

to abandon our fact-finding mechanism have had the unfortunate result of losing the momentum which once existed to come to the aid of a country devastated by human rights violations.

In the view of my delegation this mixed record points to systemic problems which are now coming to the surface. The past few years have seen a growing combativeness on the part of affected member states and an increased solidarity of regional groups. These are almost natural protective responses, and they are likely to remain as long as we have an essentially punitive approach to our fact-finding procedures, and as long as the balance of judgment within this Commission is so heavily weighted on the side of public exposure, international pressure and selective condemnation.

Let me be clear about the place of the measures in this Commission. Exposure, pressure and condemnation are legitimate weapons in the human rights arsenal, if this metaphor is not inappropriate to our peaceful vocation. In the case of Afghanistan, United Nations reports have been clinically frank and the votes of this body have been clear. In many other cases, in Chile, Guatemala, Iran and El Salvador, important steps have been taken pursuant to the recommendations of special rapporteurs in response to the weight of international opinion. These measures must remain, and we must continue to be diligent in searching for ways of remedying the procedural inconsistencies we now face.

But two other options nevertheless remain available to the Commission, and I want to turn briefly to both. First, we need to develop less adversarial, more constructive approaches to human rights in those situations where countries emerging from difficult problems have legitimate claims to international solidarity. I have mentioned Equatorial Guinea as a classic case. Uganda was another. Several other states, some on the current Commission agenda, some outside our procedures, have been in similar circumstances. We need to link the various elements of the UN system which could be brought to bear in support of human rights. We mentioned this idea earlier in our statement on Advisory Services, to which I would refer delegations for further explanation.

The second option before the Commission is more controversial. It involves transforming the Commission,