United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTIETH SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 1357th MEETING
Monday, 29 November 1965, at 10.45 a.m.
NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page
Agenda item 58:
Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued)
Articles on measures of implementation (continued)
Article XIII (continued) 391

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921; E/3873, chap. II and annexes I and III; A/C.3/L.1237, L.1239, L.1241, L.1249, L.1262, L.1272, L.1291 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1292, L.1297, L.1303 to L.1305, L.1307)

ARTICLES ON MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

Article XIII (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to continue their study of a new article XIII proposed by Ghana, Mauritania and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1). Amendments to that text had been submitted by the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1303).

2. Mr. LAWREY (Australia) pointed out that his delegation had voted in favour of the measures of implementation already adopted by the Committee in articles VIII to XII: in other words, in favour of a system of reporting and of a procedure for conciliation between States.

3. In adopting those articles, the Committee had taken an important and not unoriginal decision. The object had been to avoid losing sight of the rules of national and international life and, while seeking to attain the objectives of the Charter in the field of human rights, to avoid establishing a system which would be unacceptable to many Member States because it was incompatible with their method of discharging their national and international responsibilities. However, in considering a system of petitions addressed by individuals or groups of individuals to an international body, the Committee was entering a field where it must walk warily. Some delegations had argued that, in the world of today, it was neither possible nor desirable to continue applying certain traditional principles of international law and that, moreover, the United Nations Charter and the obligations it entailed were very much a living reality. At the same time, as everyone knew, there were in existence a European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and an identical draft convention for Latin America; one of those instruments advocated, and the other provided for, a system of petitions. Those, however, were regional instruments, relating to groups of relatively homogeneous countries, whereas the draft Convention before the Committee was intended to have a much wider, indeed a universal, field of application. He personally doubted the usefulness of including provisions such as those in paragraph 1 of the new article XIII submitted by the three Powers. (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1). Their optional character would not necessarily guarantee their effective implementation; moreover some countries might have very good reasons not to make the declaration envisaged in draft article XIII. Such results would hardly serve the cause of the ideals enunciated in the Charter.

4. The final paragraphs of the document under consideration contemplated the establishment of national committees or other bodies competent in first instance to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals. There again the provision was optional, but if a State accepted it the national body concerned would intervene between the petitioner and the international authority and would be able to communicate with the latter. He found it difficult to see how such a system could be incorporated in the various known constitutional systems.

5. Paragraph 4 did not specify who was to determine whether redress had been attained. It was possible that the national committee might consider the redress adequate while the petitioner did not. Nor was it clear whether the eighteen-member committee, in its annual report, would pass judgement on the redress or merely indicate what redress had been offered by the State concerned and for what reasons the victim had rejected it.

6. He was surprised to learn from paragraph 6 that the identity of the individual or group of individuals concerned was not to be revealed to the State Party without their express consent. The Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.1270) had contained no provision of that kind and had been more realistic in that respect. It would be regrettable for the Third Committee, after adopting the initial implementation clauses almost unanimously, to show less unanimity in adopting optional clauses which, moreover, stood little chance of being widely implemented and which consequently might tend to weaken rather than strengthen the general application of the Convention.

7. Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) reminded the Committee that his delegation had had occasion to state previously, during the general debate, that the system of reporting and conciliation between States, however desirable it might be, was not enough, and that in its opinion the submission of petitions was an essential complement to those more traditional methods. His delegation had also emphasized that individuals should where necessary have access to international authorities competent to evaluate the national rules relating to human rights. It had also pointed out that the desire to free the individual from the State had figured among the great ideas which had been spread abroad in the world by the English, French and Russian revolutions and which continued to inspire twentieth-century man. His delegation had called upon the Committee to serve as a pioneer and had pointed out that in comparable areas, for instance under the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, drastic measures of implementation had been applied with remarkable success despite the objections of the sceptics and pessimists.

8. His delegation, for its part, was firmly convinced that a compulsory system of petitions should be established, even if only on a regional basis at first. It realized of course that such an objective could not be attained overnight and that, since the functions of the Ombudsman were only beginning to gain recognition at the national level, it was hardly to be expected that they would be recognized at the international level. Consequently his delegation, in defining its position on the measures of implementation of the draft Convention, had wished neither to rest content, in a humdrum conservative spirit, nor to advocate a compulsory reporting system of those fanciful aspect it was fully aware. It had sought an intermediate solution, and believed it had found one in the system of optional petitions, one variant of which was proposed in the new article XIII submitted by Ghana, Mauritania and the Philippines. Although that article did not entirely meet his delegation's wishes, it was the outcome of patient and difficult negotiation, and his delegation was prepared to support it in principle.

9. Article XIII could not be more optional than it was. Since it left States free to recognize or not to recognize, by means of a declaration, the competence of the international committee to receive petitions from their nationals, it should reassure those States which regarded the right of petition as inappropriate in the existing state of international relations.

10. Paragraphs 2 and 4, which provided for the establishment of national committees by States that recognized the competence of the international committee, were also optional in character, since it was understood that article XIII as a whole applied only to States which had made the declaration prescribed in paragraph 1 of the article. In other words, the interests of States which opposed the principle of the right of petition were fully safeguarded.

11. In the circumstances his delegation did not see why article XIII should not be made an integral part of the Convention. In its view the article should not be placed in a separate protocol because it was binding only on those States which so desired. Furthermore, to consign article XIII to such a protocol would be prejudicial to the system of petitions, whereas its retention in the body of the Convention would make it clear that the method of petitions, in one form or another, constituted the third vital measure of implementation needed to complement the conciliation procedure and the reporting system. If a number of States accepted article XIII and made the declaration prescribed for the purpose, a body of experience would be built up which was bound to create confidence and win over new adherents. Again, it should not be forgotten that the eighteen-member committee, like any other institution, would gradually take on an existence of its own.

12. His delegation had two specific points to raise. In the first place it wondered whether national committees were really necessary, and whether it would not suffice to arrange for the petitions to come from the highest national authority empowered to deal with problems of racial discrimination, since it was also clear from paragraph 2 that the national committee concerned could be either a newly appointed or elected body or an existing body to whose regular duties would be added that of examining the petitions transmitted to it. That arrangement would spare States the difficulties involved in establishing a national committee, although it was true that problems of another sort might arise if existing bodies were used. A State might, for example, consider empowering its supreme court to transmit the petitions, but it would have to abandon that idea since the supreme court was not authorized to lodge a complaint against the national Government.

13. For those various reasons his delegation was inclined to support the new paragraph 2 suggested in the first of the Latin American amendments (A/C.3/L.1303), which did not mention the establishment of a national committee. His delegation supported the third Latin American amendment, for the deletion of paragraph 4 of the three-Power text. However, it would prefer to delete only the first sentence and to keep the idea of a national body—however constituted—to communicate with the international organ.

14. His delegation had some suggestions to make concerning the drafting of the three-Power text (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1). In the second sentence of paragraph 1, the words "not having" should be replaced by the words " which has not". In paragraph 5, the words "to enter" should be replaced by the word "of" and the words "a National Committee" by the words "the National Committee". In the second sentence of paragraph 6, the word "other" should be inserted after the word "bring".

15. Mr. GOONERATNE (Ceylon) said that his delegation shared the view so brilliantly expounded by the Canadian representative that a convention on the elimination of racial discrimination must be drafted in terms of the individual, since in the last analysis the individual was the victim of that type of discrimination.

16. The three-Power text of article XIII met that point. The difficulties of establishing and putting into operation the national committee mentioned in paragraph 2 had already been pointed out. His dele-

gation, for its part, wondered what exactly was meant by a national committee composed of individuals independent of the Government. If the idea was that those individuals were to be independent of the executive power, it should be remembered that in many cases the judiciary was independent of the executive power. Moreover, States which already had an organ to study petitions from individuals would not have to establish a national committee, but simply indicate the appropriate body. Such a body might not, however, be a national committee of the type mentioned in article XIII, paragraph 2. His delegation therefore felt that the mention of such a committee not only limited the scope of the paragraph but also restricted the manner in which the States Parties could apply article XIII. That impression was strengthened by the subsequent paragraphs, which seemed to indicate that the only way to comply with article XIII was by establishing a national committee.

17. For those reasons, his delegation endorsed the first amendment proposed by the Latin American delegations (A/C.3/L.1303), for in merely saying that a State Party might appoint, elect or indicate a competent organ or organs, the amendment left States free to take the necessary steps and also took into account the case of States in which the judiciary was independent of the executive power, of States which already had organs competent to study the petitions in question and of States which as yet had none. The paragraph, drafted in general terms, allowed the States Parties more latitude in choosing their own implementation measures. He asked for an explanation of the phrase "to determine the nature and extent of appropriate compensation". It seemed to prejudge the decisions of the organ proposed in the paragraph, and the word "compensation" was not sufficiently precise.

18. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) introduced, on behalf of the delegations of the Sudan, the United Arab Republic and his own, an amendment (A/C.3/L.1307), which if adopted would become article XIII (bis). As the article provided that individuals in dependent territories should enjoy the right of petition in the same way as those from independent territories, who had other means of redress, it should command the support of all delegations of good will.

19. Mr. COMBAL (France) remarked that after having adopted, almost unanimously, the substantive articles and most of the implementation articles, which were drawn up in precise terms and imposed definite obligations, the Third Committee, with article XIII, enteres on a hazardous terrain; the article established two interlocking pieces of machinery, both of which raised a good many problems of principle and practical difficulties.

20. The idea of national committees was very useful, and many States would certainly be guided by it in establishing or improving the domestic machinery for the protection of rights and liberties, and for the struggle against racial discrimination. Most countries already had the required institutions—whether councils, committees, or an Ombudsman. France had a Conseil d'Etat, an extremely effective judicial organ to which any individual could complain of an abuse of power.

21. It was not reasonable to hope that the national organs would be able to combat effectively racial discrimination as soon as the Convention had been adopted. Some time would be required for a national organ to become part of a country's life and structure.

22. The right of individuals or groups of individuals to present petitions, which the French delegation had defended in the Commission on Human Rights since 1947, was a familiar concept, but it had never been recognized in a universally applicable international text. It had not gained much ground even in regional bodies. The international community was perhaps not yet ready to achieve its aspirations and institute a new international order.

23. In any event, the Third Committee, which had to draw up a practical instrument to combat a present and intolerable evil—racial discrimination—must be careful not to compromise or delay the ratification of the Convention and the entry into operation of the implementation machinery. The sponsors had borne that in mind, as their text showed. Whereas elsewhere in the draft mandatory language was used, such as "States shall", or "States must", in the additional article the verb "may" was employed. Moreover, recourse to the national committee was subject to prior recognition by the State of that committee's competence by means of a formal declaration, which could be withdrawn. As pointed out by other delegations, those precautions were so striking and so numerous that the question arose whether the text really meant anything and whether it imposed any obligations whatsoever on States. Indeed, it merely offered States an opportunity to recognize the committee's competence. Such a clause, exceptional in a convention and in United Nations practice, impaired the harmony of the Convention. It was an optional provision following a number of mandatory provisions, and it weakened the entire draft. Countries which did not ratify that provision would not be committed in the same way and to the same degree as those which did. Consequently, some Governments might object to it, either at the adoption or at the ratification stage.

24. His delegation paid a tribute to the competence and realistic approach of the sponsors of the text in question, but asked them not to force the Committee to vote on a proposal on which it might be divided. If they wanted the text to be retained, they might place it in a supplementary protocol which would be transmitted to the General Assembly with the draft Convention. The new idea of the right of petition would thus enter into international law without impairing the mandatory nature of the Convention as a whole. Since the protocol would be separate from the Convention, its ratification could be made optional. But it would be regrettable for provisions on the important subject of racial discrimination to be accompanied by a clause which permitted them to be disregarded.

25. He though his proposal should reconcile the different points of view and satisfy both those who wanted to give new life to international law and those concerned with preparing an effective instrument. Placing the text in question in a separate protocol would prevent delaying tactics.

26. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) in reply to the representative of Ceylon who had asked for clarification of the phrase "to determine the nature and extent of appropriate compensation", proposed that the phrase should be replaced by the following text: "see to it, if necessary, that they obtain just and adequate reparation or satisfaction for any damage suffered as a result of such discrimination."

27. That new drafting was closer to the text of article VI as adopted by the Committee.

28. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) said that, while she had been impressed by the Australian representative's remarks, she shared the view of the Canadian representative. She thought that the amendments of the Latin American countries (A/C.3/L.1303) improved the three-Power draft (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1). She noted with satisfaction the explanations given by the Argentine representative on the question of reparations. With regard to the paragraph 5 proposed in the fourth Latin American amendment, she suggested that the words "publicly disclosed" should be replaced by the word "published".

29. Mr. CAPOTORTI (Italy) said that article XIII was very important and required very careful examination in view of the variety of views expressed. Some went so far as to advocate the very bold step of establishing an international human rights court which would give individuals access to an international judicial body. Others took a much more conservative position.

30. Article XIII was very cautiously drafted, for it used the word "communication" and not the word "petition". That was not a merely verbal precaution, for an examination of the treatment proposed for such "communications" showed that the measures envisaged were very moderate. The eighteen-member committee would merely bring the contents of those communications, which would be confidential, to the knowledge of the States Parties. It would not be required to examine the substance of the communications or to order any investigation. It would act mainly as an intermediary. Its duties would be to draw the attention of the Government of the country concerned to the subject of the communication and to ask Governments to decide what action should be taken on the application. That committee would merely take cognizance of existing problems, without passing any judgements or arranging any inquiries and would summarize the communications and the replies of States in its annual report. That committee was in no way comparable to the organ provided for in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, which examined the substance of complaints, heard the States involved and as a last resort could even refer a case to the European Court of Human Rights. Such an institution was conceivable at the regional level but not at the universal level, the main reason being that many States were not prepared to relinquish part of their sovereignty.

31. The principle of communications and petitions was nothing new; the United Nations applied that principle through the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and under the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. There were no grounds for the misgivings expressed regarding the right of petition, inasmuch as the relevant clause would be optional: i.e., States Signatories of the Convention would not be bound to accept it and, if they made the proposed declaration, could revoke it at any time. His delegation wished to point out that voting in favour of the optional clause in no way prejudged a Government's final position with regard to that clause. What the Third Committee had to decide was whether or not that clause should be included in the draft Convention; it would be for States themselves to decide whether or not they wished to make the proposed declaration. The first States to ratify the clause would make it possible for other States to take their decision in the light of the experience gained.

32. If necessary his delegation could accept the French representative's proposal that the article under consideration should be placed in a separate protocol, provided that study of the question were not postponed to another session; however, it would prefer to keep article XIII in the text of the Convention itself.

33. His delegation approved the wording of the article, which made it possible for the persons directly concerned to obtain a hearing and which, furthermore, strengthened the Convention by the addition of more effective means of implementation. Lastly, the establishment of the proposed machinery would be a useful experiment and might prove a factor in political and legal progress.

34. The establishment of national committees as contemplated in paragraph 2 of the three-Power text—a measure originally proposed by the Saudi Arabian representative—would enable States to take note of communications before they were sent to the eighteen-member committee, and thus provided an intermediate stage between the action of the individual and that of the committee. The proposed text embodied a fairly flexible compromise formula in providing for the appointment, election or indication of a national committee or other national body. It would thus be possible for each State to set up whatever type of committee—administrative or judicial—it saw fit, or to assign new duties to an existing body. The proposal by the Latin American countries, for the establishment of a body competent to receive and consider petitions, was acceptable to his delegation, for it did not expressly envisage that "a Committee" would be set up; it would be for States to decide whether they preferred to adopt the "National Committee" formula or to make use of a different body.

35. He saw no necessity to deposit the names of the members of the national committee with the Secretary-General of the United Nations or to notify that official of changes in the composition of that committee. If States were left free to indicate a body or a committee, no purpose would be served by then asking them to report its composition. He therefore proposed that the relevant passage of paragraph 3 should be deleted. He would gladly support the Latin American countries' proposal under which only the name of that body would be communicated to the Secretary-General.

36. Paragraph 4 of the three-Power text seemed redundant, since the possibility of redress was mentioned in article VI of the Convention, which the Third Committee had already approved, and since it was understood that States should guarantee, through the judicial channel, the rights of victims of racial discrimination.

37. Under paragraph 5 proposed by the Latin American countries, the competent bodies would keep a register of complaints or alleged violations; such a register might be useful, but it must not be forgotten that communications were to be treated as confidential.

38. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) said that he could agree neither to the withdrawal of the draft article XIII nor to its inclusion in a separate protocol. The prevailing attitude of mind was averse to instruments of that type because when States were called upon to adopt a convention accompanied by a protocol they got the impression that the two instruments were separate and distinct, and had difficulty, after ratifying the convention, in ratifying the protocol. Consequently, in view of the importance of the Convention under consideration, it would be undesirable to draw up a separate protocol.

39. Furthermore it was difficult to see why, if a State was willing to approve a binding clause in a separate protocol, it could not accept an optional clause embodied in the Convention itself. The sponsors had already stated the reasons why they had made that article optional even though it stated an extremely important right by which they set great store and even though, since article II, paragraph 1 (c), of the Convention had been adopted unanimously, they could have made it a binding provision.

40. Some delegations had observed that, although the article was optional, pressure might be brought to bear on States to make the proposed declaration; he referred them to the example of the International Court of Justice, whose Statute included an optional clause concerning compulsory jurisdiction; many States had managed to decline to subscribe to that clause without exposing themselves to any pressure on that account.

41. That being so, and considering that one of the functions of the United Nations was to encourage the development of international law, it must be admitted that the inclusion of such a provision as article XIII was not calculated to do much for that development. The more stringent clause included in the European Convention might perhaps have discouraged some States from acceding to that Convention, but even so it had made possible considerable progress where human rights were concerned.

42. It was almost unthinkable that States which posed as champions of an open and free society could object to what was proposed in article XIII. The form in which the right of petition and communication was stated in that article represented a minimum; the sponsors could accept nothing less, and the article should be made an integral part of the implementation clauses of the Convention.

43. Although the Committee was not at present considering the amendment submitted by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania on behalf of this country and of the Sudan and the United Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.1307), it was to be hoped that the territorial application clause of the Convention would be improved so as to guarantee the right of petition and of communication to all human beings.

44. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) considered that the principles stated in article XIII were vague and confused, and that each of them should be the subject of a separate article. It was hard to see how a State Party to the Convention could appoint a national committee that would be independent of the Government of that State. There was no indication as to how many members that committee would have, how it would function, how it would choose its chairman, or what procedure it would employ in referring complaints to the eighteen-member committee.

45. He did not think paragraph 1 fully reflected the thinking of the sponsors, for it appeared to allow any individual, whether or not a national of the State concerned, to lodge a complaint against that State a particular person had been harmed by the violation of one of the rights set forth in the Convention. It was obvious, however, that the right of petition should be accorded only to the nationals of the State concerned. Paragraph 1 should be amended accordingly. Paragraph 4 was unnecessary and should therefore be deleted, as proposed on the Latin-American amendments (A/C.3/L.1303). If not deleted, it should be reworded so as to grant the right of redress to individuals only if they were nationals of the State concerned and only after other available local remedies had been exhausted. His delegation was not satisfied with paragraph 6 either, because in its opinion no State could accept a petition lodged against it if it did not know the identity of the author. In such cases it could not be sure that the petition came from one of its nationals and not from an alien. It would have no means of knowing whether a particular person had been harmed by the violation of one of his rights. It would have no means of verifying that the petitioner had first applied to the national courts and to the national body provided for in article XIII For all those reasons his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the article if it was left as it stood; he hoped that the sponsors would be able to reword it so as to make it acceptable to all Member States.

46. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she was not entirely happy about the use of the verb "elect" in article XIII, paragraph 2. It was hard to see how, at the national level, a State could elect a body from among its nationals.

47. Mr. OSPINA (Colombia) drew attention to paragraph 1 of the three-Power text (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1), which stated that the eighteen-member committee could not receive any communications concerning a State Party unless that State had declared that it recognized the competence of that committee to receive and consider communications. He saw no valid reason for including that condition in the text since, by ratifying the Convention, States automatically recognize the competence of that committee.

48. Moreover the provision in question ran counter to the objectives aimed at, for it had the effect of denying the right to which the intention was to give the sanction of international law. There would certainly be an agreement but, unless States made the required declaration, the right of petition would remain limited to the national level.

49. In paragraph 2 it was wrong, first of all, to say that the State might appoint the national committee. The State represented an entity which was made up of the territory, the inhabitants and the Government, and which was subject to a certain legal system. It was the Government of the State which could appoint the body in question. The phrase "other national body" was also unclear, and open to dangerous interpretations. Moreover, his delegation could not agree to the inclusion in the Convention of provisions which conflicted with the constitutions of States and which, in Colombia's case, would take from the President of the Republic a power vested in him by the fundamental law of the State. The text specified that the members of the national committee should not be in the Government; his delegation, for its part, would like to see Government organs equipped with the jurisdictional powers which the national committee was to possess.

50. The amendments proposed by several Latin American countries, including Colombia (A/C.3/L.1303), should prove more effective in defending the rights which the Convention sought to protect. Those amendments were clear and concise, and took due account of consitutional institutions. In that connexion the representative of Saudi Arabia, after stating his opposition to the amendments, had hinted that the sponsors were acting on instructions from their Governments; that was perfectly true, and the fact called for no comment whatsoever.

51. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) noted that article XIII, paragraph 1, (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1) provided that a State Party to the Convention might at any time declare that it recognized the competence of the committee to receive and consider communications. He wondered what the sponsors had in mind when they said, in paragraph 3, that the declaration might be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General Did that mean that States had the right to take such action once the complaint had already been entered in the register mentioned in paragraph 5. Also, in connexion with paragraph 5, which stated certified copies of the register should be filed with the Secretary-General on the understanding that the contents should not be publicly disclosed, he wished to know what exactly was meant by "contents".

52. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) suggested that the discussion on the article under consideration should be suspended in order to give the sponsors of the new article XIII (A/C.3/L.1291/Add.1) and the sponsors of the amendments the opportunity to draft a joint text. The Committee could perhaps consider the New Zealand amendments (A/C.3/L.1304) to article XIV (formerly article XIII), which had been accepted by the sponsors.

53. Miss LUMA (Cameroon) said that her Government, realizing the importance of petitions from individuals or groups of individuals, thought it appropriate that the right of petition should be enunciated in an article which stressed the extreme importance of that right; indeed, the article, which was optional in character, should not cause any difficulty for States, since they would have full freedom of choice.

54. Her delegation endorsed paragraph 1 of the three-Power text but was not quite sure that it correctly understood the expression "at any time". It also endorsed paragraph 2 but would like the phrase "composed of individuals independent of the Government of the State or other national body" to be deleted; if, however, the Committee adopted the text of paragraph 2 proposed by the Latin American countries, which her delegation also supported, reference would have to be made in that text to the national committees as well as the other organs mentioned, in order to meet the wishes of the delegations which favoured the establishment of such committees. She endorsed the Ceylonese representative's observations concerning the term "redress". With reference to paragraph 3 of the three-Power text, her delegation supported the Venezuelan delegation's observations concerning the possibility of withdrawing "at any time" the declaration mentioned in paragraph 1; she wondered whether there was a link between paragraph 3 and paragraph 1, which also said that a State Party might "at any time declare...".

55. Without wishing to prejudge the questions which were to be considered at informal meetings, she thought that the amendments submitted by the delegations of Sudan, the United Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania (A/C.3/L.1307) did no more than recognize the right of petition of all individuals—in other words, it repeated what was already stated elsewhere.

56. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) said that his delegation welcomed the amendments of Sudan, the United Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania, which it considered to be very important; in its view, it was not superfluous to state that the committee established under article VIII would be able to accept petitions from the inhabitants of non-independent Territories because, although there was in the United Nations an organ responsible for accepting such petitions, that organ actually dealt mainly with political questions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77301—September 1966—2,175