





Distr. GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.1521 19 March 1979

ENGLISH Original: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Thirty-fifth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1521ST MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Wednesday, 14 March 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BEAULNE

(Canada)

## CONTENTS

Question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment, in particular:

- (a) Draft convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
- (b) Body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment (continued)

Question of a convention on the rights of the child

This record is subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the Official Records Editing Section, noom E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within one week of receiving the record in their working language.

Corrections to the records of the meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.79-11711

## The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

QUESTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL PERSONS BUBJECTED TO ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT, IN PARTICULAR:

- (a) DRAFT CONVENTION ON TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT
- (b) BODY OF PRINCIPLES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS UNDER ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT (agenda item 10) (continued) (E/CN.4/1296; E/CN.4/L.1458/Rev.1; E/CN.4/L.1460; E/CN.4/L.1466; E/CN.4/L.1469; E/CN.4/L.1472; E/CN.4/L.1470)

1. <u>Mr. DANELTUS</u> (Sweden), introducing draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, said that the progress achieved by the Working Group entrusted with the task of preparing a convention on torture augured well for the continuation of its work. However, if the Working Group met only for one hour each day during the Commission's session it would not be able to carry out its task. That was why the Economic and Social Council was requested to authorize a meeting of an open-ended working group for a period of three weeks prior to the thirty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights to complete the work in question. Although no specific date was mentioned for such a meeting, it would seem advisable to schedule it shortly before the next session of the Commission. He drew the Commission's attention to the fact that whereas, in the English version of the draft resolution, reference was made to "a meeting of an open-ended working group", the French translation referred to "un groupe de travail, ouvert à tous les members", a formulation which seemed to him to be unduly restrictive; the words "et aux observateurs intéressés" for example, should be added to it.

2. <u>Mr. FISCHER</u> (Federal Republic of Germany) introduced draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466 on behalf of his delegation and the delegations of Egypt, Panama and Portugal. He explained that the Commission should be able to reach an agreement that would enable the Sub-Commission as a whole to consider at its next session the reports of the Secretary-General which analysed the documents concerning the situation of detainees. Several delegations preferred to restrict the number of intersessional working groups; furthermore, following the discussions on agenda item 11, it seemed that the Sub-Commission might have an additional week at its disposal.

The body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of 3. detention or imprisonment seemed to cause no major problem and appeared to be acceptable Furthermore, the Working Group on agenda item 10 would be occupied for as a whole. three more sessions at least with the study of the draft convention on torture. Therefore, it was proposed that, following the session of the Economic and Social Council, the body of principles should be transmitted to Governments for comments. For its part, the General Assembly had set up a working group to study the code of conduct for law enforcement officials; the group's work should be finished during the thirty-fourth session of the Assembly, which would then be in a position to consider the body of principles. The sponsors of the draft had taken all those practical reasons into account in formulating operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution proposed for adoption by the Economic and Social Council. The paragraph did not prevent the Commission from considering the body of principles at its next session, if it had the time to do so, or from submitting additional comments to the General Assembly.

4. The objective of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted to the Economic and Social Council was to propose that the verbal report given by Mrs. Questiaux should be put into written form so that reference could be made to it when dealing with situations like that prevailing in Chile. The sponsors hoped that the draft, which had already been the subject of considerable consultation with a great number of delegations, would be adopted by consensus.

5. <u>Mr. DAVIS</u> (Australia), speaking on agenda item 10 (a), said that he was convinced of the need to establish human rights standards of the type envisaged in the draft convention on torture. He hoped that the fruitful work begun at the current session would be continued, and supported draft resolution E/CH.4/L.1469. However, it should be made quite clear in the French text that observers for non-governmental organizations could also take part in the open-ended working group; if necessary, that point should also be made explicit in the English text.

6. With regard to the work of the Vorking Group on the draft convention in question, his delegation had throughout the discussions in the Vorking Group opposed the deletion of the reference to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, as indicated in paragraphs 22 and 34 of the report (E/CN.4/L.1470).

7. <u>Miss EMARA</u> (Egypt) said that the preparation of a draft convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was of the utmost importance to her delegation. What caused her delegation concern in the articles already adopted was the scope of the convention, since, while article 2, for example, stipulated that the convention applied to any territory under the jurisdiction of a State - a category which included occupied territories - it did not explicitly mention such territories. She suggested that Sweden should consider the possibility of inserting in its draft resolution a provision specifying that the convention applied to any occupied territory.

8. <u>Mr. O'DONOVAN</u> (Observer for Ireland) said he wished to make it clear that he fully shared the Indian representative's view that no form of torture was excusable, whether carried out in a state of emergency or in order to implement other human rights. With regard to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, he supported the idea of convening a meeting of an intersessional working group to continue the work.

9. Referring to the convention itself, he said that his delegation's opinion, which appeared in paragraphs 22 and 34 of the report, should be reflected in the summary record. The concept of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment should be included, in the same way as the concept of torture, in the convention. His Government would continue to co-operate in the efforts made to broaden the scope of the obligations provided in other articles so that cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment would indeed be covered.

10. <u>Mr. ROSENSTAND HANSEN</u> (Observer for Denmark) said that his Government, which attached great importance to the early elaboration of a convention on torture, supported draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469. Copenhagen had followed the work of the Working Group closely and, if Sweden had no objection, the Danish delegation wished to be a co-sponsor of that text.

11. The CHAIRMAN, observing that the Swedish delegation had no objection to that request, took note of the fact that Denmark had become a co-sponsor of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469.

12. <u>Mr. JEANRENAUD</u> (Observer for Switzerland) said that his country was particularly concerned about the problem of missing persons. Indeed, the question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment was closely linked with such essential rights as the right to life, to freedom and to security of the person. The international community could not remain indifferent to enforced or involuntary disappearances of persons. The Swiss delegation was therefore particularly satisfied with resolution 33/173, in which the General Assembly, stressing the responsibility of the Commission in that regard, had requested it to consider the question of disappeared persons with a view to making appropriate recommendations. It has therefore taken note with the greatest interest of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1458 and hoped that all the members of the Commission would support it. With regard to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, his delegation thought it very important having regard to the progress made by the Working Group in its task, that it should be able to meet before the next session.

13. <u>Mr. ROKOSZEWSKI</u> (Poland), referring to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, said that, in view of the slow pace of the work on agenda item 11, under which the programme and methods of work of the Commission were being examined, and despite the interest taken by his delegation in the preparation of international instruments - as demonstrated by the fact that it had taken the initiative in the matter of the draft convention on the rights of the child - it was preferable not to decide to hold a meeting of an intersessional working group. A similar solution had already been proposed in the course of informal discussions on the possible establishment of a working group to prepare a draft convention on the rights of the child and certain delegations, including that of Sweden, had not thought it desirable. Consequently, if the present proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would vote against it.

14. Mr. CHERNICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was not in favour of the idea of setting up a working group to meet for three weeks prior to the next session to complete the work on the preparation of the draft convention, since it would simply be an extension of the work of the present session. The Director of the Division of Human Rights had requested the Commission to avoid additional expenditure, and the establishment of a working group would involve such expenditure. However, his delegation's objections to the establishment of a working group were not merely financial. It considered that there were other questions just as important as a draft convention on torture; one example was the protection of the rights of the child, and although it could not be denied that an instrument was needed to guarantee such protection, no working group had been set up to prepare it. If priority was given to torture at the expense of other questions, his delegation, while acknowledging the importance of the problem, would vote against the creation of a working group to meet before the next session. The working group on torture had made progress in its work; would it not be possible for it to take advantage of the same opportunities at the next session, when it could perhaps be given a little more time?

15. He asked for a separate vote to be taken on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1459, because his delegation would be voting against it. With regard to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466, he found it satisfactory on the whole except for a small fault of logic. In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution which the Commission proposed that the Economic and Social Council should adopt, it was stated that the Commission requested the Secretary-General to transmit to all Governments the revised body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention, to solicit their comments and to report directly to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session To that the General Assembly could consider the adoption of those principles. nowever, as a functional commission of the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Fights was compelled to act through the Council. Moreover, the Sub-Commission had thought that the Commission would have time to examine and comment on those principles, but that had not proved possible. It did not seem logical, therefore, that the Commission should address itself directly to the General Assembly, and the proposal should be rephrased slightly by replacing the words "General Assembly" by "Commission on Human Rights" and the words "thirty-fifth session" by "thirty-sixth session".

16. <u>Mr. McKINNON</u> (Canada), referring to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, said that, in common with many other delegations, his delegation believed it important to continue the work on the preparation of a draft convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment in order to submit it to the Commission, if possible at its thirty-sixth session.

17. His delegation would be prepared to support the draft resolution, but would like to know whether the Swedish delegation, as the sponsor, considered the three-week period envisaged for the meeting of the working group as a minimum. In his own opinion, the working group could meet for one week, as it had done during the present session, immediately before the opening of the thirty-sixth session of the Commission.

18. <u>Mrs. SIBAL</u> (India), referring to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, agreed with the representative of Canada that a one-weak meeting would be sufficient, especially as the financial implications of a three-week meeting were liable to be too high. If really necessary, the meeting of the working group could be extended slightly. She thought that the draft convention on the rights of the child too, should be examined immediately before the next session of the Commission.

19. <u>Mr. KAMMINGA</u> (Amnesty International) said that the question under consideration was of constant concern to his organization.

20. To begin with, there was the problem of disappeared persons. The General Assembly, taking an initiative welcomed by Amnesty International, had requested the Commission to consider the question with a view to making appropriate recommendations. For an increasing number of Governments, the device of abducting persons and holding them incommunicado was a convenient means of ridding themselves of political opponents, since all legal formalities could thus be avoided, as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had pointed out in its 1976 annual report.

21. In some countries, the authorities, no doubt with an eye to international public opinion, found it more convenient to allow persons to "disappear" for a limited period only. In general, persons were arrested at their homes or on the street by armed individuals who claimed to be security agents, and were taken to secret spots where they were interrogated and tortured and finally released after being warned not to reveal anything on pain of reprisals. However, not all the victims were fortunate enough to be released. In one Latin American country, the corpses of such persons were returned to their families in closed coffins and in one Central American country, the victims were simply shot at close range and as a result were so mutilated as to make their identification impossible.

22. The large number of disappearances proved that it was by no means an isolated phenomenon due to over-zealous security forces acting in contravention of the strict orders of the central Government. In Argentina alone, there were estimated to be 15,000 missing persons and Amnesty International was in a position to document the cases of 3,500 of them.

23. Torture was practised systematically in many countries of the world, <u>inter alia</u> during the interrogation of political suspects and opponents. In 1978, specific cases of torture involving at least 42 countries had been brought to the attention of Amnesty International. Amnesty International had recently submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the chilling testimony of an ex-torturer from a Latin American country, which it hoped would be considered by the Commission in due course under the item on violations of human rights.

24. Amnesty International was confident that the Commission, to which thousands of forgotten prisoners looked as a source of hope, would not fail to act in order to put an end to those atrocities. It hoped that the Commission would be able to adopt a draft convention on torture by the end of its next session, and that it would adopt the draft body of principles for the protection of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment with a view to transmitting it to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. It would like the Commission to accede to the repeated request of the Sub-Commission that a working group should be set up to consider information received on the situation of human rights in the case of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment, and sincerely hoped that the Commission would find a way of dealing more effectively with violations of human rights in countries where torture and disappearances had become systematic practices.

25. Amnesty International commended the Commission for its work on Chile, South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, and firmly believed that there were other countries where the situation of human rights should be examined in the same way, namely, Argentina, Uruguay, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Uganda, Ethiopia and Equatorial Guinea, on which Amnesty International was prepared to submit to the Commission all the information at its disposal.

26. <u>Mr. FISCHER</u> (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation was in favour of continuing the work on the preparation of a convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrating treatment or punishment (E/CN.4/L.1469). It agreed with the Canadian and Indian delegations that the working group on a draft convention might meet for only one week immediately prior to the opening of the Commission's next session.

27. He hoped that the work concerning the draft convention on the rights of the child would also be continued and would be brought to a successful conclusion. A working group could meet for one week for that purpose.

28. Replying to the Soviet representative's comments on draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466, which had arisen because of a mistake in the Russian text, he explained that the procedure envisaged in the text was the normal one. However, in order to satisfy the Soviet delegation and to ensure that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus, the co-sponsors would be prepared to amend the opening of operative paragraph 2 as follows: "Proposes to the Economic and Social Council to consider the following draft resolution:". It would then be for the Economic and Social Council to draw whatever conclusions it deemed appropriate.

29. <u>Mr. CHERNICHENKO</u> (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), thanked the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany for its co-operative spirit. The Soviet delegation still had doubts with regard to the wording of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466. However, it would not oppose its adoption provided it was not put to the vote, although it could not agree to its adoption by consensus.

30. <u>Mr. DANELIUS</u> (Sweden) said his delegation was grateful to the many delegations that had expressed support for the idea of continuing the work on the preparation of a draft convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and convening a working group on the subject before the thirty-sixth session of the Commission. He had noted the Egyptian delegation's suggestion that it should be specified that the convention would also apply to occupied territories, and would bear it in mind.

51. His delegation understood the reasons underlying the comments made by the delegations of Canada, India and the Federal Republic of Germany, and therefore proposed to replace the words "three weeks" by the words "one week" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended to the Economic and Social Council for adoption.

32. <u>Mr. ARTUCIO</u> (International Commission of Jurists) said that the enforced or involuntary abduction of persons was a violation of the inherent rights of human beings and was at the same time inimical to family life.

33. Disappearances had been reported in various parts of the world, for instance, in certain Asian and African countries. But it was in Latin America or at any rate in at least six countries of the region, that such disappearances were most serious, in view of their immense scale and the fact that they had become a systematic practice. It was a phenomenon which had very definite characteristics. In all cases, the persons who disappeared were regarded as political or trade unionist opponents of

the ruling régime - which they often were potentially, although not always in actual fact. The régimes were in every case authoritarian with a contempt for the law were usually led or controlled by members of the armed forces and, by the expedient of establishing states of emergency, were able to extend their powers. In a large number of cases it had been proved that the disappearances were directly attributable to the activities of the State security services, which used all the official facilities at their disposal, and were not, as was claimed, the doing of paramilitary or parapolice groups.

34. That phenomenon, which was admittedly not a new one, constituted in its contemporary form a veritable régime of terror managed by official bodies, which naturally denied any responsibility but which found in it a means of neutralizing the opposition and of blocking any change while maintaining a semblance of law and order and democracy.

35. Having been requested by the General Assembly to consider the question of disappeared persons, the Commission could ask the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to nominate one or more of its members to meet and analyse all the information available on the subject; to hear the testimony of victims who had survived and who could testify to the presence of certain "missing" persons in the official detention centres: to enter into contact with the Governments concerned; and, lastly, to draw the necessary conclusions and submit them to the Commission. The Commission would thus be allaying the distress and uncertainty of the families and would fulfil the expectations of the general public which demanded that an end be put to that barbarous practice which frustrated all the juridical mechanisms intended to protect human rights.

36. <u>Mr. SOYER</u> (France) said that his delegation, aware that acts of torture were being committed throughout the world and that it was essential to stigmatize such acts whatever justification might be invoked for them, was in favour of adopting a draft convention on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. It endorsed draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469 as a whole, and was glad to see that the Swedish representative had reduced the length of the working group meeting from three weeks to one week, which should be adequate.

37. <u>Mr. SANON</u> (Deputy Director, Division of Human Rights) announced that the financial implications of convening a working group in 1980 for a period of one week, as provided for in draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, would be the following conference services, \$19,200; and documentation (before, during and after the meeting), \$13,400; the total sum would be \$52,600.

38. The financial implications of the continuation of Mrs. Questiaux's study on the implications for human rights of states of siege and emergency, as provided for in draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466, would be \$17,000 in all in 1979. That amount represented the cost of one outside expert who would be engaged by the Division of Human Rights for a period of four months.

39. <u>Mr. McKINNON</u> (Canada) introducing draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1458/Rev.1, said that it complied with the wish expressed in General Assembly resolution 33/173. He thought that, with some minor drafting changes, it could be adopted without a vote.

40. He therefore proposed that paragraphs 2 and 3 should be amended in the following manner: in paragraph 2, the words "in accordance with the procedures laid down by the Economic and Social Council for dealing with communications," should be inserted after "transmit"; in paragraph 3, the words "transmit this information" should be replaced by "transmit the information submitted in accordance with the procedures laid down by the Economic and Social Council for dealing with communications."

41. <u>Mr. ERMACORA</u> (Austria) pointed out that the draft resolution did not take account of experience deriving from past or planned work concerning missing persons or of possible help from non-governmental organizations, which had acquired a certain experience in the matter and had accumulated a great deal of information. Since General Assembly resolution 33/173 requested the Commission to consider the question of disappeared persons with a view to making appropriate recommendations, he hoped that the member of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities who would be appointed under paragraph 4 to prepare an analysis of the information obtained would also be instructed to make recommendations to the Commission.

42. <u>Mr. CHERNICHENKO</u> (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had some reservations concerning the analysis requested in paragraph 4 of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1453/Rev.1, especially since the amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3 just read out by the representative of Canada were not clear. Were the procedures to which he had referred those set forth in Economic and Social Council resolutions 728 F (XXVIII) and 1503 (XLVIII)? If so, those resolutions should be mentioned. Then, however, the analysis requested in paragraph 4 and the procedures referred to in the two preceding paragraphs were incompatible; that analysis might in fact appear to be an attempt to evade the confidential procedure laid down in Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII). He therefore proposed that the Commission should not take a decision on that draft resolution until the forthcoming night meeting.

43. Mr. MEZVINSKY (United States of America) referring to draft

resolution E/CN.4/1458/Rev.1 and the amendments just proposed, said that the Commission's activities with respect to missing persons in Chile had had considerable financial implications; the representative of Austria had emphasized that point. It might perhaps be possible to request the two experts appointed for Chile to concern themselves with all missing persons in general. In Chile the problem was of course serious, and there were hundreds of missing persons. In other countries, however, there were thousands of such persons. An amendment should be submitted along the lines he had indicated; the Latin American delegations might perhaps make a specific suggestion on that point.

44. If the confidential procedure set forth in Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII) was applied in the case of missing persons, objections similar to those raised at the current session concerning countries like Ethiopia might be encountered. It would no longer be possible to mention the countries in which it was hoped to investigate the situation of missing persons, for example Argentina; it had been seen at the current session that distinctions between communications received and the general situation in the country had given rise to objections. He hoped that that was not the purpose of the Canadian amendment concerning the confidential procedures.

45. <u>Mr. CHERNICHENKO</u> (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the United States representative had mentioned a State whose situation was being considered in accordance with the procedure laid down in Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII); no such mention should be made in a public debate.

46. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the United States to continue his remarks but to respect established rules.

47. <u>Mr. MEZVINSKY</u> (United States of America) said that the fears he had just expressed were confirmed by the ridiculous situation in which even the name of Ethiopia could not be mentioned. If questions of missing persons were treated confidentially, then there would be a succession of points of order and it would not be possible to refer to the countries concerned. The same rule of silence must not be applied with regard to those persons as to the situation in Democratic Kampuchea.

48. <u>Mr. M'BAYE</u> (Senegal) noted that the problem of missing persons was becoming increasingly serious in Africa, and especially in southern Africa, and emphasized the importance of draft resolution E/CN.4/1458/Rev.1, which was the result of a compromise between three earlier texts and covered the whole question of missing persons. However, he too failed to understand the vague reference to Economic and Social Council procedures; in contacts he had had concerning the draft resolution, he had personnally expressed the hope that it would be worded clearly.

49. He saw the same incompatibility as did the USSR representative between the analysis requested in paragraph 4 and the procedures set forth in the relevant Economic and Social Council resolutions. Although he did not ask for confidentiality to be imposed immediately with regard to missing persons, he proposed that Council resolutions 728 F (XXVIII), 1235 (XLII) and 1503 (XLVIII) should be referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3, and that paragraph 4 should be deleted.

50. <u>Mr. CALERO-RC RIGUES</u> (Brazil) said that the second preambular paragraph, which he read out, was an incomplete reflection of the concerne expressed in General Assembly resolution 33/173; the Assembly had also said that it was deeply concerned by reports from various parts of the world relating to unlawful actions, excesses and widespread violence.

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representatives of Australia and Canada should contact the other representatives who had commented on draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1458/Rev.1; since there were apparently no substantive objections to that draft, it would doubtless be possible in that way to arrive at an acceptable text which could be adopted at the night meeting.

52. He invited the Commission to take a decision on draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466. He noted that the Federal Republic of Germany had proposed that the word "consider" should be substituted for "adopt" in the introductory part of paragraph 2.

## 53. Draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1466, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

54. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469, which had been submitted by Sweden under agenda item 10 (a) and concerned the Working Group responsible for drafting a convention on forture. He reminded the Commission that separate votes had been requested on operative paragraph 1 and also on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution which the Commission, under operative paragraph 3, recommended for adoption by the Economic and Social Council.

55. <u>Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469 was adopted by 23 votes</u> to 3, with 6 abstentions.

56. <u>Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended in operative paragraph 3 of</u> draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469 for adoption by the Economic and Social Council was adopted by 23 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

57. Draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469 as a whole was adopted by 29 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN announced that he would give the floor to two observers who had asked to speak on draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1469.

59. <u>Mr. MARTINEZ</u> (Observer for Argentina), said that, in connexion with the draft resolution which had just been adopted, he wished to refer to accusations made against his country in the latest report of Amnesty International; he wished to state that the figures and dates given by that organization were false and had no basis in fact. He considered that Amnesty International's attacks against his Government violated provisions of Economic and Social Council resolutions which he listed. First of all, in paragraph 36 of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), concerning arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations, consultative status could be suspended or withdrawn "if the organization clearly abuses its consultative status by systematically engaging in unsubstantiated or politically motivated acts against States Nembers of the United Nations contrary to and incompatible with the principles of the Charter". In that connexion, he also drew attention to paragraph 8 of Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII) and paragraph 3 (b) of resolution 1919 (LVIII), both of which he read out.

60. <u>Mrs. DAES</u> (Observer for Greece) congratulated Sweden on its initiative in proposing a draft convention on torture and supplying a preliminary text which had been the point of departure for the work done in that connexion (E/CN.4/1285). She also thanked Mrs. Sibal of India, Chairman-Rapporteur of the Working Group on that draft convention, for its report (E/CN.4/L.1470). As an observer, the Greek delegation had followed closely the activities of the Working Group, which it considered very important for the United Nations in general. She hoped that the wording of article 2 of the draft convention would take into consideration the request made by the Egyptian delegation concerning the matter of occupied territories; that point should be mentioned clearly in the final text of the article. She was completely in favour of the draft resolution (E/CN.4/L.1469) which had just been adopted.

QUESTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD (agenda item 13) (E/CN.4/1324 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4; E/CN.4/L.1465/Rev.1)

61. Mr. LOPATKA (Poland), Chairman-Rapporteur of the Morking Group set up at the Commission's thirty-fifth session to draw up the convention on the rights of the child, introduced draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1465/Rev.1 on that matter. First of all, he reminded the Commission that in 1979 the international community was observing the International Year of the Child, and that a programme of national and international measures had been adopted to improve the lot of children all over the world. That was why, at the preceding session, the Polish Government had proposed the consideration of a new item entitled "Question of a convention on the rights of the child". In its resolution 20 (XXXIV), of which he quoted operative paragraph 2, the Commission had planned to conclude the draft convention at its thirty-fifth session for transmission to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council; a certain degree of urgency had also been stressed by the Economic and Social Council and by the General Assembly itself in resolution 33/166. However, the preparation of a convention was a lengthy process: the time-table had had to be extended and in draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1465/Rev.1 it was proposed that the Commission should decide "to continue at its thirty-sixth session, as a matter of priority, its work on a draft convention on the rights of the child with a view to completing, if possible, the elaboration of the said convention at that session for transmission to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council". To that end, the Working Group established at the thirty-fifth session must be re-established at the thirty-sixth, and more time allotted to it. In the light of General Assembly resolution 33/166, the Economic and Social Council was requested, in paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1465/Rev.1, "to bring to the notice of the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session the present resolution and the relevant chapter of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-fifth session".

62. With regard to the idea of organizing a seminar put forward in part B of that draft resolution, he considered that that would be an excellent contribution to the observance of the International Year of the Child and that the results of the work of the specialists from different countries who would participate in such a seminar would be of great value in the drafting of a convention. That idea had been put forward by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and France, among others. He hoped that all Governments would be united in the desire to help the children of the world, especially those of developing countries, and that draft resolution E/CN.4/L.1465/Rev.1 would be adopted by consensus.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.