

Reporting and conciliation, of course, are techniques tried and true; and there can be no doubt that national experience has proved the value which the cumulative impact of a series of investigations and recommendations can have when they attract the white light of publicity. Reporting and conciliation, therefore, are all right as far as they go. The main difficulty is that they do not go far enough. This is particularly true when conciliation is on a state vs state basis, if for no other reason than that friends do not like to tangle in public, while rivals are only too tempted to do so. The history of the ILO complaints system is good evidence of what might happen were that system to be relied upon in the human rights area.

Reporting and conciliation, in our view, is not enough.

What is needed, we believe, is access for groups and individuals within the state to competent, impartial decision-makers outside the state. The idea is simply to vest competent non-national authorities with no less capacity than the power to pass on the treatment which the home state has meted out to its own national. In this way, the individual will have the opportunity to overleap his tribal organisation, and to bring a completely independent mind to bear on the standard which the national state is applying in the human rights area. The individual will no longer be cabined and confined by his local government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, article 16 of the Philippine proposal goes some distance, though certainly not all the way, towards recognizing such an authorisation; and the Costa Rican