

27. Mrs. HEANEY (Ireland) said that her delegation had supported the draft resolution in order to show its support for the goals of the Decade, but it reserved its position with regard to operative paragraph 5 (b) concerning the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*; it had abstained the previous year during the vote on the draft Convention. It supported operative paragraph 6 (b) on the understanding that the moral and material assistance provided should be within the framework of, and consistent with, the principles and purposes of the Charter.

28. Mr. PARTHASARATHY (India) noted that the draft resolution which the Committee had just approved without a vote contained a reference to sports events in which representatives from South Africa participated. He read out a letter dated 7 October 1974 from the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* to the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, in which the Chairman congratulated India on its refusal to play matches against South Africa in the Davis Cup Finals.

29. Mr. LUGO (Nicaragua) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution in question, but had reservations concerning operative paragraph 6 (b); it shared the views expressed in that connexion by the Costa Rican, Venezuelan and Guatemalan representatives.

30. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution under consideration without reservations. It felt that the Programme for the Decade should include effective national and international measures so that practical results could be obtained in the struggle to eliminate racism and *apartheid*. It had therefore welcomed the draft resolution in the Economic and Social Council and whole-heartedly supported the amended version just approved by the Committee.

31. One of the major provisions of the draft resolution was operative paragraph 5 (b), and his delegation was pleased to note that the International Convention on the

Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* had already been signed by 18 Member States, most of them African and socialist States. It was to be hoped that the Convention, which represented a stern warning to the racists of southern Africa, would soon enter into force. Other provisions of operative paragraph 5, such as the banning of participation in sports events with the representatives of the racist régime of South Africa and the amendment submitted by Sierra Leone in document A/C.3/L.2104/Rev.1 were both timely and appropriate, and his delegation welcomed the provisions of operative paragraph 6 (b) concerning moral and material support to the liberation movements and peoples which were victims of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

32. In conclusion, he expressed his delegation's hope that the text which had just been adopted and the Programme for the Decade would be fully implemented, notwithstanding the reservations of some members of the Committee.

33. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) asked that the reservations expressed in the Committee, concerning the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, should be fully reflected in the summary records of the meeting.

34. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) pointed out that his country had signed the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The parliamentary procedure for ratification had not been completed, however.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee wished to approve draft resolution A/C.3/L.2105.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2105 was adopted without objection.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

2062nd meeting

Thursday, 10 October 1974, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2062

AGENDA ITEM 53

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (continued) (A/9603, chap. I, chap. V, sect. C.I; A/9666 and Add.1-5, A/9719, E/5474, E/5475, A/C.3/L.2101/Rev.2):

- (a) **Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (concluded);**
- (c) **Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

(concluded)

1. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation was gratified that the Committee had unanimously adopted the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1863 (LVI), as amended, particularly by the adoption of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2103, which she herself had supported.
2. Her delegation nevertheless had some reservations to make regarding operative paragraph 5 (b) and para-

graph 7 (a) (formerly paragraph 6 (a)). With regard to paragraph 5 (b), Italy, as was well known, had refrained from ratifying the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex) solely for juridical reasons. With regard to paragraph 7 (a), its provisions did not agree with the views of the Italian delegation, which believed that political relations with South Africa afforded an opportunity to bring pressure on the Government of that country.

3. Mr. NOTHOMB (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in its amended form and was pleased that it had been adopted unanimously. He wished to state, however, that he had the same reservations as did the representative of France (2061st meeting) regarding operative paragraph 5 (b), and, in the case of the new operative paragraph 6, he pointed out that Belgian gymnastic federations were private associations.

4. Mr. EVANS (Australia) said that although he had voted for the draft resolution in its amended form, his delegation, too, had reservations, on juridical grounds, regarding paragraph 5 (b); those reservations concerned the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*.

5. Mr. ARMAN (Democratic Yemen) expressed his gratification that the Committee had adopted the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption by the General Assembly, because the matter with which it dealt was of particular concern to his Government. His country had already ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex), and he addressed an appeal to all countries which had not yet ratified that instrument, exhorting them to do so without delay. However, it was important for the victims of discrimination and *apartheid* to be given material support in addition to moral support, and that was why his delegation had been particularly in favour of the former paragraph 6 (b) (new paragraph 7 (b)). His country would make its contribution to the Programme for the Decade, and it hoped that the specialized agencies and other organizations would give the Programme their generous support so that it might meet with success.

6. Mrs. YOTOPOULOS-MARANGOPOULOS (Greece) said that her delegation, in conformity with the new policy of the Greek Government, had supported without reservations the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption. She hoped that the intentions expressed in the draft resolution would be matched by concrete measures that would give them tangible form. The Economic and Social Council should, between the present time and the next session of the General Assembly, consider what practical measures, and especially what kinds of cultural and economic measures, might be taken against States that persisted in practising discrimination in disregard of the resolutions of the United Nations, and what were the most appropriate and efficient means which could be used to apply those measures. There would thus be available for the next session a study on questions of a practical nature which might provide the basis for a new approach to the matter of the elimination of racial discrimination.

7. Mrs. ABANKWA (Ghana) expressed her gratification at the adoption of the draft resolution on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (A/C.3/L.2105) and expressed the hope that it was an indication that more and more countries would be ratifying the Convention.

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2101/Rev.2) relating to measures to improve the situation of migrant workers, which had been submitted by the Mexican delegation.

9. Miss CABALLERO (Mexico) thanked the representative of Italy for her comments at the previous meeting on the draft resolution submitted by the Mexican delegation, for they had enabled certain points to be clarified. The Mexican delegation continued, however, to believe that the draft resolution should be considered under the item now before the Committee. That had been the opinion of the General Assembly when the question had been discussed there. Many delegations did not share the Italian delegation's view that it was inappropriate for the problem of migrant workers to be considered under the item relating to racial discrimination, and the Mexican delegation, for its part, was convinced that a discussion of that problem within the context of discrimination would further the activities provided for in connexion with the Decade.

10. Mr. TRAVERT (France) said that he endorsed the proposal by the Italian delegation to defer consideration of the question of migrant workers. That was a very important question, and the French delegation, which strongly condemned the unlawful exploitation of migrant workers, would like to have sufficient time for reflection. That change would in no way affect the progress of work, and, since paragraph 405 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/9603) dealt with a draft resolution entitled "Question of international legal protection of the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live", it would be quite logical for the question of migrant workers to be taken up under the item relating to the report of the Economic and Social Council (item 12). His delegation hoped that the suggestion would be accepted. In any event, it hoped there would be a short interval before the vote, in accordance with established practice, because, like many other delegations, it had not had time to receive instructions on the new text, which had not been distributed until shortly before the opening of the meeting. The topic was one which could not be studied in detail in advance, since it had come up unexpectedly during consideration of item 53 (a) and was not mentioned separately in the provisional agenda.

11. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) expressed support for the Mexican delegation's proposal. The Cuban delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2101/Rev.2 because it considered the item now before the Committee to be the proper one under which to take up the question of migrant workers, and it felt that a decision on that draft resolution could be taken forthwith. His delegation's support for that draft was also dictated by humanitarian considerations, for, in its revised version, the draft resolution could help to dissipate the concern that might be aroused by the distinction between migrant workers entering a country legally and those entering surreptitiously. He did not

believe that there was any reason for deferring consideration of that draft resolution.

12. Mr. EVANS (Australia) recalled that at the 2060th meeting he had proposed the deletion from paragraph 3 (a) of the initial version of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2101 of the words “who enter their countries legally or surreptitiously”; he had done so in the belief that that would dissipate the concern of a significant number of delegations. The text of the revised draft resolution which had just been submitted was an improvement but did not fully meet the objections of a number of delegations. Thus, it would perhaps be better to defer consideration of the text in question until the Committee took up agenda item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council), because that was where its discussion more properly belonged.

13. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that she was in full sympathy with the substance of the draft resolution submitted by Mexico and would vote in favour of it, but her delegation had serious reservations regarding its operative paragraph 4 (c). The problem of migrant workers who entered a country surreptitiously was a matter of grave concern to the Philippine Government because of the archipelagic nature of the Philippines which made illegal entry difficult to control. In the opinion of her delegation the problem should be considered in greater depth.

14. Mrs. WATANABE (Japan) requested clarification of the English terminology used in paragraph 4 (b) and (c). She wondered whether the “adoption” of agreements was what was actually meant in the two cases.

15. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) recalled, for the benefit of the representative of Italy, that the question of migrant workers had been raised two years previously by the delegation of Mali, and then later by her own delegation, and that it had already been the subject of decisions under item 50 of the agenda of the twenty-seventh session, relating to the elimination of racial discrimination (see General Assembly resolution 2920 (XXVII)). The logical and desirable course was therefore to take it up forthwith. Racism and racial discrimination were manifested for the most part in two forms. One of them was what could be called the traditional form and was directed against a person who did not have the skin of the same colour, the same kind of hair, the same kind of features or the same religion as did the people among whom he lived. The other was a modern form of technological or xenophobic racism that was characterized by extreme intolerance towards immigrant workers. Such workers, whether European, African or Latin American, were all victims of the same economic and racial discrimination. That was why she would like the draft resolution in question to be considered under the item now before the Committee.

16. With regard to the wording of the draft resolution, she would like, in connexion with paragraph 4 (c), to draw the Committee’s attention to the text of a convention that was soon to be adopted by the International Labour Organisation. The International Labour Conference Committee on Migrant Workers had recommended to the Conference the adoption, together with other provisions, of a text providing that, without prejudice to the measures for ensuring that migrants were brought into the national territory and

were admitted to employment in conformity with the applicable legislation, they should, even where such legislation had not been complied with, be entitled to equality of treatment by the persons or agencies employing them or obtaining other services from them.

17. By comparison with that provision, the text of the draft resolution under consideration was very moderate, and she would like it to be strengthened. As she considered however, that it represented a compromise formula, she declared herself willing to support, in its present form, the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Mexico (A/C.3/L.2101/Rev.2).

18. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) recalled that the question of migrant workers had been discussed by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session, when it had adopted its resolution 2920 (XXVII) on the basis of a draft resolution submitted by Algeria. The subject had been broadened since then, and a study on the exploitation of labour through illicit and clandestine trafficking¹ had been considered by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its twenty-seventh session. However, the study, some passages in which dealt with the causes of the illicit trafficking, did not mention the question of racial discrimination. She therefore felt that the revised draft resolution submitted by Mexico (A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2) should not be considered under the present item but under item 12, i.e. in connexion with the consideration of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

19. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that, while she fully supported the substance of the revised draft resolution submitted by Mexico, she wondered whether it would not indeed be preferable, as the representative of Italy had proposed, to consider it under agenda item 12. The question of migrant workers involved some very varied problems, and the Committee might confine itself to the racial aspects alone if it discussed the matter under the item relating to the elimination of racial discrimination.

20. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) observed that the Third Committee had taken up the question of migrant workers for the first time at the twenty-third session in connexion with its consideration of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (General Assembly resolution 2542 (XXIV)). Some members of the Committee now wished the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2) to be considered under another item on the grounds that the question of migrant workers did not relate to racial discrimination. However, paragraph 15 (d) (vi) of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination referred to “problems of discrimination arising in connexion with immigration of men, women—married and unmarried—and their children and foreign workers of both sexes”; he therefore proposed that the Committee should take an immediate vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by Mexico.

21. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that he endorsed the draft resolution, which followed along the lines of similar initiatives taken by Morocco, Algeria and his own delegation

¹ See E/CN.4/Sub.2/351 and 352.

at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The question of migrant workers was a timely one which affected not only the countries of the Americas but those of Europe and Africa as well. The Moroccan representative had clearly shown that the wording of the draft resembled, in a more moderate form, that of the draft convention on the subject prepared by the ILO at the fifty-ninth session of the International Labour Conference in June 1974. His country was particularly sensitive to the problem of migrant workers since there were more than a million Turkish workers in Europe; he felt that all migrant workers, regardless of whether they entered the host country legally or surreptitiously, should be granted treatment equal to that provided for nationals of the country in question. A compromise was needed, and from that standpoint he thought that the Mexican draft resolution provided a satisfactory formula. His delegation therefore supported the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2) as well as the proposal by the Mauritanian representative that the Committee should take an immediate vote.

22. Mr. TRAVERT (France) said that he would have some comments to make concerning the status of migrant workers in France and therefore requested, on the basis of rule 78 [120] of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that the vote on the revised draft resolution should be deferred.

23. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 78 [120] of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and said that, since the draft resolution had been discussed at the previous day's meeting, the Committee had to take a decision on the motion put forward by the French delegation.

24. Mr. BAL (Mauritania), speaking on a point of order, said that the French representative was probably correct in wishing to apply the rules of procedure in a strict manner. However, the reason the Committee had before it a revised draft resolution was that there existed an original draft resolution, which had already been considered by the Committee. That being the case, the voting process had begun and the French proposal could not be accepted. He repeated his proposal calling for an immediate vote on the draft resolution.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that the Committee should take a vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2.

The proposal was adopted by 62 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2 was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

27. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that he would have voted for the draft resolution if he had been present during the vote.

28. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) said that his country was fully aware of the importance of the problem of recognizing the fundamental rights of migrant workers. It was a problem that arose in many parts of the world. It

was the policy of the United States to give all migrant workers within its borders, legally or illegally, equitable and humane treatment. He recalled that his delegation had sponsored the text of Economic and Social Council resolution 1706 (LIII) on exploitation of labour through illicit and clandestine trafficking, which had been adopted on 28 July 1972.

29. He nevertheless felt that it would have been more appropriate to consider the matter at the same time as the report of the Economic and Social Council, in connexion with agenda item 12.

30. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it felt that operative paragraph 4 (a) was worded too vaguely. The fundamental rights of migrant workers should have been defined more clearly. In addition, he did not feel that operative paragraph 4 (b) and (c), which had to do with the illicit traffic in alien workers, fell within the discussion on the elimination of racial discrimination.

31. Mr. TRAVERT (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it had not had sufficient time for reflection to take a position on operative paragraph 4 (c). The rights of alien workers were respected in France. Under French law, alien workers had the same rights as French workers in the matter of hiring, pay, unemployment and mobility allowances, social welfare, vocational training and trade-union membership subject to reciprocity, i.e. provided that their countries of origin accorded the same rights to French workers. His Government fully supported the conclusion of bilateral agreements for the purpose of organizing and facilitating the movement of labour across frontiers. It had signed such agreements with a number of African countries and within the European community, in most cases for the purpose of simplifying the administrative formalities to which alien workers were subject when they entered France. Unfortunately, it was precisely those preferential arrangements that sometimes helped to create problems, since, during periods of economic depression, workers tended to seek employment abroad in greater numbers and often found that conditions in the host country were not much better than in their own country and that they were then faced with all sorts of problems.

32. Racism was not, of course, unknown in France, but, from a legal standpoint at least, alien workers enjoyed absolute equality of treatment with French workers.

33. Mr. LOH (Malaysia) said that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2102/Rev.2 even though he had some reservations regarding operative paragraph 4 (c).

34. Miss CABALLERO (Mexico) expressed regret that four delegations had been unable to support the draft resolution so that every effort could be made to implement the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and ensure respect for the rights of migrant workers. She thanked those countries which had voted for the draft resolution and expressed the hope that it would be adopted unanimously in the plenary Assembly.

35. Mr. PIERCE (Jamaica) said that he had abstained in the vote because his delegation had not completed its deliberations; he hoped, however, that his delegation would be in a position to vote for the draft when it came before the General Assembly.

36. Mr. EVANS (Australia) said that, although his delegation endorsed the principles set out in the draft resolution, it was still not satisfied with the word “surreptitiously” in operative paragraph 4 (c).

37. Mrs. YOTOPOULOS-MARANGOPOULOS (Greece) said that her delegation supported the substance of the draft resolution since there were many Greek migrant workers in various countries. Although she had some doubts about the competence of the Committee to deal with the subject, she had thought it her duty to vote for the draft resolution, since the question of competence had been solved in previous years, in order to avoid repetitions at least on questions of formality.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections D to F), IV (section J), V (sections A to C, D, paragraphs 436 to 478, 487 to 492 and 494 to 506, and E), VI (sections A.1 to 5 and 7, E and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (A/9603, A/9637, A/9733, A/9764, A/9767, A/9785)

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to begin the consideration of agenda item 12, relating to the report of the Economic and Social Council on the work of its fifty-sixth and fifty-seventh sessions (A/9603). She drew the Committee's attention to the note by the Chairman concerning the Committee's agenda (A/C.3/L.2099), containing the list of those chapters and sections of the Economic and Social Council's report which the General Assembly had referred to the Third Committee and of those referred to the Third Committee which might interest other committees. The note also indicated those parts of the report referred to other committees which might interest the Third Committee. In addition, when the Third Committee took up the report of the Economic and Social Council, it might consider the humanitarian aspects of the question dealt with in agenda item 60 (Assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations) which had been referred to the Second Committee.

39. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) introduced the section of the Economic and Social Council's report which was devoted to human rights questions (A/9603, chap. VI, sect. C) and in which the Council reported on the work done and the results obtained in the exercise of its functions under Article 62 of the Charter. He wished to make some explanations or clarifications concerning the questions dealt with in that section which were not the subject of separate items of the Third Committee's agenda and to give some additional information concerning new developments and important measures that had been adopted, in particular by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, since the Council's fifty-sixth session.

40. Several of the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council in connexion with its consideration of

the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirtieth session² were designed to answer the need to analyse more thoroughly and elucidate further certain specific problems which were often complex and sometimes urgent. Thus the Council had approved, by its resolutions 1864 (LVI), 1865 (LVI) and 1866 (LVI) respectively, the decision of the Commission on Human Rights to authorize the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to undertake studies on the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, on the historical and current development of the right of peoples to self-determination, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and other instruments adopted by United Nations organs, with particular reference to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and on the implementation of United Nations resolutions relating to the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. At its twenty-seventh session, the Sub-Commission had entrusted those studies to three special rapporteurs, namely Mr. Khalifa (Egypt), Mr. Cristescu (Romania) and Mr. Gross Espiel (Uruguay), respectively.

41. In its resolution 1871 (LVI), the Council had requested the Sub-Commission to consider as a matter of high priority at its twenty-seventh session the problem of the applicability of existing international provisions for the protection of human rights to individuals who were not citizens of the country in which they lived and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-first session. The Sub-Commission had therefore entrusted one of its members, Lady Elles (United Kingdom), with preparing a supplementary report on the question, which would be submitted to the Sub-Commission at its next session and should include a list of desirable measures, including the possibility of preparing a declaration in the matter.

42. The Sub-Commission had, at its twenty-seventh session, examined the study prepared at its request by Mrs. Warzazi (Morocco) on the exploitation of labour through illicit and clandestine trafficking.¹ It had asked Mrs. Warzazi to continue and complete her study on certain points and had decided to consider the question as a matter of priority at its next session, with a view to formulating proposals and recommendations. In addition, the Secretary-General had been requested to envisage the possibility of organizing, as part of the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, a seminar which would deal with the question in a systematic and multidisciplinary manner. Some Governments had already expressed interest, and the Secretariat would consider possibilities with them. The non-governmental organizations which had met in Geneva in September to consider the problems of *apartheid* and colonialism had envisaged devoting the conference they hoped to hold the following year to the problems of migrant workers.

43. Lastly, the Sub-Commission had entrusted one of its members, Mrs. Daes (Greece), with undertaking a study on

² *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 5.*

the duties of the individual to the community and on the limitations which might be placed on human rights and freedoms under article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

44. The Economic and Social Council had adopted resolution 1867 (LVI) on the question of the realization of the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It had considered the study³ which it had entrusted to Mr. Ganji (Iran) and which had included Mr. Ganji's observations, conclusions and recommendations. The members of the Council had recognized the value of that study and had asked that it should be widely circulated. The study would therefore be printed in five languages and a public information brochure would be published by the Office of Public Information.

45. At the recommendation of the Commission on Human Rights, which, following the wishes expressed in 1968 by the International Conference on Human Rights, had worked on the preparation of model rules of procedure for United Nations bodies dealing with violations of human rights, the Council had, in its resolution 1870 (LVI), taken note of the reports on that subject⁴ prepared by the Working Group established by the Commission and had brought them to the attention of all organs and bodies of the United Nations dealing with questions of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

46. Two other resolutions of the Council related to the activities of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts whose mandate was to inquire into the violation of human rights in southern Africa and in the Territories under Portuguese domination. In its resolution 1868 (LVI) the Council drew the attention of the General Assembly to the mandate and activities of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts, emphasizing that the Group was available to undertake any inquiries which the General Assembly might desire to assign to it and to maintain appropriate collaboration with the bodies concerned. In its resolution 1869 (LVI), the Council invited the General Assembly to bring to the notice of the Security Council the deterioration in the situation in Southern Africa, which posed a serious threat to world peace and security. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts had carried out a mission of inquiry in Europe and Africa during the summer with a view to collecting testimony which would be utilized, together with other pertinent information, in preparing the report to be submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Working Group to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-first session. In connexion with its mission, the Group had addressed to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia cables describing the practices to which Africans in Namibia were reportedly being subjected and had requested that those cables should be brought to the attention of all competent United Nations bodies. The Committee had before it the text of those communications, which appeared in the note by the Secretary-General concerning torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (A/9767).

47. The Council had adopted a resolution relating to the protection of human rights in Chile (resolution 1873 (LVI)), in which *inter alia* it endorsed the concern of the Commission on Human Rights. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had itself adopted a resolution on the matter (resolution 8 (XXVII)); the text of that resolution was contained in annex II of document A/9767.

48. By its decision 16 (LVI), on the question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of *apartheid* and colonialism, the Council had authorized the Sub-Commission to establish a working group composed of five members of the Sub-Commission to review developments in that field. The Sub-Commission had established that group at its twenty-seventh session and had asked it to submit to the Sub-Commission a report containing *inter alia* proposals on methods of future action in the matter.

49. In its resolution 3059 (XXVIII) on the question of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to inform it, under the report of the Economic and Social Council, of the consideration which might have been given to that question by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities or by the Commission on Human Rights and other bodies concerned. The note by the Secretary-General (A/9767) contained all available information in that regard.

50. At its fifty-seventh session, when it had taken up the question of priorities in the economic, social and human rights fields, the Council had again stressed the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of world-wide co-operation for the promotion of human rights. In its resolution 1910 (LVII), it requested the Secretary-General to prepare his draft programme budget and medium-term plan in such a way as to permit the General Assembly to deploy the resources allocated to the realization of the major objectives of the United Nations, which explicitly included the promotion of human rights, taking into account the desirability of ensuring a meaningful element of real growth in programmes which were particularly responsive to those objectives.

51. Lastly, in approving the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1975 and taking note of the provisional calendar for 1976 by its decision 52 (LVII), the Council had maintained its practice of alternating between New York and Geneva for the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and its subsidiary bodies, including the Sub-Commission, an arrangement whose usefulness had been recognized by the delegations.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take up in the following order those parts of the Council's report which were not dealt with in separate items of the Committee's agenda: chapter V, section C; chapter V, sections D, E and A.2; chapter V, section B; chapter IV, section J; chapter VI, sections A.1-5 and 7; chapter VII; chapter VI, section E.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

³ E/CN.4/1108 and Add.1-10 and E/CN.4/1131 and Corr.1.

⁴ E/CN.4/1086, E/CN.4/1134.