



Chairman: Mr. Carlos GIAMBRUNO
(Uruguay).

Organization of work (A/C.3/L.1930)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to rule 101 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and invited them to express their opinions concerning the order of priority in which the various items assigned to the Committee should be considered.
2. Mr. KORPÅS (Sweden), after noting that all the items on the Committee's agenda were important, recalled that it had not been possible at the previous session to deal adequately with the item on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance and said that his delegation therefore would like item 59 to be given priority at the current session.
3. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) expressed the opinion that the Committee should begin its work with an item which did not present great difficulties, that item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council) should be considered as soon as possible and that the most complex and crucial items should be considered early in the session. The items which required a special presentation, such as item 56 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), should be considered when the persons concerned could appear before the Committee, while the new items should be left until the end.
4. Mr. VALTASAARI (Finland) agreed that the complex issues, including item 50 (Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination) and item 49 (b) (Protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions in areas of armed conflicts), should be examined at an early stage and that sufficient time should be allowed for them.
5. The General Assembly had decided, in its resolution 2843 (XXVI), to consider in depth at the current session the question dealt with under item 53 (Crime prevention and control). Accordingly, sufficient time should be allowed to study that item exhaustively.
6. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) proposed that the Committee should begin with item 50. In his opinion, the Committee should not begin with a non-controversial item, for that procedure had in many cases been counter-productive. At the same time, he supported the Swedish representative's view that priority should be given to item 59. Considerable progress had been made in the United Nations with reference to the elimination of racial discrimination and the time had come to try to do the same with regard to the elimination of religious intolerance, which was no less important. Although the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief was further advanced than the draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, his delegation would prefer that priority should be given, as was customary, to the latter. He would also like to see priority given in the Committee's programme of work to item 57 (Freedom of information).
7. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that he was confident that the Committee could give adequate consideration to all the items on its agenda at the current session. In deciding on the order in which the items were to be dealt with, it would be necessary to take into account the availability of the requisite documents and the fact that item 56 and item 61 (Assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations) would have to be considered at the time when the special presentation which they required would be feasible. He suggested that after the observations of the members of the Committee had been heard the Chairman should propose an order that would be acceptable to all.
8. Mr. BELTRÁN (Uruguay) emphasized the importance of all the items on the Committee's agenda and said that his delegation thought priority should be accorded to items 59 and 57.
9. Mrs. MARIKO (Mali) suggested the following order for consideration of the items before the Committee: item 60 (Programme for the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights); item 50; item 51 (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); item 54 (Youth, its education in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, its problems and needs, and its active participation in national development and international co-operation); item 53; item 49 (b); and item 52 (Principles of international co-operation in the detection, arrest, extradition and punishment of persons guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity).
10. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that having held conversations with various delegations and representatives of the Secretariat, he wished to propose as a

generally acceptable formula that the Committee should begin by considering items 60, 50, 52 and 49, in that order. As far as the other items were concerned, his delegation would go along with the decision of the majority. He wished only to observe that the fact that certain items had not been considered for several years did not mean that they must be taken up at the current session, for it might be advisable to leave them aside until a more propitious time.

11. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that he was in favour of first taking up item 60 and then going on to item 50. He would also like priority to be given to the question dealt with under item 49 (b), which had been on the Committee's agenda since the twenty-fifth session and which the Assembly, in its resolution 2854 (XXVI), had decided should be examined as a matter of the highest priority at the current session. For those reasons, his delegation thought that item should be taken up by the Committee immediately after item 50.

12. Miss SANO (Japan) observed that although the question dealt with under item 58 (Human rights and scientific and technological developments) had been allocated to the Committee ever since the General Assembly's twenty-third session, it unfortunately had to be recognized that little progress had been made. In her view, there was some similarity between that item and the item on the human environment; however, work on the question of scientific and technological developments was much less advanced than that on the human environment. Something should be done about that situation; there were a number of reasons why priority should be given to the question. Firstly, new guidelines for the activities of the Secretariat could be laid down, taking into account the results of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held at Stockholm, from 5 to 16 June 1972, since until recently the line of demarcation between the question of the human environment and that of scientific and technological developments had not been very clear and it was essential to avoid duplication. Secondly, new guidelines for the Secretary-General which would facilitate the work of the Secretariat and enable it to be carried out more systematically were required. In addition, it appeared that the preparation of the documentation on that question had been unduly delayed and she wondered if something could not be done to accelerate the work of the Secretariat in that connexion. Her delegation also thought that the Committee should have the opportunity to study the results of the international Seminar on Human Rights and Scientific and Technological Developments, held at Vienna, from 19 June to 1 July 1972, for it had been the first international meeting of that kind at which experts from various countries had participated.

13. Mr. CHRISTIANI (Austria) endorsed the views of the representative of France with regard to the organization of the Committee's work. He therefore suggested that the Committee should begin by considering item 60, then go on to item 50 and subsequently take up item 49 (b).

14. Miss SHAHKAR (Iran) supported the position taken by the representatives of France and Austria with regard to the order in which the Committee should take up the different items allocated to it. She accordingly thought that it should begin with items 60, 50 and 49. As to the rest of the agenda, the Committee should be guided by practical considerations, including that of the time at which the documents relating to each question would be available.

15. Mr. ZAPPA (Brazil) said that he was entirely in agreement that item 60 should be considered first. In his view, that was an item which not only was non-controversial but also could symbolize what the Committee was capable of achieving unanimously and without polemics.

16. Mr. MAROOFI (Afghanistan) said that he did not have any preferences between the various items allocated to the Committee and would accept whatever order might be suggested by the Chairman. However, he thought that item 12 should be dealt with at an early stage, as suggested by the representative of Egypt.

17. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that she thought priority should be given to item 50. However, especially considering that the requisite documents were not yet available, she thought that the Committee should begin by considering item 60.

18. Item 12 should also be considered soon, as should items 49, 51 and 54. It could later be decided when to consider items 56 and 61.

19. Miss MENESES (Venezuela) agreed with those who thought that items 60, 50 and 49 should be taken up first. She was pleased to see that many members thought that priority should be given to items which had previously been pushed into the background, such as items 59, 57 and 53.

20. Mrs. DE BROMLEY (Honduras) said that she also felt all the items were of equal importance; however, she agreed with the representative of Uruguay that the Committee should make sure that it would consider items 59 and 57, since they had not been studied for several years, although they were just as important as items 50 and 54.

21. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said that, like others who had spoken before him, he did not think that the order of consideration of the items was an indication of their importance. In his opinion, the most practical course would be for the Committee to start its work with a review of a non-controversial item. He therefore suggested that a start should be made with the item concerning human rights in the light of recent developments; that consideration should be given to item 60, then to item 50. Priority should also be given to items 54 and 53, since they were particularly important for the maintenance of international peace and security. As to the remainder of the items, he would abide by the decision of the majority.

22. Mrs. GUEYE (Senegal) said that, like several previous speakers, she thought there were three items which deserved special attention during the current session: firstly, item 60; secondly, item 50 and thirdly, item 49 (b). The remaining items could be considered later, as and when the relevant documents became available.

23. Mr. CONSTANTINESCU (Romania) noted that Romania had always been interested in the education of youth in the respect for human rights and hoped that at the current session enough time would be allocated to item 54 to be considered properly. He requested the Chairman to bear that request in mind when he suggested the order in which the items should be considered.

24. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he attached great importance to the question of the education of youth in the respect for human rights; in his opinion item 54 should be considered early, since the youth of today would be the rulers of the world tomorrow. He hoped that that point would be taken into account in deciding the order in which the items were to be considered. Item 55 (Status of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) should also be considered as soon as possible, since the results of two decades of efforts should not be cast into oblivion. Furthermore, it was indispensable to consider the question of freedom of information, which had constantly been given priority since 1947, but had always eventually been postponed. If item 57 did not receive the consideration it deserved, the international community might think that tendentious propaganda was prevailing over freedom of information.

25. Like many others, he thought that item 50 dealt with a very important question, but he wished to recall that at the preceding two sessions 44 meetings had been devoted to consideration of that question. It would therefore seem only fair that in the current year more attention should be given to other matters, such as chapter XIII of the report of the Economic and Social Council, which dealt with the question of narcotic drugs; although that question was extremely topical it had not received much attention at previous sessions.

26. With regard to item 49 (b), that important question should be considered in the light of modern methods of warfare, which made no distinction between friend and foe, and both were victims of death and destruction to an equal degree. In fact, such methods meant that genocide was being committed. That question should have precedence over item 55. Item 54 deserved high priority. Youth was showing itself to be increasingly restive and was reproaching its elders for their insensitivity to the world's ills.

27. The question dealt with under item 51 was of deep concern to all the members of the Committee. The question was closely related to the item on ter-

rorism, which would be considered by the Sixth Committee. With regard to item 52, he noted that only the war criminals of defeated countries were branded as guilty; for instance, the bombing of Dresden, Hiroshima and Nagasaki had not been dealt with in the International Military Tribunals of Nuremberg and Tokyo. He recalled that the draft Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity was to have been examined in the Sixth Committee, but that nothing had been done about it. Before considering the question, it was necessary to define the standards to be applied. Therefore, the item should be given the priority it deserved in the current circumstances.

28. Item 53 was a most important one and was linked to social change and demographic pressures. However, item 59 should be given a higher priority on the Committee's agenda. With regard to item 12, report of the Economic and Social Council, the Committee should not spend too much time on section H of chapter XII, on capital punishment, or to chapter XIV, on human rights, but it should pay more attention to chapter XIII, which dealt with narcotic drugs. With regard to chapters XVII and XVIII, referring to questions of programme and co-ordination, the Committee should not waste time considering such matters since, although there should be no duplication in the work of the Committees, each Committee organized its work independently and it would be very difficult to co-ordinate the Third Committee's work with that of all the others.

29. For all the reasons he had stated, he felt that the Committee should first consider item 54, and then item 57. It should also ensure that it devoted two or three meetings in November to item 56.

30. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) agreed that it was difficult to assign priorities to given items since all the items were of importance to human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, she agreed that consideration should first be given to item 60, then to items 12, 51, 54 and 62 (United Nations conference for a world convention on adoption law), depending on the availability of documents. She noted that item 62 was a new item on the Committee's agenda and that it was a very important question affecting children all over the world.

31. Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) agreed that priority should be given to item 60: first, because a consensus had emerged in that regard and, secondly, because the Committee should attach great importance to that matter, with a view to drawing the attention of the public to the human rights situation throughout the world. However, his delegation would be opposed to a formal type of programme, with, for example, art exhibitions, statements by Heads of State. Rather than a solemn occasion, it had to be an effective one, demonstrating to the world the progress that had been made, since the world public was not at all sure that any progress had in fact been made in the observance of human rights, but was rather inclined to believe that ground had been lost. Although there was a greater

awareness of the significance of human rights, owing to the endeavours of UNESCO, the Commission on Human Rights and other bodies, those rights were in practice being violated in many parts of the world. It was also important to decide on the number of meetings to be devoted to the item, so as not to prejudice the consideration of others that were equally important, particularly item 50.

32. When, at the fifty-second session of the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights had been accused of being slow and ineffective, he had come to the defence of the Commission and had stressed its achievements, in particular with regard to the draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*. For the first time in the history of human rights, a consensus had emerged to the effect that *apartheid* should be declared a crime. However, the legal definition of that crime, the corresponding instrument and the punishment were matters that still had to be resolved. Although the practice of *apartheid* was soundly condemned, its elimination in practice had yet to be achieved.

33. In addition, preferential treatment should be accorded to item 12, since it was a prime responsibility of the Third Committee. Item 49 (b) merited special attention, and he was disappointed that item 49 (a), on the report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolutions 2852 (XXVI), paragraph 8, and 2853 (XXVI), had not been included in the Committee's agenda. The Committee would not even be able to consider the report on napalm, a weapon that was being brutally employed in Viet-Nam in violation of the population's human rights. A question of such importance should not have been referred to the First Committee, which was snowed under with disarmament. Furthermore, the question of the protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions had already been considered exhaustively and, in his view, the Committee was in a position to reach a consensus on it.

34. On special instructions from the Government of Chile, he wished to request that the Committee attach fundamental importance to item 54. The world was witnessing a revolt by young people and it was essential to deal with their troubles, which were merely attempts to flee from their responsibilities and their scepticism. The young should be a subject of continuing concern in all countries. Chile had created a special presidential office for the problems of young people, and ministries of youth are already in existence in some countries.

35. Item 51 should be given a certain priority. Article 1 of both the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights referred to the right of peoples to self-determination and their sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. The rights of individuals could not be observed without observance at the same time of the rights of peoples. Only by freeing people from exploitation could they be enabled fully to enjoy their rights and fundamental freedoms. It did not make sense to try to separate self-determination from the freedom of the individual.

36. Unfortunately, the Commission on Human Rights had not been able to give proper attention to the question dealt with under item 55. There was a widespread belief that human rights were exclusively civil and political; however, there were also economic and cultural rights, and their importance had not been sufficiently emphasized. Civil and political rights and economic and cultural rights were so closely inter-related that it was impossible to observe the former without observing the latter also.

37. Items 57 and 59 were of prime importance to Chile and all the Latin American countries. Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that those questions had on other occasions given rise to serious controversy, attributable mainly to the diversity of the world's political and religious systems. While controversy should not be feared, it was none the less necessary to avoid unproductive work. Accordingly, it might be better to give a higher priority to other items that were of more vital interest to world public opinion.

38. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) observed that the Committee appeared to have reached a consensus whereby it would first consider item 60 and give special priority to the work on items 50 and 59. Her delegation would like priority consideration to be given to item 53, and it agreed with the representative of Japan that priority should also be given to item 58, which was increasingly timely and important. As to the remaining items, it would accept whatever order the Chairman suggested in the light of the wishes expressed by the various delegations.

39. Mrs. ORLIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Polish proposal that the Committee should first consider item 60, and she proposed that it should then take up items 50, 52, 49, 51 and 58, in that order. Her delegation would also like priority to be given to item 54, on whose importance it was unnecessary to comment.

40. Mr. KANGWA (Zambia) agreed that all the items on the Committee's agenda were important. However, he believed that some of them deserved special priority. Accordingly, he suggested that the Committee should first consider item 60, subsequently item 50, and then items 51 and 54, which, in his opinion, were of special significance.

41. Mr. BEMBOY (Zaire) said that his delegation would accept the Chairman's suggestions regarding the order in which the agenda items should be taken up.

42. Mr. VARGA (Hungary) shared the views of the representatives of Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; he suggested that consideration should first be given to items 60, 50, 52 and 49, in that order.

43. The CHAIRMAN observed that, from the views expressed by the various delegations, there was some agreement that priority should be given to certain items; but there were also some divergent views which needed to be reconciled. In the order that he was about

to suggest, he had taken account not only of the wishes expressed by delegations but also of certain practical matters, such as the availability of documents. Apart from an order for consideration of the items, he would also suggest the number of meetings to be devoted to each item, which was necessary in order to establish a date for completion of the Committee's work.

44. He therefore suggested that the items allocated to the Committee should be considered in the following order: item 60, to which 4 meetings would be devoted; item 50, 15 meetings; item 49, 10 meetings; item 12, 8 meetings; items 51, 52, 59 and 54, 4 meetings each; item 53, 6 meetings; items 58 and 57, 4 meetings each; item 62, 3 meetings; and, lastly, item 55, which would be dealt with in only 1 meeting. The Committee could decide at a later stage when it was to consider items 56 and 61. As to the closing date for the Committee's work, after consultation with the Secretariat, he sug-

gested that it should be 8 December. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved that order and the number of meetings allocated to each item, together with the closing date suggested.

It was so decided.

45. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the date of the Committee's next meeting, said that it would be helpful for delegations to have time for preparation and also to obtain the requisite documents. Accordingly, he suggested that it should be held on Thursday, 28 September. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to his suggestion.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.