed the right of every individual to be treated as a man with dignity and honour.

60. One fear of the developing countries was that the big Powers might interfere in their internal affairs and it was a fact that some of those Powers did not hesitate to satisfy their own selfish interests and even went so far as to accuse small countries of violating human rights if they took measures to oppose outside interference. It would be unfortunate if the

implementation system of the Covenants simply provided certain States with a means of interfering in the internal affairs of the developing countries and only led to a hardening of the attitude of the countries affected, without in any way furthering the interests of the individual. She therefore appealed to Governments to implement the Covenants in their territory with all possible goodwill and without trying to use them as an instrument of interference in the affairs of other States.

61. With reference to article 27, she drew attention to the fact that her delegation had opposed the appointment of experts as it considered that a person's origin and education necessarily influenced his judgement, however impartial he might claim to be. Furthermore, there were still very few experts in the developing countries. In conclusion, she said that her Government remained faithful to the principle of universality. The International Covenants on Human Rights should be opened for signature by all countries without exception.

62. Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) requested that the Tanzanian representative's statement should be fully reported in the summary record of the meeting since it accurately summarized the concern of all the developing countries.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that would be done.

64. Mrs. SOUMAH (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Hungary, Mali and Guinea, thanked all the delegations which had contributed to the adoption of the Covenants, thus providing mankind with a number of sure guarantees. She regretted that the Covenants were not to be opened for signature by all States without exception as she would like all peoples of the world to be able to enjoy the protection of United Nations instruments and she regretted that certain delegations which claimed to uphold human rights were deliberately seeking to deprive a large part of humanity of the benefit of those guarantees.

65. The delegations on whose behalf she was speaking had abstained in the vote on the Protocol as a whole because they feared that the right of petition would be used for political ends.

66. Those delegations would have liked a single system of implementation for the two Covenants, but the work of the Committee had finally resulted in the adoption of three separate instruments: one providing a reporting system, the other for a human rights committee and the third for a system of individual petition.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.