



Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 55

Youth, its education in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, its problems and needs, and its participation in national development: report of the Secretary-General (concluded) (A/7921 and Add.1 and 2, A/8003, chap. IX, sect. K; A/C.3/L.1764)

EXPLANATIONS OF VOTE (concluded)

1. Miss EDMONDS (United States of America) explained that she had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2, as amended, because she believed that on balance it was positive. In particular, she strongly supported the paragraphs which stressed the involvement of youth in wide sectors of human activity, called for the education of young people in ideals of justice, co-operation and respect for human rights and requested continuing activity of United Nations bodies in programmes and projects dealing with youth. The United Nations must become more responsive to the needs of young people and secure their participation in its activities, in order to establish with them a close relationship which would ensure that the Organization would be vital to the succeeding generation when it assumed leadership.

2. However, her delegation could not fail to express its concern at a resolution which introduced political considerations reflecting the special views of members of the Committee rather than the ideals and aspirations of youth in general. It therefore particularly welcomed the adoption of its amendment to paragraph 4 (A/C.3/L.1784 and Corr.1) concerning the need at any future World Youth Assembly to ensure fair treatment and full participation for all youth representatives, and of the fourth amendment in document A/C.3/L.1790/Rev.1 submitted by Argentina, Costa Rica, Panama and Uruguay. As to the amendment to operative paragraph 7 submitted by Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.1792/Rev.1), as orally amended, her delegation, like others, was naturally opposed to the evils enumerated in that text but it could not support it without betraying the guarantees of freedom of speech set forth in the Constitution of the United States and in those of many other nations. It had also opposed the new paragraph proposed by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.3/L.1775), which seemed tendentious in tone and did not provide youth with constructive guidance or emphasize the desirability of peaceful solutions in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) made it clear that self-determination was manifested not only in the emergence of an

independent sovereign State but also in free association or integration with an independent State.

3. The sponsors of the draft resolution had not taken into consideration such important educational factors as concern for quality of life, environment, population and educational reform. Nor had they mentioned such positive actions as international voluntary service or an international university, which had been drawn to the attention of delegations by the Secretary-General, the Shah of Iran and the President of the United States. It was even more regrettable that the sponsors had assumed certain views expressed by the World Youth Assembly to be representative of youth as a whole, totally ignoring the denial at that gathering of the most fundamental human right—that of free speech—to all participants.

4. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation had abstained on or opposed those amendments which had a political connotation extraneous to the problems dealt with in the draft resolution or even to the competence of the Committee. Although most of those amendments had been adopted, her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, because the sponsors had shown a real spirit of co-operation in accommodating requests made by various delegations, including her own, thus making the final text a more balanced one.

5. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, although some of the provisions of the text and of the amendments did not meet with his delegation's approval. Specifically, he had had to vote against the amendments submitted by Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.1792/Rev.1) to operative paragraph 7 and against the Czechoslovak amendment to operative paragraph 13 contained in document A/C.3/L.1783 because their wording was not clear and might encourage attempts to prevent freedom of speech. The former also sought to include a reference to nazism in paragraph 7, notwithstanding the lengthy debate on the insertion of a reference to that ideology in paragraph 8. His delegation had also voted against the amendment submitted by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.3/L.1775) because it was of a political nature and repeated ideas already expressed in paragraph 8, and against the amendment to the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by Mongolia (A/C.3/L.1782), because it did not consider that there were logical reasons for granting special privileges to young people in times of armed conflict.

6. On the other hand, his delegation had voted in favour of the sub-amendment submitted by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1795), which provided a compromise formula very similar to that already accepted orally by the representative of the Netherlands in connexion with his own subamendment

(A/C.3/L.1794); if the former had not been adopted, he would have voted in favour of the latter. Although he had supported the Canadian amendment to operative paragraph 8 (A/C.3/L.1788/Rev.1), he had abstained on that paragraph in its amended form because it also contained references to other instruments, the principles of which were not in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

7. Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana) said that his delegation had voted against all the amendments which expressed concepts already included in the text of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2. In particular, it had voted against the Mongolian amendment (A/C.3/L.1782), the main idea of which was already covered in the fourth preambular paragraph. Its vote in favour of the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.1784 and Corr.1) to operative paragraph 4 was due to its concern at the unfortunate way in which the activities of the World Youth Assembly had been conducted. It had also voted in favour of the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1795), because it was a good compromise between the different wordings submitted by the USSR (A/C.3/L.1793) and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.1794) for the inclusion of a reference to nazism in operative paragraph 8. Lastly, he had voted against the second of the amendments submitted by the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.1778) because its wording appeared weaker than that of the original text.

8. Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom) said that she had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1767/Rev.2, as amended, although with considerable reservations and misgivings. Her delegation had hoped for a resolution addressed to the problems of youth and was disappointed that the text was of a highly political nature, which might give youth the impression that the Committee was not really concerned about its problems and aspirations but was merely using the discussion on the item to introduce international political questions.

9. With regard to operative paragraph 8, she had welcomed the adoption of the Canadian amendment (A/C.3/L.1788/Rev.1), although she had decided to abstain on the paragraph as amended because of its highly political nature and because of the restrictive wording of its reference to nazism. She had voted against the new paragraph proposed by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.3/L.1775) not only because of the political nature of its subject matter but also because she considered the wording tendentious and misleading and the call to youth embodied in it ambiguous. Her delegation had, however, felt able to vote in favour of the amended draft resolution as a whole, even after the inclusion of that paragraph, on the understanding that, despite the regrettable omission of any reference to the Charter, the paragraph did not condone the use of force.

10. She would have voted in favour of operative paragraph 7 if it had not been modified in terms of the amendment submitted by Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.1792/Rev.1), which, in addition to being a purely political proposal, contained a very limiting reference to nazism and implied restrictions on freedom of speech. Operative paragraphs 1, 8 and 13 contained explicit or implicit references to the Declaration on the Promotion

among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, on both of which the United Kingdom had expressed its opinion on other occasions.

11. In conclusion, she welcomed the adoption of the amendments to operative paragraph 4 submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.1784 and Corr.1) and Argentina, Costa Rica, Panama and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.1790/Rev.1). They stressed the need for any future world youth assembly to preserve freedom of speech and to ensure fair treatment and full participation for all youth representatives.

12. Mrs. SIPILÄ (Finland) said that she had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, because in her view it reconciled the very divergent points of view expressed in the discussion. Her delegation welcomed the virtually unanimous adoption of the text, an outcome due largely to the strenuous efforts of its sponsors. Her delegation's votes on the amendments reflected its opinion on their relevance to the draft resolution and did not imply any views on the substance of those proposals. Although many delegations had said that the topic of youth would not be controversial, the discussion had shown that youth problems were highly complex and deserved the closest possible attention.

13. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) explained that, despite her interest in the topic of the education of youth in respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, she had had to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because it was not the message which her delegation would have liked to address to world youth.

14. With regard to the preamble, Costa Rica had voted against the inclusion of the new paragraph proposed by Mongolia (A/C.3/L.1782), which it thought would upset the balance of the preamble. It had voted in favour of the fifth paragraph, although the question of development was not one which should have been dealt with in the resolution, and had welcomed the approval of the new sixth paragraph proposed by Argentina, Panama, Uruguay and itself. It had voted for the seventh paragraph but had abstained on the eighth because the United States proposal had not been adopted. It had had reservations about the ninth paragraph and had therefore voted against it. Her delegation would have voted against the Syrian amendment for the same reasons had it been present during the vote on the tenth paragraph.

15. As far as the operative part was concerned, Costa Rica had voted in favour of paragraph 4 as amended by the United States proposal (A/C.3/L.1784 and Corr.1) and the proposal in document A/C.3/L.1790/Rev.1, concerning the strict observance of freedom of speech. That concept had to be taken into account in any move to convene a youth assembly. Her delegation had also supported the amendment submitted by Mauritania and Morocco (A/C.3/L.1789/Rev.1), since it was important for young people to be aware not only of their rights but also of their responsibilities. It would have voted for paragraph 7, but had been obliged to oppose it because of the adoption of the amendment of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/

L.1792/Rev.1), which introduced ideas that conflicted somewhat with the aim of the resolution. In that connexion, it did not think it was within the Committee's competence to distinguish between just and unjust wars. Nor had it supported paragraph 8, as amended to include the word "nazism"; also, it had opposed the Iraqi subamendment (A/C.3/L.1795), because it unduly restricted the interpretation of the concept of "totalitarian ideologies". The fact was that there were ideologies and régimes which, although not necessarily racist, denied human rights and fundamental freedoms just the same. Lastly, her delegation had abstained from voting on the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.1775) because the proposal reiterated concepts expressed elsewhere in the resolution and introduced political elements.

16. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was surprised at the statements that the resolution that had been adopted was of a political nature, an argument which had been used to reject various important amendments, including some of those proposed by his delegation.

17. The debate had shown that nazism still had its disguised but active supporters who concealed their intentions beneath a cloak of reforming zeal. Defence of that evil ideology, whether open or covert, was a sign of irresponsibility, however much it might masquerade behind semantic arguments or pompous respectability. The discussion had also served to strengthen his conviction that, in the present period of world development as symbolized by the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, there could be no acceptance of such ideologies of enslavement, which were merely the counterpart of colonialism, representing an outrage against human dignity and against the interests of the international community as a whole.

18. Although his delegation would have preferred a document that spelt out certain concepts more decisively, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it reflected most of the ideas put forward in the discussion. In that connexion, he wished to express his gratitude to the sponsors of the text which had been adopted for their untiring efforts and their objectivity.

19. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the definition of the term "totalitarian" read out by the Netherlands representative at the preceding meeting, said that Webster's Dictionary was not exactly the most appropriate source in the context in question and that, in addition, the quotation was incomplete.

20. Mr. AL-SHAWI (Iraq) said that, although the Netherlands representative was to be commended for attempting to define the term in question, he himself, during his long experience first as a student and then as a professor of political science, had never used Webster's Dictionary as a reference work on political matters, nor has he known it to be used for that purpose by others.

21. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that he was somewhat perplexed by the two previous statements since he thought he had made it perfectly clear that his remarks

on the term "totalitarian" were addressed to the USSR representative. He wished to point out to the latter that the word "totalitarian" appeared in resolution 2545 (XXIV), on the question of nazism. That resolution had been adopted unanimously, and presumably, since the subject was of the keenest interest to the Soviet Union, it had participated in the vote and was thoroughly familiar with the meaning of the terms used in that text.

22. Mr. AL-SHAWI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, reminded the Netherlands representative that, without exception, the Committee consisted of representatives of sovereign and independent States.

23. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he wished to point out to the Netherlands representative that his sole purpose in intervening was to draw attention to omissions and inaccuracies in a quotation taken from a work the use of which was unacceptable for reference purposes in political discussions.

24. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said he could not understand the object of the statements by the Netherlands representative or his repeated allusions to the USSR. Nor could he see the point of the reference to resolution 2545 (XXIV), since his delegation never had difficulties with clear and accurate formulations. The drafting problems which had been raised were simply a pretext to divert the attention of the international community from the question of nazism and its present manifestations and to hinder the fight against that ideology.

25. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic), explaining his vote on the subamendment of Iraq (A/C.3/L.1795), pointed out that nazism and other totalitarian ideologies were the underlying causes of a great many of the world's problems, and that nazism had been the main destructive force in the Second World War. There were ideologies and practices in existence which resembled nazism and which were responsible for the aggression and discrimination practised in the Middle East and the policies of discrimination and racism which were being applied in southern Africa. It was therefore necessary to make every possible effort and to muster the forces of all generations to eradicate that evil and eliminate those practices. His delegation wished to state that, in voting in favour of the subamendment of Iraq and all the other amendments and paragraphs, it had been guided primarily by the opinions and ideas expressed by youth itself and clearly manifested in the message of the World Youth Assembly. Youth had demonstrated its faith in the Charter of the United Nations, its love of peace and its firm determination to fight against oppression and discrimination and for the liberation and self-determination of peoples.

26. The representative of the Netherlands had said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had drafted a complicated political instrument lacking in impartiality. However, it should be pointed out that the draft resolution which had been adopted was based largely on General Assembly resolution 2037 (XX), 2447 (XXIII) and 2497 (XXIV) and on the conclusions of the Belgrade seminar and the message of the World Youth Assembly.

AGENDA ITEMS 53 AND 60

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (A/8003, chap. IX, sect. A; A/8027, A/8057, A/8061, A/8062 and Add.1 and 2, A/8117, A/C.3/L.1765):

- (a) **International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) **Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination and the policies of *apartheid* and segregation in southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (c) **Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, submitted under article 9 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;**
- (d) **Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General**

The importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (A/7998)

27. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) stressed the importance of the topics before the Committee and said that he would first discuss the four subitems under item 53 on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

28. Concerning subitem (a) on the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, he recalled that the decision to dedicate a year specifically to action to combat racism dated from the International Conference on Human Rights, held at Teheran in 1968, and that the General Assembly, referring to resolution XXIV¹ adopted by the Conference, had in its resolution 2544 (XXIV) designated the year 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Assembly had considered that that year should be observed in the name of the ever-growing struggle against racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations and in the name of international solidarity with those struggling against racism; it had approved the programme for the observance of the International Year prepared by the Secretary-General² and had called upon all States and international agencies to co-operate in every possible way in its implementation. There was thus a programme for the observance of the International Year, reproduced in document A/C.3/L.1765, and every effort should be made to implement it as effectively as possible.

29. He then listed the various elements comprising the programme, mentioning the purpose of the International Year and the decision that it should be a year of action, and analysed the various suggestions, particularly those addressed to the relevant United Nations organs to the effect that they might organize at Headquarters a special meeting

of the General Assembly on the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and undertake a comprehensive review of measures and decisions taken to eliminate racial discrimination (see A/C.3/L.1765, suggestion B). It would be recalled that in its resolution 3 (XXVI),³ the Commission on Human Rights had requested the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to consider those questions and to transmit its conclusions and recommendations. Complying with that request, the Sub-Commission at its twenty-third session had approved, after consideration, the general outline of the report that had been submitted by the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Santa Cruz, which was available to members of the Committee.⁴ In the same resolution the Commission on Human Rights had also decided to review further the detailed programme of the International Year at its twenty-seventh session and had approved some other very interesting provisions. For example, it had renewed the appeal made by the Economic and Social Council to universities, scientific institutes and establishments to contribute as widely as possible in the fields of science and education to the cause of human rights and, in particular, to the fight against racial discrimination. It was, in fact, apparent from available reports that a growing number of universities were allocating a place in their educational programmes to the question of respect for human rights and, in particular, to the fight against racial discrimination.

30. In subparagraph (c) of suggestion B of the programme (see A/C.3/L.1765), it was indicated that the competent United Nations organs might initiate new programmes aimed at the eradication of racial discrimination, as contemplated in resolution VII⁵ of the Teheran Conference. The Secretary-General had arranged to undertake the activities proposed in that resolution and endorsed by the General Assembly at previous sessions.

31. All the organs mentioned in subparagraph (d) of the same suggestion had been informed of the programme for the International Year, and several of them had furnished specific and positive replies. The President of the Trusteeship Council would issue a statement in that connexion in January 1971. The Commission for Social Development would probably deal with the question at its twenty-second session in March 1971. The Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa had recently issued a report⁶ in which it expressed its interest in the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and indicated what form its participation would take. The United Nations Council for Namibia was also dealing with the question in its report,⁷ and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples would also consider the matter at its future meetings and report to the General Assembly.

³ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 5*, p. 72.

⁴ Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/301.

⁵ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 8.

⁶ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 22*.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 240.

¹ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 18.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 55, document A/7649.

32. Three organizations—the Council of Europe, the League of Arab States and the Organization of American States—had already responded to subparagraph (e) of the suggestion with positive action along the lines proposed.

33. With regard to subparagraphs (f) and (g), it would be for the General Assembly, of course, to issue the appeals in question at the current session or at the next one.

34. In accordance with suggestion C in the programme for the observance of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the Secretary-General was requested to organize, under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, a world-wide seminar on measures to be taken on the national level for the implementation of United Nations instruments aimed at combating and eliminating racial discrimination and for the promotion of harmonious race relations. The Government of Cameroon had invited the Secretary-General to convene a symposium on that subject at Yaoundé in 1971, and consultations were taking place concerning the agenda. In addition, the Government of France had invited the Secretary-General to organize a seminar in that country; although the theme of the latter meeting had not yet been finally decided, it was expected that the topics to be considered would include the identification of racial intolerance in all its forms and means of combating it. With respect to subparagraph (b) of suggestion C, all Governments had been advised of the availability of United Nations technical assistance in drafting legislation to prohibit racial discrimination. The guidelines in subparagraph (c) of suggestion C had also been given attention and were being put into effect. For instance, a special issue of the publication *Objective: Justice*, devoted to the International Year and containing contributions by the relevant specialized agencies, would be distributed in seven languages in January 1971. A radio documentary script had also been prepared, and arrangements had been made for an exhibition of documents at United Nations Headquarters. Postage stamps commemorating the International Year would be issued in September 1971 in New York and at Geneva, and special cancellations would be used during the year. Arrangements had also been made for the distribution of bulletins on the subject and, in view of the success of the symbol for the International Year for Human Rights, an emblem had been devised for the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Lastly, steps had been taken to co-ordinate the activities of the entire United Nations system in connexion with the International Year and to facilitate the exchange of information with international and national agencies through the establishment of a special co-ordination group.

35. In response to the invitation in suggestion D, twenty-five Governments had indicated that they would be celebrating the International Year with various activities, including official functions attended by senior government officials, the submission of draft legislation, the holding of public debates, radio and television broadcasts and, in some cases, the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

36. Suggestion E related to the activities of the specialized agencies; the reports of the agencies contained information on their plans in connexion with the International Year.

37. About fifty non-governmental organizations had already responded to the invitation that had been issued in accordance with suggestion F. They included institutions engaged in studying the problems of racial discrimination, United Nations associations, and other bodies whose work for the promotion of human rights was based on religious ideals or scientific interests; all of them could actively assist in disseminating information and teaching basic concepts. He emphasized in that connexion the value of individual action, which could be encouraged by Governments.

38. With regard to item 53 (b), he noted that the action taken by the Secretary-General and by United Nations organs to implement General Assembly resolutions 2547 A (XXIV) and 2547 B (XXIV) were summarized in the report of the Secretary-General (A/8057). In that report, pursuant to operative paragraph 17 of resolution 2547 A (XXIV), which requested information on the implementation of the resolution by the Governments of Portugal, the United Kingdom and South Africa, the Secretary-General stated that he had received data concerning the United Kingdom Government, but not the Governments of South Africa and Portugal. The report also complied with the request made in paragraph 18 of the resolution. It should be noted in that connexion that the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia summarized the Council's work on the subjects to which the resolution related. The report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was requested in resolution 2547 A (XXIV) was still awaited. Those two reports would be considered in other committees of the General Assembly.

39. In connexion with the provisions of operative paragraph 13 of resolution 2547 A (XXIV), he stated that two competent departments of the Secretariat maintained registers of persons subjected to imprisonment, detention, banishment and other restrictions in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration and that they gave wide publicity to the lists of prisoners. With regard to paragraphs 15 and 16 of the resolution, concerning the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and a possible expansion of its scope, he drew attention to document A/8117 and to the report of the Secretary-General (A/8109), which had been submitted to the Special Political Committee.

40. With respect to resolution 2547 B (XXIV), the report by the Secretary-General contained in document A/8057 dealt with the question of radio programmes for southern Africa and the establishment of a judicial committee for Namibia. That report included an account of the publicity that was being given to the evils of the policies of *apartheid*, racial discrimination and colonialism, as requested in operative paragraph 14 of the resolution.

41. Item 53 (c) and (d) concerned the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; in that connexion, he considered the situation to be encouraging. Seventy-two States had signed the Convention, and forty-four had ratified or acceded to it. Inasmuch as only twenty-seven accessions or ratifications had been needed to bring the Convention into force and that number had been reached a year and a half previously,

it was clear how much support and approval the Convention had in the international community. The fact that so many of the States Members of the United Nations and other qualified States had decided to consider themselves bound by the provisions of the Convention refuted the occasional assertions that Members of the Organization made a practice of voting for texts which they did not intend to put into effect. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had held its first two sessions, and its report had been circulated as document A/8027. Everyone who had observed the Committee's work had been impressed by the earnestness and scrupulous conscientiousness with which its members had performed

their duties. The Committee had adopted its rules of procedure (see A/8027, annex II) and established its methods of work, and it was to be hoped that the States parties to the Convention would help it in its important tasks by providing it with substantial reports.

42. Lastly, with regard to item 60, he observed that, although other Committees were dealing with problems of that kind, the General Assembly undoubtedly felt that the subject was closely linked to human rights and had referred it to the Third Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.