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OTHER MATTERS
The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 53. TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/33/L.52, L.70 and L.50)

1. The Chair invited the Committee to consider draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.52 and L.70. The financial implications of the latter draft resolution were contained in document A/C.3/33/L.30.

2. H.R. PAPADIESAS (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the Swedish revisions of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52, which had already been announced at an earlier meeting. He also announced that Belgium, Greece, Portugal, Norway and the United States were to be added to the list of sponsors.

3. MR. HANZAZI (Morocco) proposed the addition, at the end of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52, of the following words, which would bring the text into line with that of the corresponding resolution adopted at the previous session:

   "And to submit all information received to the Commission on Human Rights and to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its thirty-third session."

4. MR. NORDHELFELT (Sweden), MRS. SIRAL (India) and H.R. HUYENDAAM (Netherlands) said that the Moroccan amendment was acceptable to them as sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52.

5. MR. CASTRO DE BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation wished to co-sponsor draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.52 and A/C.3/33/L.70.

6. Miss ZOUPADICHVILI (France) said that her delegation would join in a consensus on draft resolutions A/C.3/33/L.52, as amended, and A/C.3/33/L.70, to show the importance which France attached to the question of torture.

7. By adopting resolution 3452 (XX), embodying the Declaration on the question of torture, the General Assembly had expressly recognized that torture could not be justified in any circumstances. However, an international convention was now desirable. States should, as a matter of urgency, enter into a commitment not to resort to torture and to punish all those who resorted to it. The provisions of such an instrument should, of course, leave no loophole. Since the Declaration did not contain a satisfactory definition of torture, the convention should, as a matter of priority, incorporate such a definition, especially as the association of the concept of torture with that of degrading treatment gave rise to the possibility of confusing the two. The convention should also mention the matter of torture by private persons.

8. While her delegation was fully in favour of a convention, it had legal reservations with regard to the unilateral declarations called for in paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52. However, it welcomed the Swedish revision of that paragraph.
9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52 as orally revised and amended, by consensus.

10. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by consensus.

11. Mr. PAPADIMITRIOU (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.70, which had been accepted by the sponsors. He also announced that Costa Rica, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom had become sponsors.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.70, as orally revised, by consensus.

13. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.70, as orally revised, was adopted by consensus.

14. Mr. BIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had agreed to the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52, as revised and amended, on the understanding that paragraph 3 also applied to parties not parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 7 of which strictly prohibited torture. The Soviet Union’s instrument of ratification of that Covenant contained a statement in which the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR had declared that all provisions of the Covenant would be strictly complied with. The Soviet Union complied strictly with its international obligations, including those laid down in article 7 of the aforementioned Covenant.

15. Mr. RANDONAIRO (Madagascar) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.52, as revised and amended, but maintained the reservations which it had expressed at the previous session with regard to the unilateral declarations referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

16. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 34.

AGENDA ITEM 34: INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(a) REPORT OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE (continued)

(b) 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: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

17. Mr. PEDERSSEN (Denmark), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.72 on behalf of the sponsors, announced that the amendments proposed to paragraph 12 had been accepted by the sponsors. The last part of the paragraph, after the words "Optional Protocol", would thus read:

/...
"... and being informed of the shortage of staff and resources of the Human Rights Division, to make appropriate suggestions in the budget for the next biennium with regard to adequate staff and resources needed for servicing the above-mentioned instruments, taking into account resolutions 3534 (XXIX) and 31/93".

16. The Committee would recall that those resolutions concerned the programme budget and the medium-term plan. He suggested that the draft resolution, as orally revised, should be adopted by consensus.

19. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.72, as orally revised, was adopted by consensus.

20. **Mr. EDIS** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation appreciated the excellent work of the Human Rights Committee, and hoped that in future it would receive more publicity than hitherto.

21. The **CHAIRMAN** announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 84.


22. The **CHAIRMAN** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.79, proposed by the Chairman. Following consultations between the Governments of Denmark and Costa Rica concerning their offers to act as host to the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women, 1980, it had been decided that the offer of the Government of Denmark would be accepted. She suggested that the Committee adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

23. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.79 was adopted by consensus.

24. **Mr. PEDERSEN** (Denmark) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the Chairman, whose interest in the question of the venue of the 1980 World Conference and whose consultations in conjunction with the Bureau had made possible a consensus on the draft resolution. He also thanked Member States for having accepted his Government's offer. Denmark would do its utmost to make the Conference a success. He also expressed his Government's thanks to the Government of Costa Rica for its co-operation in the matter.

25. **Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH** (Costa Rica) congratulated the Danish delegation, whose country had been chosen as the venue for the 1980 Conference. Her delegation was very satisfied with the way in which the matter had been settled, and felt sure that the Government of Denmark would be a magnificent host.

26. The **CHAIRMAN** thanked the delegations of Denmark and Costa Rica for their co-operation, and announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 88.

/...

27. Ms. BEAGLE (New Zealand), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81 on behalf of the sponsors, announced that the following countries had also become sponsors: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Guyana, India, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and Sweden. The draft resolution was the result of intensive consultations, and she wished to pay tribute to the secretariat of the Working Group on the Drafting of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, as a result of whose efforts the Working Group had finally been able to complete the task entrusted to it at the current session.

28. As a result of the deliberations, every member of the Working Group had gained a special understanding of the problems involved, and had agreed on the need for a sensible, balanced document on the elimination of discrimination against women. It was hoped that the work on the Convention would be completed at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. As the draft resolution was sponsored by delegations from all the regional groups, she hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

29. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in order to complete its work, the working group of the Third Committee on the Drafting of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women at the next session would have to hold 15 meetings. There would have to be interpretation coverage in Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish and approximately 50 pages of pre-session, 50 pages of in-session and 40 pages of post-session documentation in all the official languages of the United Nations, at a total cost of $34,000.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she heard no objections, she would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81 by consensus.

31. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.81 was adopted by consensus.

32. Mr. O’DONOVAN (Ireland) commended the excellent work done by the secretariat of the Working Group, which had made it possible to reach a consensus on the draft resolution.

33. Ms. MARTINEZ (Jamaica), speaking as Chairman of the Working Group, paid a tribute to the spirit of co-operation shown by the members of the Working Group, which had made it possible to reach a consensus.

34. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 75.

The meeting was suspended at 4.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM 12. REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

35. The CHAIRMAN announced that Norway wished to co-sponsor draft resolution
A/C.3/33/L.42/Rev.1, and that Pakistan wished to co-sponsor draft resolution
A/C.3/33/L.75.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.57/Rev.1

36. Mr. NYAMEREYI (Ghana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the
sponsors, said that following consultations it had been decided to amend operative
paragraph 3 to read as follows: "Urges Member States to consider favourably the
granting to such persons of all the rights and benefits accorded to refugees under
existing legal instruments;"

37. Without the South African military and police forces, apartheid would clearly
be overthrown at once, and his delegation therefore welcomed the increasing trend
among young people in South Africa to refuse to serve in those military or police
forces, or to desert from those forces, and seek asylum abroad. The World
Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the Special Committee
against Apartheid had both recognized the impact which such action could have on
the situation in South Africa by debilitating the apartheid régime, and had urged
that refugee status, with all its attendant guarantees, should be granted to all
conscientious objectors and deserters from South Africa.

38. Some of the countries to which such refugees had gone, and also the United
Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had, however, found the status of such
refugees ambiguous and, as a result, had had difficulty in helping them. The draft
resolution now submitted by the sponsors should help to resolve those ambiguities
without, however, interfering with the right of any country to decide whether or
not to accept such refugees. The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution
established the right of all persons to refuse service in the military and police
forces used to enforce apartheid, and called upon Member States and the United
Nations as a whole to assist all persons who refused such service.

39. The draft resolution should serve to promote peace and justice in South Africa
by helping those persons who were prepared to sacrifice their personal interests in
the fight against apartheid, by eliminating the ambiguities in the status of such
persons which currently prevented the United Nations and individual countries from
assisting them, and by encouraging other South Africans to take similar action in
the knowledge that they would enjoy international support and assistance. He
therefore urged that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.59

40. Mrs. NYUNDUKIKA (Zambia), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.59 on behalf
of the sponsors, announced that Angola, Ireland, Mozambique, Niger, Norway and
Suriname had also become sponsors. The draft resolution was self-explanatory and
/...
responded to the need to assist student refugees from South Africa. Given the increasingly repressive measures that were being imposed in South Africa against black students, and the deteriorating situation in that country, the influx of students and refugees in general from South Africa would become even greater in future and impose an even heavier burden on the educational and other facilities of neighbouring countries. International assistance would be required to enable those countries to cope with that situation, and the Secretary-General would have to arrange for periodic reviews of the refugee situation in those countries by sending missions of inquiry. Provision was made for that eventuality in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, in order to ensure that the necessary financial arrangements were made. The words "through the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session, 1979", should be added after the word "session" in that paragraph for the sake of consistency with earlier resolutions on the same subject. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that, as in the case of earlier resolutions on the issue, the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.71

41. **H. GLIBER (Canada)**, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, observed that the United Nations Yearbook on Human Rights played a vital role in circulating information about international, regional and national human rights activities. However, since the Yearbook had first been established, many new human rights bodies had been created whose activities had still to be given adequate coverage. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Human Rights Committee in particular were engaged in significant long-term work in the area of human rights, which deserved full publicity. At its third and fourth sessions the Human Rights Committee had gone so far as to consider the possibility of producing its own yearbook. Under draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.71 therefore, the United Nations Yearbook on Human Rights would be reviewed and updated in accordance with the usual United Nations reporting procedures. The sponsors also hoped that the Commission on Human Rights would draft a recommendation on that question and submit proposals to the Economic and Social Council at its sessions in 1979. As many delegations had been consulted on the drafting of the resolution, she hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.73

42. **Mr. HORDENFELDT (Sweden)** said that it was well known in the Committee that his country closely followed developments concerning human rights in Chile. Each year, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile had confirmed that human rights violations had taken place and continued to take place in Chile, thereby demonstrating that the international community's indignation had been amply justified

43. The creation of the Ad Hoc Working Group had not only been justified, but had also set a valuable precedent in the United Nations for dealing with cases of gross and flagrant violations of human rights. The fact that the Group had been able to /...
visit Chile, and to report that there had been an improvement in the human rights situation in that country, showed that international concern could be a factor for positive change.

44. The situation in Chile still gave cause for concern, however. At least 600 people had been reliably reported missing after their arrest or detention, and the Chilean Government must take urgent steps to investigate and clarify the fate of those people. The right to life, liberty and security of a person would, in fact, remain unprotected in Chile as long as the Judiciary had no powers to investigate the activities of the security agencies which had succeeded the now dissolved DINA. Numerous arrests were still made on political grounds, and torture continued to be used as part of the interrogation process. While the recent amnesty granted in respect of many prisoners was to be welcomed, it must be pointed out that that amnesty had also had the negative effect of eliminating the criminal responsibility of those who were alleged to have violated human rights by engaging in torture or committing acts resulting in the death or disappearance of detainees. Nor did the amnesty remedy the situation of Chilean exiles or prevent further expulsions from Chile.

45. The Government of Chile should therefore be called upon to refrain from arresting or detaining persons on political grounds, from using torture or inhumane treatment as part of the interrogation process and from expelling its citizens. It should also be called upon to try those people who were alleged to have practised or to have allowed the practice of torture, and to take punitive action against anyone found guilty of such crimes.

46. The state of emergency, which was totally unjustified by the present situation in Chile, severely limited the full enjoyment of individual human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile. The Government of Chile should therefore be called upon to lift the state of emergency and allow the country to return to constitutional normality, with separation of political and judicial powers.

47. Although there was slightly more freedom of the press than there had been in the past, any opposition to Government policy was repressed in Chile. The Government of Chile should therefore be called upon to restore democratic rights, including freedom of speech and association and the right of the people to express its will in free and authentic elections. Trade union rights also continued to be seriously curtailed in Chile, and the latest labour legislation had deprived Chilean workers of previously acquired rights. Those rights had been even further restricted recently, as seven trade unions had been banned, and trade union leaders were reported to have been arrested. The Chilean Government should therefore be called upon fully to restore established trade union rights, including the right to organize, the right freely to elect trade union leaders, the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike.

48. United Nations efforts should therefore continue in the form recommended by the Working Group, until such time as national means of protecting human rights in Chile were operating adequately in accordance with the International Covenants on Human Rights.
49. All the elements he had just mentioned had been derived from the latest report of the Ad Hoc Working Group and had been the subject of intensive discussions over the past two weeks. However, it had finally become clear from those discussions that agreement could not be reached on a draft resolution that all interested delegations could sponsor. In order to break the deadlock, his delegation had decided to table its own draft resolution which kept as close as possible to the findings, recommendations and language of the Working Group’s report and, as far as possible, took account of the views of the various delegations which had participated in discussions. It did not wholly satisfy any delegation, but represented a sincere attempt at a compromise. He therefore appealed to all those delegations which shared his country’s concern over the situation in Chile to refrain from proposing amendments to the draft, so that maximum unity could be maintained for continued international pressure on the Chilean authorities to restore human rights and fundamental freedoms to the Chilean people.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.75

50. Mrs. SEMITCHI (Algeria) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.75 and stated that Lesotho, Trinidad and Tobago and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

51. Being concerned over the fact that the Commission on Human Rights had not yet completed the task entrusted to it in General Assembly resolution 32/120, the sponsors wished to emphasize the continuing precarious situation of migrant workers in most countries, despite laudable efforts by a few Governments to consider them not as extraneous elements called in to help meet their development needs but as workers with social rights. Migrant workers, who contributed to the economic development of the host countries, deserved respect for their human rights and dignity, which unfortunately was not uniformly accorded in the environments in which they worked. There, information in the mass media could be of help.

52. The draft resolution came within the framework of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and was based on the Migrant Workers Convention and the Recommendation concerning Migrant Workers adopted by the ILO General Conference in 1975, which covered all problems facing them and their families. The International Bill of Human Rights referred to the family as the fundamental group unit of society, and hence it was the duty of the host countries to promote the reunion of migrant workers with their families and, in co-operation with UNESCO, to ensure equal educational opportunities for their children.

53. The sponsors appreciated the work done by the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which in its Declaration and Programme of Action, referred specifically to the migrant worker problem.

54. Certain operative paragraphs of the draft had been taken from General Assembly resolution 32/120, and in paragraph 5 the Assembly would express the hope that the Commission on Human Rights would submit to the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council in 1979 the study recommended in that resolution.
55. The sponsors envisaged the possibility of elaborating an international convention on the rights of migrant workers covering a wider area than had previously been covered. Accordingly the Secretary-General would be requested, in operative paragraph 7, to explore that possibility. Information on the results of the Secretary-General's consultations with Member States would be appreciated, as it would help to supplement the recommendations made by the Economic and Social Council at its next session, when it would be considering an item on migrant workers.

56. In view of its importance, she hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

57. Mr. VARGAS (Mexico) suggested that the Spanish language text of draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.75 should be brought into line with the French text, and that in operative paragraph 7, the word 'estudie' should be replaced by the word 'explore'.

58. Mr. TAWELL (Jordan) said that there should be co-operation between the specialized agencies, the United Nations and other bodies on the problem of migrant workers. Many Jordanians encountered the problems that draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.75 had been designed to meet, and his delegation wished to co-sponsor the draft.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.1

59. Mrs. RESTREPO de REYES (Colombia) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.1, and said that Iceland, Norway and Portugal should be added to the list of sponsors.

60. Since it dealt with an important humanitarian problem of concern to all, the resolution had been drafted in neutral terms to deal with the problem of disappeared persons, which was usually a question of human rights, in general. The resolution had been drafted after many consultations, and she hoped it would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.70

61. Mr. DANOVI (Italy) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/33/Rev.70, which was intended to emphasize, independently of the draft resolution dealing with the situation of human rights in Chile, the extreme importance for future world-wide human rights action by the United Nations of the investigation carried out in Chile by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile. The draft resolution would in no way interfere with confidential procedures available to the Commission on Human Rights under Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII); instead it addressed itself to situations for which the Commission on Human Rights might consider exceptional measures justified, such as the one which had led to the adoption of its resolution 8 (XXI). In the third operative paragraph of the draft resolution, whose wording presented difficulties for some
delegations, the Assembly would merely invite the Commission to consider the possibility, in exceptional situations that it considered as grave as in the case of Chile, of following the same line of action it had successfully taken in that case. The wording was far from binding on the Commission and left many possible lines of action open.

62. However, in a spirit of compromise, he suggested the following changes in operative paragraph 3: in the first line, after the word "consider" the phrase "within the framework of the over-all analysis requested of it under resolution 32/130," should be inserted. In the second line the words "more often" should be deleted; in the fourth line the words "serious human rights violations" should be deleted and replaced by the words "consistent patterns of gross violations of human rights, and to report on the subject at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly."

63. He hoped that the new wording would enable the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus or without a vote.

64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 12.

Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.20

65. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) introduced draft amendment A/C.3/33/L.77 to draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.20. The amendment sought to reflect more precisely the decision in Commission on Human Rights resolution 20 (XXIV) to continue considering the question of the preparation of a draft convention on the rights of the child. His Government believed that the drafting of such a convention was a laudable goal which should move the United Nations beyond the 1959 Declaration on the Rights of the Child; but the process should not be rushed, since the draft should be as well formulated as possible.

66. He could understand those delegations that wished the convention to be a special event during the International Year of the Child. But the new information derived from the Year's extensive programme could serve as a data base for the complicated drafting of the convention, and his delegation therefore preferred a draft that would take into account the Year's accomplishments.

67. Mr. NEWTON (Poland) said that Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Mongolia, the Philippines and Suriname had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.20.

68. Consultations had been held since the draft had first been introduced, especially with the Western European and other States which wanted the draft resolution to be flexible on the question of the time when the draft convention would be ready for adoption. So as not to divide the Committee on an item of great concern to them, the sponsors had arrived at a compromise, consensus text that would incorporate the following changes in the draft resolution: in the title,
before the word "Convention", the word "the" should be changed to "a"; in the third preeambular paragraph, the word "Noting" should be replaced by "Taking note of"; in the fifth preeambular paragraph the words "Fully convinced" should be replaced by the word "Considering", and after the word "adopter" the word "the" should be changed to "a"; in operative paragraph 2, the whole concluding phrase after the word "adoption" should be deleted and replaced by the phrase "if possible during the International Year of the Child"; in operative paragraph 3, after the word "question", the words "of the adoption" should be deleted.

69. The amendment to operative paragraph 1 suggested in document A/C.3/33/L.77 almost amounted to a reversal of the unanimous decision of the Commission on Human Rights in paragraph 2 of its resolution 20 (XXXIV). He appealed to the United States delegation, therefore, to withdraw its amendment and to use the wording of the Commission's decision instead.

70. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that he was ready, in a spirit of compromise, to accept operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution with the following changes: the words "initiative undertaken" should be replaced by the word "decision", and the entire phrase after "resolution 20 (XXXIV)" should be replaced by the phrase from the Commission's decision: "to continue at its thirty-fifth session, as one of its priorities, its consideration of a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child". He was prepared also to accept the other changes suggested by the Polish delegation and withdrew his draft amendment in document A/C.3/33/L.77.

71. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that his Government would accept the will of the majority, although so far as it was concerned the rights of each child were well safeguarded in United Kingdom law. However, the proposal for a convention had not thus far been adequately discussed.

72. The text of the draft convention annexed to resolution 20 (XXXIV) of the Commission on Human Rights was in many respects vague and ambiguous, and a more precise text would have to be elaborated. A decision on the need for a convention should await assessment of the accomplishments of the International Year of the Child in 1979, and take into account the views of non-governmental organizations.

73. Draft resolution A/C.3/33/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted by consensus.

74. Mr. RAKOTOMAIVVO (Madagascar) said that his Government fully supported all efforts to protect children, who were society's most vulnerable group. Thus the satisfaction of their basic needs was given high priority in the economic and social policy of his country, which was currently engaged in a socialist revolution. His Government sought both to protect children in their natural fragility and inexperience and to prepare them through education for their future responsibilities as adult and aware citizens.
OTHER MATTERS

75. Mrs. BEN AHI (Israel) paid a tribute to the memory of the late Golda Meir, former Prime Minister of Israel. The people of Israel mourned the death of Mrs. Meir, one of the most outstanding personalities of her generation, who had personified all those virtues which men and women considered to be of value.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.