

time," she said, "should be allowed for each Government to consider the views and comments of other Governments, for differing viewpoints to be reconciled, and for the greatest possible measure of agreement to be achieved."

Mrs Newlands proceeded to give specific reasons why her delegation believed that it would be desirable to adopt the declaration and the covenant at the one time. She referred to the belief of most members of the Committee that the declaration should be a statement of general principles having moral but not legally binding effect. Since it was the Covenant on Human Rights which would create legal obligations, it should be considered the more important document. Immediate adoption of the Declaration alone might make States less enthusiastic towards the covenant and, as a result, unwilling to overcome the very real difficulties associated with its preparation. Moreover, the existence of the declaration and the covenant side by side would be an answer to those few members of the Committee who were suggesting that the declaration itself imposed some form of legal obligation on member States.

Most members of the Committee clearly felt that, whatever validity there was in the New Zealand point of view, the need for definitive United Nations action in the field of human rights called for immediate adoption of a declaration alone by the General Assembly. So, when the Committee decided by 42 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions to examine the Declaration of Human Rights with a view to its adoption by the Assembly at its third session, the *New Zealand* delegate abstained. She explained that, despite the views she had expressed, her delegation was anxious that an adequate discussion of the declaration should take place. But the delegation did not regard itself as committed as to the action it would take when the Committee was asked to approve the final text.

At the same time as the decision to proceed with the declaration was taken, the Committee agreed that there would be an opportunity later for the exposition of views on other parts of the Bill of Rights.

During the article-by-article discussion of the declaration the *New Zealand* delegation proposed a number of amendments, the more important of which are discussed below. These proposals were consistent both with the attitude New Zealand had taken since the time of presenting her comments to the Commission on Human Rights and with the tenor of the New Zealand statement in the general debate: they were designed to make the declaration as short and concise a statement of acceptable general principles as possible. At the same time, the delegation sought to obtain the acceptance of proposals coinciding with New Zealand Government policy. But these two objectives were not always compatible. The Committee as a whole found that if the