



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Friday, 4 March 1966,
at 10.55 a.m.

Fortieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Agenda item 10:</i>	
<i>Measures for the speedy implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (concluded)</i>	83
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Non-governmental organizations (concluded)</i>	84

President: Mr. Tewfik BOUATTOURA (Algeria).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Algeria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Argentina, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ghana, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Sudan, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

The observer for the following non-member State: Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Measures for the speedy implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (concluded) (E/L.1111 and Corr.1, E/L.1114)

1. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that the amendments submitted by the Philippines and Sierra Leone (E/L.1114) were satisfactory to his delegation. If the Council were to adopt draft resolution E/L.1111 and Corr.1 in its original form, a question such as anti-Semitism would be excluded from the work of the Commission on Human Rights.

2. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to comment on the amendments proposed by the Philippines and Sierra Leone, and in particular on the second amendment, under

which consideration of the question of the violation of human rights would be included in the consideration of periodic reports on human rights instead of forming a separate item on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights. However, the Commission received only a small number of periodic reports, none of which came from colonial or dependent countries or territories. The effect, therefore, would be that that burning question would be examined only once in three, five or even six years, or that a question such as apartheid, which was rampant in countries that never sent in a report, would not be examined. He accordingly believed that operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Cameroon, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Republic of Tanzania (E/L.1111 and Corr.1) was preferable to the proposed amendment. With regard to the objection that the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights was overcrowded, the Council should remember that that agenda included minor matters which were not of the same urgency as apartheid or the granting of independence. The amendment had been submitted with the best intentions in the world, but it would not enable the Commission on Human Rights to consider the important question of the violation of human rights through racial discrimination.

3. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that he wished to reply to the USSR representative on two points of fact. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Periodic Reports, he could confirm that few Governments submitted reports; in the current year there had been nine reports from Western Europe and the United States, four from Africa, three from Asia, two or three from Latin America and one from an East European country, Poland. It was obvious that the world racial situation was not fully reflected in those reports. However, it was not necessary to have a report from South Africa in order to examine the human rights situation in that country: there was, for example, a report from the United Kingdom. At all events it was clear that the Commission on Human Rights could hold discussions without receiving reports from Governments.

4. Mr. BENSID (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1111 and Corr.1, proposed a revised text of operative paragraph 1 which he hoped would meet with the approval of all members of the Council. The paragraph would read as follows:

"Invites the Commission on Human Rights, at its twenty-second session, to consider as a matter of importance and urgency the question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories, and to submit to the Council at

its forty-first session its recommendations on measures to halt those violations."

5. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Philippines and Sierra Leone, said that the two delegations accepted the amendment proposed by Algeria, since the four sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1111 and Corr.1 appeared to have accepted the first and third amendments (E/L.1114).

Draft resolution E/L.1111 and Corr.1, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. BOULLET (France) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the amended draft resolution but wished to make a reservation with regard to the two General Assembly resolutions mentioned in the second preambular paragraph, which France had been unable to support. Moreover, in his delegation's opinion it would have been preferable to place the question on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights without specifying the degree of urgency, so as to allow for greater flexibility in the Commission's decisions concerning its own work.

7. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but believed it would have been better to specify that the question of violations of human rights, including racial discrimination, should be examined in connexion with the periodic reports on human rights. The agenda of the Commission on Human Rights was very heavy. He thus thought the best procedure would be to examine violations of human rights in the light of the information supplied under the system of periodic reports.

8. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in order to facilitate the adoption of the draft resolution, his delegation had refrained from submitting any amendments; it would have liked the word "some" to be inserted before the words "colonial and other dependent countries and territories" in paragraph 1. His delegation would always be against giving precedence to other matters, in the Commission on Human Rights, over the question of the violation of human rights.

9. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) felt that it was for the Commission on Human Rights to decide on its own agenda. For example, the International Council of Women was to make a report to the Commission on Human Rights on the racial situation in the United Kingdom as a result of immigration. The United Kingdom could not have that item excluded from the Commission's agenda.

10. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council of the decision it had taken at the previous meeting to form itself into an Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole in order to continue consideration of agenda item 1^c (Non-governmental organizations). He suggested that the Council should suspend its plenary meeting and open the meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

*It was so decided.**

The meeting was suspended at 11.35 a.m. and resumed at 1.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Non-governmental organizations (concluded) (E/4166; E/L.1110)

11. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) introduced the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole (E/4166), which recommended the adoption of draft resolution E/L.1110, as amended by that Committee.

Draft resolution E/L.1110, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

12. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that he had abstained from voting because he considered it unwise to enlarge the membership of all organs irrespective of the nature of their work. In the present case, the proposed enlargement was not proportionate to that of the Council or other organs.

13. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

*The summary record of the second meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole was circulated as document E/AC.53/SR.2.