



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.3/SR.1884
1 December 1971
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Twenty-sixth Session

THIRD COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED
AND EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 26 November 1971, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS

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

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

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. SÍPILA	Finland
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. MOUSSA	Egypt

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the four working languages (English, French, Russian or Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and also incorporated in one copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 1 DECEMBER 1971, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 6 DECEMBER 1971.

The co-operation of participants in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

71-73316/A

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNIVERSAL REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND OF THE SPEEDY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES FOR THE EFFECTIVE GUARANTEE AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS (A/8331; A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, L.1878, L.1879, L.1880, L.1881/Rev.1, L.1882, L.1886/Rev.1, L.1888, L.1889 and L.1893) (continued)

Lord GOWRIE (United Kingdom) said that, like the representative of Norway, he regretted that a large number of amendments and subamendments on which the Committee had voted at the previous meeting had been of a political nature and had therefore not been within the Third Committee's competence.

He did not wish to explain all his delegation's votes some of which, like the negative vote on the Ugandan amendment (A/C.3/L.1880), reflected the well-known policies of his Government. He wished, however, to underline his delegation's concern at a recurring theme, that of the use of force. Even where the United Kingdom Government was convinced of the justice of a cause, it was opposed to the use of force being considered as a means of resolving disputes or righting grievances. It was therefore regrettable to note that some of the original paragraphs of the draft resolution and some of the proposed amendments implied support for the use of force and that the formula adopted in the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations had not been adhered to in some cases. For that reason, his delegation had welcomed the adoption of a United States amendment to operative paragraph 1 which emphasized that the means available to the peoples struggling for freedom should be consistent with the United Nations Charter. The adoption of that amendment had enabled his delegation to abstain on operative paragraph 1 as a whole instead of voting against it, as it had intended to do.

It has also been in order to avoid wording which, explicitly or otherwise, supported the use of force in the text of the draft resolution that his delegation had voted against the additional preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1882 and against the amendments or subamendments which were along the same lines. Lastly, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the subamendments submitted orally by Morocco the effect of which was to pass judgement on one of the areas mentioned in the amendment to which they were related. That kind of selective judgement had no place in a resolution.

Mr. NASSER-ZIAYEE (Afghanistan) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the subamendments submitted orally by Morocco on the understanding that the mention of certain specific cases or peoples in no way weakened the legality of the struggle of peoples who were fighting to attain their right to self-determination in other parts of the world.

Mr. MOLEPHE (Botswana) deplored the confusion in which the voting had taken place. For its part, his delegation would have had no difficulty in voting in favour of the original text of the resolution in document A/8331 and it had reservations regarding operative paragraph 1 as adopted.

Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8331, as amended, because his delegation felt that the text would assist the United Nations in its efforts to ensure the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. Most of the amendments which had been submitted improved the original text and made it more specific in that they indicated the crucial problems of the present day and drew attention to those States which were primarily responsible for those problems.

His delegation deplored the attempts which had been made in some amendments, for example in documents A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, L.1888 and L.1889, the sponsors of which had endeavoured either to delete substantive ideas relating to the oppressive policies of some States or to over-generalize the problems of self-determination in order to diminish their own responsibility and that of their allies. Thus, his delegation had voted against the amendments submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1) because it felt that no generalization of the problems of self-determination could enable the United States and its NATO allies, in particular Portugal, to escape their responsibilities for maintaining the last vestiges of colonialism in some parts of Africa and encouraging violations of the rights of the Palestinian people by Israel.

His delegation had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan subamendment in the belief that the original amendment (A/C.3/L.1882, para. 4) would be retained. Since it had been the Moroccan proposal which had been retained, his delegation had voted in favour of that formula and in favour of the paragraph as a whole.

Mr. SANE (Senegal) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8331, as amended. It had voted in favour of amendment A/C.3/L.1878 which reaffirmed resolutions which had been adopted previously and which Senegal had supported. It had also supported the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1), particularly with regard to the addition of a new paragraph calling upon all States to give assistance to peoples struggling for liberation. In the same spirit, his delegation had accepted the Afghan amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1879.

Amendment A/C.3/L.1880 had also been supported by his delegation because it affirmed as essential principle, namely that independence should only be granted to Zimbabwe when a government representative of the great majority of the population was established; the application of such a principle would in fact have the merit of preventing the emergence of rebel governments in the future. Lastly, his delegation had supported the Pakistan amendments (A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1) which reaffirmed the right of peoples to self-determination and were designed to ensure the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

In his delegation's view, the amendments submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1) were unacceptable because they fell far short of the original draft resolution and deleted any mention of Portugal and NATO, which were the true authors of the evils from which the countries subject to colonial domination suffered. His delegation was surprised at the duplicity, nay the Machiavellianism, which it had detected in the United States proposals in view of the fact that a few days earlier the United States delegation had abstained in the vote in the Security Council on a resolution which defended the principles set forth in the United States amendments. It was therefore satisfying to note that those amendments had been rejected.

He pointed out that he had participated in all the meetings which had led to the formulation of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1882. For that reason his delegation had accepted practically all of them. Thus, in accordance with its traditional position, it had voted in favour of all the amendments which were designed to strengthen the original text by reaffirming the right of peoples to freedom and peace. It had, however, abstained in the various votes on

the word "Palestine". At a time when four Heads of State in the discharge of a mandate from the Organization of African Unity, were seeking ways and means of achieving a political settlement to the Middle East conflict, it was important to avoid opening a debate on the problem in the Third Committee which might impede the African endeavour. Some people had claimed that his delegation had deliberately attempted to weaken the scope of the sixth preambular paragraph by recommending the deletion of the word "Palestine". He therefore wished to state categorically that Senegal's wholehearted support for all movements which were struggling to secure the restoration of their rights was one of the constants of its foreign policy. The repeated attacks of the Portuguese colonial forces against the territory of Senegal were irrefutable proof of that, if any was needed. Moreover, Senegal's position with regard to the Middle East conflict, more particularly, was well known and each of the protagonists in the conflict was familiar with Senegal's arguments which did not need to be repeated in that forum. If, therefore, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the word "Palestine" it had been, on the one hand, out of prudence, since at a time when some Heads of State were carrying out a peace mission it was important to allow them to do so in the best possible circumstances, and, on the other hand, out of courtesy, in order not to impede their efforts.

Mr. SEIGNORET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on Morocco's subamendments relating to the Middle East. In the belief that all peoples should be able to enjoy the full exercise of all human rights, it would have liked to have been able to support those subamendments in so far as they emphasized the tragic situation which existed in Palestine. However, support for those amendments could have been interpreted as signifying that his country had abandoned its traditional policy on the question of the Middle East. He wished to point out that any consideration of the question of the Middle East should take place within the framework of Security Council resolution 242.

Mr. SABIK (Poland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole since it clearly indicated the task incumbent on the

(Mr. Sabik, Poland)

United Nations as well as the obstacles it had to face. As a result, in particular, of the amendments submitted by Iraq, by Morocco, and by Algeria and other countries, the resolution indicated the regions where liberation movements were waging a legitimate struggle in defence of their territory. His delegation had voted in favour of the Moroccan subamendment in document A/C.3/L.1888 and it asked that the record of the vote should be corrected accordingly.

Mr. van WALSUM (Netherlands) explained that his delegation's decisions on the different texts had been based on the following reasons: firstly, the problem of southern Africa and that of the Middle East were not of a similar or comparable nature, and the two should not be linked in a single resolution; secondly, his delegation refused to subscribe to measures which would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter; thirdly, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should not be linked to the policy of one of its members which the other members rejected.

The text recommended by the Economic and Social Council and the flood of amendments to it demonstrated that the discussion of the items under consideration was progressively taking on the form of a phraseological tournament which was more appropriate to some other United Nations forums than to the Third Committee. His delegation agreed that there was a connexion between self-determination and human rights, but it felt that the draft resolution, as adopted failed to add any new dimension to the consideration of the problem of self-determination from the human rights angle.

Mr. ARIM (Turkey) said that his delegation had always supported the efforts of the United Nations in the sphere of decolonization. That was why it had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8331, as amended, although it had reservations about some of the paragraphs. For instance, it had abstained in the vote on the third preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 3 and 4. On the other hand, it had voted in favour of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, on the understanding that the wording of those amendments could not be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the principles of international

law embodied in certain instruments, such as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation had voted in favour of operative paragraph 1, as amended, and the new preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1882 which endorsed the principle of self-determination. It had also supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1880, which embodied a principle that Turkey had always upheld.

Miss SELAMI (Algeria) deplored the fact that, in a forum where the sole concern should be the defence of human rights and the common wish to see them triumph, some chose to sacrifice them to pseudo-juridical considerations and doubtful casuistry. Without daring to deny the reality of the African liberation movements, certain delegations had sought directly or indirectly to deny the Palestinian people their right to freedom and - what was even more serious - their right to independence. In submitting the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1882, her delegation had adhered to the principles which had always prompted Algeria to affirm its solidarity with all peoples struggling for liberation, including the peoples of Angola, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Palestine.

Her delegation had voted in favour of the various amendments which clarified the rather general concepts formulated in the original draft resolution.

Mr. BOURGOIN (France) said he regretted that he had had to vote against a resolution on the right to self-determination and human rights, as the French delegations to the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights had done. France had been among the precursors in the field of human rights and it had always widely practised the principle of self-determination, a fact of which it was proud. His delegation felt, however, that the resolution that had just been adopted went too far. Passing censure would not bring a solution any nearer. There were other ways and his delegation was helping to explore them in the competent United Nations bodies. It was hoping to find some way more effective than statements, which might give satisfaction but had little effect on the real situation.

Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said that his country, which had suffered under colonialism for more than four centuries, supported all peoples struggling for

(Mr. Torres, Philippines)

their liberation. In his opinion, the slowing-down in the process of decolonization was attributable to the resistance of those countries which were benefiting from the situation. His delegation had therefore supported all the amendments supporting the national liberation movements, as well as all those which reaffirmed the principles of the Charter and of other instruments. It had, however, abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole in view of certain elements of a dubious political and juridical nature.

Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) said she regretted that her delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution because of reservations about some of the amendments and subamendments. It also regretted that only one of the United States amendments (A/C.3/L.1881) had been adopted, because they would have made the draft resolution acceptable for a large number of countries. In its present form the draft resolution went beyond the competence of the Third Committee and contained unjustifiable conclusions. For instance, there was no justification for establishing a link between NATO activities and the oppression of liberation movements.

Her delegation regretted that the amendments submitted by Barbados and Uganda (A/C.3/L.1888 and L.1889), which it could have endorsed, had not been put to the vote in their original form. Her delegation supported the struggle of the Palestinian people as well as Security Council resolution 242. It believed, however, that no single aspect of the Middle East question could be considered in isolation; for that reason it had abstained in the vote on the Moroccan subamendments.

In view of the fact that the functions of each organ of the United Nations were clearly defined in the Charter, her delegation had abstained in the vote on the amendment contained in the last paragraph of document A/C.3/L.1882, because it was not for the General Assembly to urge the Security Council to take action.

Mr. MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of amendment A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, which it interpreted as meaning that assistance to peoples struggling for their independence was consistent with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Mrs. JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8331, as amended, despite some reservations, particularly regarding the United States amendments. It could have agreed to the incorporation of those amendments in the draft resolution but not to their replacing some of its passages. As they stood, they would have weakened the draft resolution. That was why her delegation had abstained in the vote, except on the amendment relating to operative paragraph 1.

Sierra Leone had also abstained on the amendments relating to the Palestine problem, not out of lack of sympathy for the struggle of the Palestinian people, but because that problem was of a different order from the problems of the African peoples. Moreover, her country wished to avoid jeopardizing the peace mission to the Middle East undertaken by a number of African Heads of State.

Mrs. TALBOT (Guyana) endorsed the statement made by the Zambian representative at the previous meeting. By their votes, both her own country and Zambia had sought to demonstrate that they did not consider the problems of the Middle East identical with those of southern Africa, and that it was therefore undesirable to group them together. Guyana fully endorsed the principle of self-determination for all peoples in the context of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and also subscribed to the principle of the inadmissibility of acquiring territories by force.

Turning to another matter, she said that her delegation wished it to be known that it deplored the personal attacks to which some representatives had been subjected, in particular the representative of Barbados. It was true that not all delegations could see all matters in the same light, but they should at least agree that each was entitled to express its opinion.

Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8331, as a whole, as amended, although it had reservations regarding some of its provisions.

The draft resolution referred to the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. Greece could not countenance any exception to the universality of that principle and all countries had a duty to promote its realization, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. For those

(Mrs. Daes, Greece)

reasons, her delegation had voted in favour of the Moroccan subamendment relating to the self-determination of the Palestinian people. It had also voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the United States because they were based on the provisions of the Charter and on the relevant resolutions previously adopted by the competent United Nations organs. Her delegation was glad that the United States amendment relating to operative paragraph 1 had been adopted because it clarified and completed that paragraph and defined the framework within which the struggle of peoples for self-determination and liberation should take place.

Her delegation had abstained in the vote on the third preambular paragraph and on the sixth amendment in document A/C.3/L.1882, because provisions calling for condemnations and sanctions against States fell within the competence of other organs of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council.

Mr. ERMACORA (Austria) said that, although his country was sympathetic to the principles of the right of peoples to self-determination, it had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole, firstly, in order not to prejudge the study on self-determination which the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session had requested from the Commission on Human Rights, secondly, because of the clumsiness of the wording, and thirdly because it did not want to support a text which might be interpreted in a way which was inconsistent with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.

Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of Algeria. Her delegation would have preferred the fourth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882 to be adopted rather than the formula proposed by Morocco that had been adopted, because the latter weakened the text. At least, the Moroccan amendment had made it possible to mention the Palestinian people in a resolution concerning the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

Her delegation deplored the fact that France, which had originated the principle of freedom and human rights, had found itself unable to vote in favour of a draft resolution that it had considered excessive. However, while the sponsors of the amendments had sought to rectify certain omissions, they had been constantly

(Miss Farouk, Tunisia)

guided by a sense of proportion. Thus, while paragraph 5 of the original draft resolution condemned "States", amendment A/C.3/L.1882 condemned the policy of certain States.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that the representative of Zambia during his explanation of vote had expressed a view that was identical to that of Barbados, namely that the question of southern Africa and the question of the Middle East were entirely different. Attempts to associate the two problems had undermined the principles on which any action in either case must be based. In the case of the Territories under Portuguese administration and southern Africa the problem was one of decolonization and the liberation of millions of Africans dominated by a notorious colonialist State. In the case of the Palestinian refugees, however, the history of the Middle East must be viewed as a whole, and until all concerned, including the Palestinians, met around the table to deal with the problem together, no solution would be possible. The current talks in Paris on Viet-Nam should serve as an example. In itself, the state of war would lead to nothing - as was clearly shown by the situation of the Palestinians, which had not changed for 20 years.

In another context, he said he was indignant at the attitude taken by certain delegations during the debate. Firstly, it would appear, according to some, that a delegation could not submit a proposal without first having consulted other delegations. His delegation found that principle inadmissible. Furthermore, it condemned the impudence of those who considered themselves authorized to dictate to a country the choice of its friends. If Barbados desired to have diplomatic contacts with Israel, South Africa and Portugal, nothing would prevent it.

Certain delegations, unfortunately, allowed themselves to be influenced by the threatening attitude of some representatives. But that did not frighten his delegation, which would pursue its activities in all fields and would always follow implicitly the instructions of its Government. Similarly, in no circumstances would it abandon the rules of diplomacy in accordance with its country's traditions.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey, Barbados)

His delegation had maintained its amendment despite the unfavourable reaction to it. Its position was that of the majority of African States, as was reflected by the position of Zambia. He felt justified in speaking on behalf of the African States since, until 1970, he himself had represented an African State. When a valid resolution on the Palestinian question was submitted, his delegation would give it enthusiastic support.

He warned the Committee against those who wished to use the Palestinian question for selfish ends, regardless of the consequences for the Palestinian people.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) considered that the decision of the International Court of Justice had been a striking display of solidarity with the peoples of southern Africa and Palestine against the forces of colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and neo-nazism. It underlined the indivisible character of the struggle of the peoples of Africa and Asia against the forces of oppression. Once more, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination had been recognized, despite the desperate attempts of imperialism, Zionism and colonialism to isolate their movement. Certain delegations had attempted to distort the statement by the representative of Zambia, but the summary records clearly indicated that Zambia unreservedly supported the struggle of the Palestinians. The Zambian delegation had never stated that the Palestinians had no right to return to their country and had never denied that Israel was a creation of colonialism. His delegation would defend to the last the freedom of expression of all representatives and the right of Palestinians to speak for themselves. Casuistry and sophistry would not destroy Palestine.

Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said she wished to make a few comments on the explanations of vote given by a number of delegations, particularly that of Barbados. Firstly, it was clear that the resolution contained in document A/8331 was not entitled "Colonialism in southern Africa". The discriminatory phenomena of colonialism, aggression and the violation of human rights were not the prerogative of the African continent. The resolution adopted confirmed the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights. Clearly, what was involved was

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

the universal realization of the right of all peoples, as the Moroccan subamendment specified. The sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882 had sought to mention particular cases the existence of which was not denied. It had been for the purpose of making a clear distinction between Africa and Asia that her delegation, when introducing its subamendment, had proposed the use of the words "as well as the Palestinian people" and not "and elsewhere". It was regrettable that the Zambian delegation had not understood that that correction was equivalent to a new paragraph, since that would have enabled it to vote in favour of the subamendment in question.

Finally, she affirmed that the Moroccan Government upheld its traditional principles and that it was ready to do its utmost to ensure the triumph of a just cause.

Mr. AL-SHAWI (Iraq) said he wished to point out to the representative of Barbados that, by insisting so vigorously that the Palestinian question should be dissociated from that of southern Africa but should receive equal attention, he had adopted a position which in essence was reminiscent of that of the protagonists of apartheid, who considered black people as equals but treated them differently.

Furthermore, he wished to stress that the resolution adopted by the Committee had all the greater moral force and validity since it had received the support of the USSR and China, which together accounted for three quarters of the world's population.

Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) deplored the fact that in his statement, the representative of Barbados had presented his delegation's point of view as if it were that of the majority of African States. That was certainly not the case. He wished to know on what authority the representative of Barbados felt empowered to speak on behalf of the African States.

Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that in view of the arrogance and lack of tact shown by certain delegations, he felt he should point out that the manoeuvres undertaken by the Arab States in order to introduce the question of the Middle East into the text recommended by the Economic and Social Council had received support

(Mr. Barroni, Israel)

only from the Arab delegations and their obedient allies. Only the force of numbers had made it possible for the text to be adopted.

Consequently, his delegation considered that the draft resolution adopted by the Committee had not the slightest moral authority.

Mr. NYANG'ANYI (United Republic of Tanzania) said he wished to explain that, contrary to the impression given by the statement from the representative of Barbados, the Tanzanian delegation had not supported the amendment proposed by the delegations of Barbados and Uganda. The position of the United Republic of Tanzania was similar to that of Zambia. It supported the Palestinian struggle but would have preferred it to be mentioned in a separate paragraph.

Since Tanzania had voted for the subamendment proposed by the Moroccan delegation, it could not be included in the majority of African States on behalf of which the representative of Barbados said he had spoken.

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 (A/8390, A/C.3/L.1894 and L.1898).

Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.1894 on behalf of the sponsors. They were aware that there had not been a general discussion on that very important point but they hoped that delegations had had time to consider it and that, to save time, the draft resolution would be adopted by a show of hands.

The sponsors had prepared the text before the Committee in the light of the Secretary-General's report (A/8390) and they believed that the draft resolution they had prepared would help to promote and strengthen the aims of the United Nations in the field of human rights. Since September 1971 the international covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights had been ratified by a number of countries. In accordance with their respective articles 27 and 49 those two Covenants would enter into force after the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession had been deposited. The Optional Protocol had been ratified by five States and would only enter into force after the tenth instrument of ratification had been deposited. Countries that had not already done so should therefore take the appropriate steps.

(Mr. Papademas, Cyprus)

It was in that context that the sponsors had prepared the draft resolution under consideration. Although it was not the appropriate time to go into a detailed analysis of the draft resolution, he wished to point out that in the third preambular paragraph, the sponsors had not been trying to impose a time-limit; they thought it was sufficient to express the hope that the instruments in question would be ratified in time for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1973.

The sponsors were aware that it was sometimes difficult to hasten the process of ratification because of the internal legislation and procedures of many countries, but they thought States should try to speed up those procedures. That was the intention of paragraph 1. As for the amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1898, he wished to emphasize that the sponsors had refrained from mentioning the Optional Protocol in the second preambular paragraph and in the operative part because, as its name showed, the protocol concerned was optional and they did not wish to place an obligation on any State. They would be grateful therefore if the sponsors of the amendment would accept the text of the draft resolution as it stood and withdraw their proposals.

Mr. van WALSUM (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1898, explained that before drawing up their proposal, they had asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to mention the Optional Protocol in their text. Some of them had been unable to accept that proposal since they hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously. The sponsors of the amendment were aware that the Optional Protocol was mentioned in the first preambular paragraph but regretted that there was no reference to it in the second preambular paragraph nor, more strikingly, in the operative paragraphs. They were also aware, and it had been stressed, that the term "Covenants" might be considered to include the Optional Protocol. It seemed, however, that the instruments in question were normally referred to as "the Covenants and the Optional Protocol". That, at any rate, was the wording used in paragraphs 2 and 3 of General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI) which had been adopted unanimously. Moreover, the Covenants and the Optional Protocol were

(Mr. van Walsum, Netherlands)

mentioned separately in paragraph 1 of that same resolution and also in resolution XXI of the Teheran Conference which appealed for an early ratification of the instruments in question by all countries.

The delegations of Costa Rica, Sweden, Uruguay and the Netherlands felt, therefore, that there was no valid reason to deviate from established practice since that might lead to a misinterpretation of the position adopted by the General Assembly.

That was the spirit in which the delegations of the countries mentioned had proposed the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.1898. Those amendments could not be regarded as controversial since they strictly adhered to the wording of a resolution adopted unanimously by the General Assembly five years previously.

Mrs. NILSSON (Sweden) said that she was pleased to inform the Committee that Sweden would be able to ratify the two International Covenants on human rights in the near future. The advice of Parliament had been requested and the Government would ratify the two Covenants as soon as they had been approved. Sweden would also be able to ratify the Optional Protocol.

Like many other countries, Sweden attached the greatest importance to a complete respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Those were its guiding principles both in the United Nations and in the Council of Europe and other international bodies. In view of the universal nature of the Declaration of Human Rights, it was a matter of urgency for all countries to ratify and to apply immediately the two International Covenants, if they have not already done so. That appeal was addressed to all States but particularly to the great Powers who ought to set an example where human rights were concerned.

Finally she emphasized that it was because Sweden attached considerable importance to the Optional Protocol that her country was among the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1898.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.