



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 60:	
Interim measures, pending entry into force of the Covenants on Human Rights, to be taken with respect to violations of the human rights set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	355

**Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).**

**AGENDA ITEM 60**

**Interim measures, pending entry into force of the Covenants on Human Rights, to be taken with respect to violations of the human rights set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (A/3187 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.594) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said that, as the Salvadorian representative had pointed out (748th meeting), the adoption of the original Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592) or of the revised text (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1) would not constitute a decision setting up the proposed committee. Even the text of the original proposal had merely indicated a subject for study and a path for the Commission on Human Rights to follow, and had not raised the question of the Commission's competence. Thus, the USSR representative had been incorrect in stating that the Commission was not competent to deal with the matters referred to in the Greek draft resolution. The Commission's terms of reference as laid down by Economic and Social Council resolution 1/5, as amended by resolution 2/9, were clearly set forth in the Secretary-General's note (A/C.3/L.594). Paragraph 2 (*e*) of the terms of reference provided that the Commission should submit proposals, recommendations and reports to the Economic and Social Council regarding any other matter concerning human rights not covered by paragraphs 2 (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*). Furthermore, under paragraph 3, the Commission was called upon to make studies and recommendations and provide information and other services at the request of the Economic and Social Council, and, under paragraph 4, the Commission was empowered to propose to the Council any changes in its terms of reference. Furthermore, paragraph 5 provided that the Commission might make recommendations to the Council concerning any sub-commission which it considered should be established. The Greek draft resolution was fully consistent with those provisions.

2. The USSR representative had gone on to say that the eighteen members of the Commission on Human Rights were not as competent to decide the matter as the eighty members of the United Nations convened in the General Assembly. The Greek delegation con-

sidered that the Commission was perfectly competent to state whether or not it felt able to undertake a task such as that set forth in the original Greek proposal, and *a fortiori* whether it could carry out a simple study such as that required of it in the revised text, after which study the Assembly would take its decision. The General Assembly was fully entitled to rule on the matter; Article 13 of the United Nations Charter provided that the Assembly "shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of . . . assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all . . .". Accordingly, the Greek proposal was consistent both with the Commission's terms of reference and with the letter of the Charter.

3. At the 750th meeting the French representative had invoked Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. However, that was at variance with French doctrine; thus Professor Cassin, the distinguished Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, had warned against raising that argument in connexion with human rights. Any attempt to undermine human rights by recourse to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, Professor Cassin had argued, would be nonsensical and a trick played on humanity. The French representative had also alleged that the Greek proposal was closely connected with the right of individual petition; the Greek delegation could not agree. The French representative had also referred to the various material difficulties facing the Commission on Human Rights, including the time factor. In view of the many meetings that the Commission had devoted to minute details relating to the publication of the *Yearbook on Human Rights*, such arguments were unconvincing. As for the French representative's assertion that no new facts had supervened to justify taking the proposed measures, all delegations present had admitted that there had been numerous violations of human rights, so serious, prolonged and flagrant, as to constitute new facts of great importance. He regretted that the French and United Kingdom representatives were using such methods to prevent the realization of human rights. Attempts to preserve the vestiges of colonialism would not deceive the small countries, which would present a common front against such manoeuvres.

4. The Greek delegation had made every effort to conciliate the various views that had been advanced, and would be prepared to consider any amendment that would promote the study of violations of human rights by any organ of the United Nations. Accordingly, it had accepted the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.596) and the Philippine suggestion (751st meeting), and would take the suggestions of the Chinese and Mexican delegations (751st meeting) into account. However, it could not accept the Swedish proposal (750th meeting) that the words "if possible" should be added at the end of paragraph 1 (*a*); the Committee's task was to expedite the adoption of the draft Covenants, and not to express vague hopes for the completion of its work. He regretted that certain delegations had adopted

a negative attitude, and in particular that the Australian delegation had been so cautious with regard to the Greek proposal and had abandoned its earlier progressive position, asserting that in view of the wide variety of subjects dealt with by the Commission on Human Rights, the proposal would place too great a burden upon the latter. In point of fact, it was quite proper for so important a matter as that of violations of human rights to be added to the Commission's agenda. The United States representative had argued (751st meeting) that the Greek proposal showed a negative approach because it was concerned with the violation rather than the promotion of human rights. But delegations should ponder whether the control of violations of human rights, which meant also the prevention of such violations, was not a more constructive way of approaching the problem of respect for human rights, than, for example, the regulation of details relating to work by women in certain industries.

5. It had been argued that the revised Greek proposal implied a certain contradiction in that, while it called for the completion of the draft Covenants in two years, it also provided for interim measures. However, a considerable period would inevitably elapse between the adoption of the Covenants and their full implementation. Moreover, the Commission had never undertaken a serious study of violations of human rights; the Greek delegation considered that the Commission was the body best qualified to make such a study, but out of deference to delegations which had expressed doubts on the subject it had not insisted that the Commission should be given detailed directives, and had left the final decision in the hands of the General Assembly.

6. Finally, some representatives had objected to the provisions of paragraph 3 of the revised Greek proposal on the ground that Member States would not have enough time between the end of the Commission's session and the twelfth session of the General Assembly to submit observations on measures to be taken with respect to the violation of human rights. The Greek delegation, however, had every confidence in the capacity of those Member States which were devoted to the cause of human rights to collaborate fruitfully in applying the provisions of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

7. Mr. TALAAT (Egypt) said that his objections to the original Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592) had for the most part been removed by the Greek delegation's acceptance of the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.596). The Egyptian delegation fully endorsed the provisions of paragraph 1 designed to expedite the work on the draft Covenants, and it would support any proposal to prolong the Committee's deliberations on the draft Covenants during the current session or at the twelfth session of the General Assembly. However, it considered that the words "the possibility of adopting" should be deleted from paragraph 2, as they seemed to imply that the Commission on Human Rights should inquire into its own competence. In the opinion of the Egyptian delegation, the Commission was competent to study methods of dealing with complaints of violations of human rights and to submit appropriate recommendations. If the Commission's competence was in doubt, the matter should be taken to the Economic and Social Council, which was responsible for the Commission's terms of reference.

8. With regard to the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595), he pointed out that it referred to only one

method of dealing with complaints, whereas several methods had been mentioned in the Commission on Human Rights and in the General Assembly. Accordingly, specific reference to one method would imply the Committee's preference for that method, and would prejudge the issue, since the question had not yet been studied in detail as a whole. He would therefore abstain on the Uruguayan amendment.

9. The tenor of the discussion was certainly far removed from the Greek delegation's original intentions, but such things could not be avoided in a Committee of eighty Members, and the Greek delegation had shown a commendable spirit of compromise. He would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution as a whole; he could not agree with the view that the text was inconsistent with the title of the item.

10. Miss LIMA SCHAUL (Guatemala) said that although the United Nations had proclaimed human rights and set forth the fundamental freedoms in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter, it was still without machinery for ensuring respect for those rights and freedoms. Although the draft resolution submitted by Greece (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1) did not provide a fully adequate solution, it was a laudable attempt to bridge the gap between the mere statement of principles and their application in practice. She would therefore support the draft resolution as a whole. She would abstain on operative paragraph 1, although she agreed that it was urgent to complete the consideration of the draft Covenants, because she did not agree to the limitation of debate implicit in paragraph 1 (b). She would vote for operative paragraph 2, as her Government could see no possible objection to studies being undertaken by the Commission on Human Rights.

11. She had great sympathy with the proposal contained in the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595), but felt bound to point out that it involved a partial surrender of sovereignty on the part of States. Her Government could not support such a proposal until it had been discussed in the Guatemalan Congress; however, her delegation would not vote against the amendment, but would abstain, in view of its sympathy with the purpose of the Uruguayan proposal.

12. Mr. LIMA (El Salvador) said that in view of the lack of time he doubted whether the Third Committee would be able to reach any valid decision on the important issues raised by the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). The time factor was important not only in the debate on the draft resolution, but also in its implementation. Under operative paragraph 3, the Secretary-General was requested to ask Members to submit observations on measures with respect to the violation of human rights before the twelfth session of the General Assembly, and to prepare a note on those observations. Such a procedure would be lengthy, and if it was adopted the Commission on Human Rights would not have the observations in question at its disposal before starting the study it was requested to undertake in operative paragraph 2. Thus it would save time if the observations could be communicated direct to the Commission on Human Rights. He doubted whether it would be possible to complete the consideration of the draft Covenants with a view to their adoption at the thirteenth session, as proposed in the amendment submitted by Afghanistan (A/C.3/L.596), which had been incorporated in operative paragraph 1 (a) of the revised draft resolution;

in any case, interim measures would be necessary, as the Covenants would not come into force immediately. There was a further difficulty: if operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were put to the vote separately and only the former was adopted, the Committee would be adopting a draft resolution stating that the interim measures to be taken, pending the entry into force of the Covenants, consisted in completing the study of the draft Covenants. As such a resolution was illogical, operative paragraphs 1 and 2 should be voted on together.

13. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that his delegation was anxious for the establishment of machinery to deal with violations of human rights, and had accordingly given the original Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592) sympathetic consideration. It had also carefully studied the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.596), while recognizing that their aim was not the same as that of the Greek proposal. Afghanistan had suggested that steps should be taken to ensure the rapid completion of the work on the draft Covenants, while Greece had suggested certain interim measures to be taken in respect of violations of human rights, precisely because the Covenants would not enter into force for some time. The two concepts were fundamentally different, and should not have been amalgamated in the same draft resolution.

14. The revised Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1) was also unsatisfactory in other respects. It was not clear whether the measures envisaged were really interim measures or whether they were general measures. In any event, they duplicated some aspects of the implementation measures included in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (E/2573, annex I B). It did not seem logical both to press for urgent consideration of the draft Covenants, which included implementation measures, and to propose the study of interim measures. Furthermore, the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595) had raised another point: it was not clear whether the measures advocated by Greece were to apply to violations by States or by individuals. Again, it was illogical to insist on the need for the speedy completion of the work on the draft Covenants while at the same time requesting the Commission on Human Rights to embark on a vast and complicated study. At all events, the Committee was quite unable, at the current stage, to consider all the implications of the proposals before it or to make adequate recommendations.

15. He would vote for operative paragraph 1 of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), as it stood, since the completion of the draft Covenants was the Committee's most urgent task. The addition of the words "if possible", as proposed by Sweden (750th meeting), would merely weaken the text. He agreed with the Egyptian representative's objection to the words "the possibility of adopting", in operative paragraph 2, and would abstain on that paragraph and on operative paragraph 3 because, although he conceded the desirability of the proposed study, he did not think that the Commission on Human Rights should be asked to undertake such a task until it had dealt with the draft Covenants. He would vote for the draft resolution as a whole, as he was fully in sympathy with its aims. He could not support the Uruguayan amendment; so far-reaching a proposal should be studied in connexion with the implementation measures of the draft Covenants.

16. Mr. DE ROSSI (Italy) said that it was difficult to reconcile the title of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), which referred to interim measures, with the contents of the draft resolution itself. However, he was, in principle, in favour of operative paragraph 1. He had no objection to the substance of operative paragraphs 2 and 3, but would be unable to support them, as he felt that such questions should be taken up in connexion with the draft Covenants. The same was true of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595). In any case, Governments would be unable to accept such a procedure except within the framework of the draft Covenants, as it raised delicate constitutional questions.

17. Miss MURPHY (Ireland) said that the conclusion which emerged from the debate on the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1) was that it would be neither appropriate nor wise to ask the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of adopting measures with respect to the violation of human rights. She would therefore vote against operative paragraphs 2 and 3. Operative paragraph 1 (a) was unrealistic and might give the public false hopes concerning the date at which the draft Covenants would be ready for signature. Furthermore, the Third Committee could hardly dictate to the General Assembly on matters of procedure. She would therefore be unable to support paragraph 1, unless the two oral amendments proposed by Sweden (750th and 751st meetings) were adopted. Although she sympathized with the purpose of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595), she could not support it, as she felt that the time was not yet ripe to give it adequate consideration. It would not be possible to consider such machinery until the draft Covenants had come into force. The Irish delegation was anxious for the work on the draft Covenants to be finished as soon as possible but would insist on adequate time being given to the discussion of the various articles; the sincerity of her country's interest in the cause of human rights would be judged from the fact that it had been the first member of the Council of Europe to accept the jurisdiction of the Court of Human Rights to be set up under the Council's Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

18. Mr. ETEZADY (Iran) said that there were serious objections to the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). First, it was premature to propose the establishment of machinery for dealing with violations of human rights before the Covenants had been adopted. Moreover, there was some discrepancy between the title of the draft resolution and its contents. Operative paragraph 1 (a), which envisaged the adoption of the draft Covenants at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, was at variance with the statement in the original version of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592) that "the Covenants would not enter into force for some time". Operative paragraph 1 (b) was unnecessary, as the Third Committee could decide the matter at the beginning of the next session. The Commission on Human Rights should be consulted before being asked to undertake the study proposed in operative paragraph 2; as the Dominican representative had proposed (751st meeting), the records of the current debate should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights for its information. The Secretary-General would be unable to carry out the work requested of him in operative paragraph 3 in the time at his disposal. The Committee should be careful to do nothing

which might interfere with the adoption of the draft Covenants at the earliest possible date.

19. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that as the representative of a country which had a long and glorious record of struggle and sacrifice in the cause of freedom and human rights, he had the deepest sympathy with the Greek proposal. However, the original proposal (A/C.3/L.592) had raised some very delicate problems connected with the domestic jurisdiction of States. There were grounds for hope that the nations were progressing towards a better understanding of their mutual dependence, which might eventually transform international relations, thus making the Uruguayan proposal (A/C.3/L.595) feasible. Unfortunately, mankind had not yet reached that stage.

20. Turning to the revised Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), he said that he could not support operative paragraph 1, since, although he agreed that the draft Covenants should be adopted as soon as possible, he did not think that the Committee should attempt to decide at the current session on the work to be undertaken at a future session. The General Assembly would decide in due course. It was inappropriate for the Third Committee to request the Commission on Human Rights to undertake a study, as provided in operative paragraph 2 of the Greek draft resolution; under Article 60 of the United Nations Charter, responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization set forth in Chapter IX was vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council, of which the Commission on Human Rights was a subsidiary body. It would therefore be more appropriate to address the request to the Council itself. Other delegations had already criticized operative paragraph 3, but he did not object to it in principle. In spite of the many technical defects of the draft resolution as it stood, he would not vote against it because of his profound sympathy with the cause it sought to further.

21. Mr. PEREZ MATOS (Venezuela) said that his delegation found it hard to conceive of interim measures being taken with respect to rights which were not yet fully defined. The Committee was still drafting the substantive rights; it could not establish the procedure *a priori*.

22. So far as the revised Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1) was concerned, he felt that no practical results could be hoped for at the current stage from operative paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b). The Swedish delegation's suggestion (750th meeting) to include the words "if possible" had been most useful and practical. Operative paragraph 2 would achieve no results, either from the juridical or the practical standpoint; operative paragraph 3 lacked precision, and could not be effective because of the time factor. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b), and would vote against paragraphs 2 and 3. He wished, however, to express his appreciation to the Greek representative for the brilliance with which he had defended his views and for the spirit of compromise he had shown.

23. Mr. CURRIE (Canada) said he wished to associate himself with the compliments paid to the Greek representative on his introductory statement (745th meeting), which had set the high intellectual and moral tone the discussion had since followed. The fact that a subject which could easily have led to a debate of a

partisan nature had remained so free from political rancour spoke well for the sponsor's manner of presentation and for the restraint and objectivity of all the members of the Committee.

24. His delegation shared the Greek delegation's concern at the slowness of the progress that was being made towards the creation of adequate machinery for combating violations of human rights; but that did not necessarily imply its agreement with the means proposed to achieve that objective. He wished to place on record the misgivings his delegation had felt concerning the original Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592), both in order to explain his delegation's position on operative paragraph 2 of the revised draft (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), and to complete the record for the future information of the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation had shared most of the misgivings previously voiced in the Committee as to the legal, judicial, constitutional and political implications of asking the Commission on Human Rights to examine complaints made against Member States.

25. The Canadian delegation had hoped that the Greek representative would withdraw his draft resolution, in order to ensure that the draft Covenants could be fully discussed at the next session. The incorporation of part of the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.596) in operative paragraph 2 of the revised text of the draft resolution had not improved matters. The Commission on Human Rights had already made recommendations on measures of implementation, and agreement on those measures would only be delayed if the Committee had to consider new recommendations from the Commission.

26. The Uruguayan proposal (A/C.3/L.595) had already been considered by the Commission on Human Rights, but had not been included in the draft Covenants. It would therefore be inappropriate to ask the Commission to reconsider the question of appointing a High Commissioner or of establishing a special organ to deal with individual petitions. His delegation would accordingly vote against the proposal.

27. Operative paragraph 3 of the revised Greek draft resolution was unnecessary, and perhaps even undesirable. Not many Governments would be able to make new comments on the subject in the short time available. He did not believe the proposed communications would serve any purpose; Governments would not say anything in such communications that their representatives could not say equally well in the Committee at the next session. Any discussion on measures relating to violations of human rights should be avoided except in the context of the relevant articles of the Covenants. A positive approach, stressing measures to promote wider respect for, and fuller observance of, human rights, would be more likely to produce beneficial results than a negative one concentrating on machinery to deal with complaints against States concerning alleged violations of human rights.

28. With respect to operative paragraph 1 of the revised Greek draft resolution, he agreed with the representative of Afghanistan that the original draft was unnecessarily pessimistic as to the future prospects for the adoption of the draft Covenants. It might be better, however, to leave the Committee more latitude, and to refrain from making any reference to the completion and adoption of the Covenants at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. The Afghan representative had been concerned over the possible effect of the ori-

ginal Greek proposal on public opinion; but the effect might be equally unfortunate if the Committee were to bind itself to a time-table which later proved impossible to fulfil.

29. Miss SOUTER (New Zealand) said that her delegation shared many of the misgivings that had been voiced with respect to the Greek draft resolution, not so much because of its basic assumption, in the original text (A/C.3/L.592), as to the probable date of entry into force of the Covenants as because of the equally basic assumption, in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the revised text (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), that it would be feasible to set up machinery to deal with violations of human rights apart altogether from the procedure to be provided in the Covenants. Her delegation could not agree with the latter assumption; Governments had never been willing to submit to the jurisdiction of an independent body in respect of complaints made against them, in the absence of minimum legal safeguards and guarantees. Whether complaints were to be dealt with on a political or a judicial basis, Governments required assurances as to the nature and quality of the body to which they would be referred and as to the criteria by which they would be judged. Those principles, applied to complaints in the field of human rights, formed the very basis and purpose of the draft Covenants. The substantive provisions would establish what human rights the States parties would be bound to observe, and the implementation provisions would establish the manner in which redress could be sought for alleged violations. It was not likely that any new project to establish a procedure for dealing with complaints would be more successful in a shorter period than that required for the completion and entry into force of the Covenants. No procedure for dealing with complaints in the entire field of human rights could be set up on a scale any less extensive than that provided in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (E/2573, annex I B); and so long as there was still a chance that that Covenant would be completed and would become an effective international instrument, her delegation considered that it would be unwise to seek any other method, apart from existing procedures, of dealing with complaints of alleged violations of human rights.

30. Her delegation would therefore be unable to support operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). With respect to operative paragraph 1, it shared the doubts already expressed by other delegations on formal and procedural points, and it also considered that there was a real difficulty of substance. If the Committee set a rigid time-table for the completion of the Covenants, it was likely to fulfil it only at the expense of the thoughtful consideration and careful drafting which the work required. Her delegation felt some sympathy for the Swedish proposal to regard the end of the thirteenth session as the target date for completing the draft Covenants; but the responsibility of ensuring that the draft Covenants should be completed as soon as possible and that they should meet the high standards required rested with the Third Committee itself.

31. New Zealand had been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the draft Covenants when the idea had first been put forward, and despite certain developments which had since made it adopt a more cautious attitude, her delegation still believed that it was worth

while to press on with the task of drafting the Covenants.

32. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) thanked the Greek delegation for having brought out the point that notwithstanding the obligations arising from the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations had not yet been able to devise measures to remedy violations of human rights. The consensus in the Committee was that the machinery for dealing with violations of human rights would be established by the Covenants on Human Rights. It was therefore vital to expedite the completion of the draft Covenants.

33. The Afghan amendment concerning operative paragraphs 1 and 2 (A/C.3/L.596) was not inconsistent with the purposes of the Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592), and the Greek delegation had wisely accepted it. Her delegation believed that the request addressed to the Commission on Human Rights "to study the possibility of adopting measures to be taken with respect to the violation of human rights" was a useful one, and saw no contradiction in the revised text (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1).

34. Although the question of the competence of the Commission on Human Rights did not arise in that connexion, her delegation wished to state that it fully shared the view of the Egyptian representative that the Commission on Human Rights was entirely competent to study any measures in the field of human rights. It believed that Economic and Social Council resolution 75 (V) was inadequate, and should be revised. Under Article 13 of the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly was authorized to assist in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and it was therefore entitled to introduce any measures to further that end. Since the Charter had made the individual a subject of international law, her delegation felt that the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595) had much to recommend it. The individual should have the opportunity of redress, even against his own State, in the event of any violation of his fundamental rights and freedoms; however, the establishment of a High Commissioner's Office would not be acceptable to her delegation. Only impartial and qualified members of a given community could evaluate any violation of individual rights in that community. Her delegation therefore believed that the Covenants should contain measures establishing in each signatory State a non-governmental committee or organization on human rights which would evaluate complaints of violations.

35. She would show her delegation's sympathy with the Greek representative's views by supporting the revised Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1).

36. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) pointed out, by way of clarification, that Economic and Social Council resolution 75 (V) merely stated that the Commission on Human Rights had no power to take any action in regard to any complaints concerning human rights. But to make a study was not the same thing as to take action. He saw no reason why objections should be raised to making a study of measures of implementation outside the context of the draft Covenants.

37. He did not agree with the suggestion that the Third Committee's records should be sent to the Commission on Human Rights; if that body returned the material without taking any decision much time and effort would have been wasted. The Committee would



not be discharging its functions unless it came to its own decision.

38. He withdrew his amendment (A/C.3/L.595), and would support the revised Greek draft resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1), which incorporated the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.596).

39. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that several representatives had misunderstood her; as the summary record of the previous meeting showed, she had not said that the Committee should refrain from taking a decision.

40. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he would vote for the revised Greek resolution (A/C.3/L.592/Rev.1). He would have been unable to support

the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.595), as he felt there were other more appropriate ways of dealing with the question; for example, the establishment of a supranational committee to investigate violations of human rights and take them up with the Governments concerned. Such a committee would be accorded immunity and would be composed of distinguished persons noted for their honesty, objectivity and courage. He also favoured a procedure for appeal, to a body patterned along the line of the Commission on Human Rights. But however interesting such proposals might be, the Committee's most urgent task was to complete its work on the draft Covenants.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.