



---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 81st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.3/35/SR.81  
10 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1, L.7<sup>4</sup>, L.76, L.77, L.78, L.79 and L.96)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to explain their votes on the draft resolutions adopted at the 80th meeting.
2. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) said that, during the consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.60 at the 79th meeting, the Moroccan delegation had referred to a case in which African children had allegedly been forced to go into exile on an island. He would appreciate further information on that matter, since the Congo had no knowledge of such a case; if the incident had indeed happened, it believed that Morocco should inform the appropriate international authorities. On the basis of its ideals, his country would participate in any action that was taken.
3. Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) said that although his delegation welcomed the commitment of the United Nations to the protection of human rights in Member States, draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.61 contained a number of statements about the situation of human rights in Chile, and specifically about the constitutional plebiscite held in September 1980, which failed to do justice to reality, since it failed to take into account the improvements made in recent years. It was not right that the procedure which had been followed in relation to Chile should remain restricted to one country; in the light of the situation prevailing in many parts of the world, that approach inevitably seemed biased and selective in the long run. In that situation, it did not seem justified to continue to review the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. His delegation had nevertheless voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.61 because of the text's general statements in support of greater respect for human rights and because it hoped that the draft resolution would have a favourable impact on the human-rights situation in Chile and throughout the world.
4. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2, said that there was a great deal of public and parliamentary concern in the United Kingdom about the human-rights situation in El Salvador, particularly in the light of recent developments. His delegation would have preferred a more balanced resolution along the lines of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2, but unfortunately the suggestions it had made to the sponsors had not been acceptable to them. It had voted in favour of the resolution of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2. As a result of the adoption of that resolution, the Salvadorian Government had given an assurance of its respect for human rights within the framework of the law; at the same time, it had pointed out that the resolution had been adopted without an on-the-spot investigation. His delegation did not believe that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 should place blame solely on the Salvadorian authorities. It did not condone violations by the security forces but noted that the context in which they were alleged to have occurred was the containment of the activities of extremist groups which had themselves committed atrocious acts of violence. In his delegation's view, pending an investigation by the Commission on Human Rights, condemnation should include all violations irrespective of who committed them.

5. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that his delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 reflected his Government's concern about violations of human rights in El Salvador and its desire that the Salvadorian Government should do everything in its power to restore respect for human rights. Paragraph 4 called for an end to violence in El Salvador; his country deplored all violence, from any quarter, and its understanding was that the paragraphs concerned with the supply of arms applied to all factions involved. Although the General Assembly was considering a human-rights situation in a particular country, it should not lose sight of its duty to consider serious cases of violations of human rights in any country in which they occurred.

6. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 because it felt deep concern at the increasingly frequent reports of violations of human rights in El Salvador. It would have preferred the reference to the supply of arms and other military assistance in the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 to be directed in a more specific way at all the parties involved in the current difficult and tragic situation.

7. Mrs. SUTHERLAND (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 because the Canadian Government and people remained seriously concerned about the current state of the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador. The tragic events of recent days confirmed that concern. Nevertheless, it had specific reservations about the references in the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 to the supply of arms and other military assistance, since it believed that it was inappropriate that a resolution concerned with human rights should refer to matters which could more appropriately be considered by the Security Council.

8. Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.61/Rev.1 and had voted against draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2 and A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2. It believed that the latter two draft resolutions were unbalanced, selective and discriminatory and that they failed to observe due legal process with regard to the countries concerned and to take into account the question of sovereignty. The representative of Bolivia, in addressing the Committee, had indicated that Bolivia was prepared to co-operate with the United Nations and was willing to receive a representative of the Secretary-General or a group from the United Nations which could investigate the human-rights situation if it wished. Yet, without taking that offer into account and without giving Bolivia an opportunity to state its case, the Committee had arbitrarily constituted itself as accuser and judge and condemned Bolivia, thus setting a very serious and dangerous precedent. The same considerations applied to the case of El Salvador, which had been judged on the basis of newspaper articles and news items without giving its Government a chance to be heard. The representative of El Salvador had explained to the Committee the conditions prevailing in his country and traced the causes which had led to the growth of violence. Yet the Committee had condemned El Salvador without any further investigation. There was nothing in the United Nations Charter to allow the United Nations to intervene in the affairs of countries in order to protect human rights. While he did not question the noble motives underlying the draft resolution, he believed that it was dangerous to use human rights as a pretext for intervention in the internal affairs of States.

9. Mrs. PADUA (Portugal) said her Government believed that human-rights violations were a concern of the United Nations. It deplored the situation in El Salvador and believed that it should be investigated. Its position on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 was based on the belief that not enough information was available to make a correct assessment of the delicate and complex situation prevailing in El Salvador and that, consequently, the draft resolution did not reflect a balanced view of events there.

10. Mrs. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka) said that if her delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2, it would have abstained.

11. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2. Australia was formally committed to the advancement of human rights and supported the principle that situations of human-rights violations such as those experienced by the people of El Salvador were properly the concern of the United Nations and of the international community as a whole. It believed that the decisions of the General Assembly could affect the outcome of situations of that kind and that therefore such decisions had to be very carefully formulated with a clear recognition of the objective of the early restoration of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the individuals concerned. Australia deplored the almost daily reports of manifest human-rights violations in El Salvador, where violence seemed to have become endemic and to have so seriously weakened the basic structures of society that normal democratic processes could not function. It was clear that both the right and the left had resorted to violence in the pursuit of political objectives, and that fact should have been more clearly reflected in the draft resolution. The expressed hope of the representative of El Salvador for a broader process of democratic dialogue was to be respected, although there was reason to fear that the search for appropriate procedures to establish such a dialogue had become a nightmare, particularly for those associated with the Revolutionary Democratic Front but also for those associated with the Government. Her delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 reflected the view that it contained some extraneous elements, especially in the ninth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 5. Her delegation shared the concern of the delegation of Venezuela that the draft resolution was not sufficiently broad in its consideration of the situation in El Salvador and made no reference to the activities of the Organization of American States in relation to El Salvador. She drew attention to the Secretary-General's press statement of 2 December and hoped that in the light of the over-all concern expressed by the international community about the deteriorating situation, every effort would be made to restore basic rights and fundamental freedoms to the people of El Salvador.

12. Ms. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 with some reservations, which also applied in part to its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2. Like the Nigerian delegation, her delegation was concerned at the apparent trend in the Committee towards selectivity in its criticisms of human-rights violations, which was reflected in the proliferation of draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly. Her delegation would have preferred a more objective and balanced text in the draft resolution on El Salvador. Its support for the draft resolutions she had mentioned was based on its concern about the situations reported in El Salvador

(Ms. Fawthorpe, New Zealand)

and Bolivia and the desire to take constructive action for the promotion and protection of human rights, which it regarded as one of the key responsibilities of the United Nations under the Charter. In connexion with draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2, she said that her delegation was opposed to the use of armed struggle or violence in solving any problem. It therefore interpreted the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 as an appeal to all the parties involved to desist from the violence which had contributed so much to the tragic situation that now prevailed.

13. Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands) said that his Government felt deep concern at the reports of wholesale violations of human rights in El Salvador, and its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 must be seen as an expression of that concern, which was shared by a large segment of the people of the Netherlands. Nevertheless, El Salvador was not the only country whose human rights situation gave his Government cause for concern, and his delegation had referred to many other countries by name in that connexion. His Government had misgivings about certain elements of the draft resolution and its over-all thrust, and it believed that the principal sponsors had shown a lack of prudence in selecting some of the other sponsors whose names appeared at the top of the document. With regard to the substance of the draft resolution, it should be borne in mind that in El Salvador there was a situation of civil strife in which rival factions of the left and right were engaged in random killing and bloodshed and the Government was caught between them. It was clear that the Government alone could not be blamed for all the violations of human rights, although reports of events of the preceding week, when members of a predominantly left-wing group had been abducted with the help of the army and later found dead, raised serious questions about the involvement of the Government of El Salvador in the widespread murders in that country. A major shortcoming of the draft resolution was that it made no mention of the role of the Organization of American States in relation to the situation in El Salvador. His Government would have liked a less detailed resolution emphasizing further investigation by the Commission on Human Rights. If the sponsors had heeded the suggestions made, the draft resolution would have given much less cause for reservations, especially on the part of countries whose votes were most important to El Salvador.

14. Mrs. EFTEKHARI (Iran) said that her delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.63 had erroneously been cast in favour; in fact, her delegation had intended to abstain.

15. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that the General Assembly, in its activities for the protection of human rights, was faced with the problem of determining which situations had to be studied; the decision that a situation required investigation by international bodies was a serious one and should be made on the basis of valid information, with similar action on all similar situations. The indictment of certain countries at the initiative of individual States was liable to be insufficiently well founded and unduly selective, since other equally disturbing situations were often wilfully overlooked. The protection of human rights should be ensured, in so far as possible, on the basis of well-defined procedures and by the *Commission on Human Rights*, the body established for that purpose.

(Mr. Giustetti, France)

16. The competence of the General Assembly to consider human rights, under the Charter, could not be questioned; its role, except in cases of special urgency, should be to call particularly disturbing situations to the attention of the Commission on Human Rights, so that they could be investigated. In the light of those considerations, his delegation had been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution on Bolivia but had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on El Salvador, believing that it prejudiced the measures that might be taken by the Commission on Human Rights and also that it should not be addressed only to the Government of El Salvador.

17. Mr. VIDAL (Dominican Republic) said that if his delegation had been present for the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2, it would have abstained because it believed that the subject was one which fell within the exclusive competence of the Organization of American States.

18. Mrs. SABATIER (Niger) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/35/L.52/Rev.2, A/C.3/35/L.61/Rev.1 and A/C.3/35/L.71/Rev.2 because they condemned individual States Members of the United Nations for human-rights violations. Other delegations had expressed concern about the selective approach adopted; the three countries concerned were all in the same continent, and one might wonder which continent and which countries would be next. It seemed that the purpose was not to defend human rights but to condemn certain countries. Moreover, violations of human rights in the countries concerned and elsewhere were often perpetrated with the support of certain external Powers which should also be held responsible. The Committee's attention was being diverted from the real question of human rights and, while condemning a few scapegoats, it was overlooking the countries in which real violations of human rights were taking place. The concept of human rights did not involve political rights alone; there were also economic rights, and the peoples making up three quarters of mankind were condemned to poverty and famine because other countries were violating their rights from afar. Her delegation felt concerned about the procedure adopted and hoped that States, especially those of the third world, would reflect on the accusations made, since no provision of the Charter allowed intervention in the internal affairs of States by using human rights as a political pretext.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1

19. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands), introducing document A/C.3/35/L.96 containing amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1, said that his country too had suffered from nazism and fascism during the Second World War. The people of the Netherlands would continue to fight against any form of totalitarian ideology because they did not believe that the State should be superior to the individual. The sponsors of the amendments wished to apologize for the lateness of their submission and to suggest that the Committee should postpone consideration of the document until the following meeting.

20. Mr. SCHLEGAL (German Democratic Republic) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.70/Rev.1 had held consultations with all interested delegations and, in the light of those consultations, had revised the draft. The intention of the proposed amendments was merely to destroy the purpose of the draft resolution, and the motive of the sponsors was to avoid taking a stand against

(Mr. Schlegal, German Democratic Republic)

nazism and fascism. In any event, the sponsors of the draft resolution needed more time to study the proposed amendments and, accordingly, agreed that their consideration should be postponed until the following meeting.

21. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.74

22. Mr. ROS (Argentina) said that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.74 contained two basic contradictions. First, the hierarchy of the Commission on Human Rights should be respected if that body and its subsidiary bodies were to carry out their functions properly. Accordingly, paragraph 3 should have referred only to the Commission and not to the working group, since the former was the primary body entrusted with matters of human rights. The Commission would then be able to give instructions to the working group within its terms of reference. Secondly, the third preambular paragraph should have referred merely to General Assembly resolution 33/173, without specifying one and only one of the issues dealt with in that resolution. His delegation still maintained the reservations it had expressed when the working group had been established.

23. Mr. BELL (Canada) announced that his delegation had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

25. Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.74 was adopted without a vote.

26. Mrs. RODRIGUEZ CALDERON (Cuba) said that if the draft resolution had been put to the vote, her delegation would have abstained, since it felt deep concern about the proliferation of United Nations bodies because of the risks implicit in setting up a particular group to study each case. That did not mean that her delegation disagreed with the substance of the draft resolution; Cuba strongly condemned the enforced disappearances resulting from the criminal acts of Fascist régimes.

27. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to adopting the draft resolution without a vote even though it had some reservations regarding parts of the text. It wished to reaffirm what it had stated at the thirty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, when it had pointed out that the working group should carry out its functions in the course of one year. The draft resolution should not prejudge the activities of that group.

28. Mr. CALDERON (Chile) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, regarding it as a first positive step in the universalization of United Nations procedures in such matters. However, it objected to the ad hoc nature of the establishment of the working group and therefore would not be able to work with that body. When such ad hoc proceedings were discontinued, Chile would reconsider its position.

/...

29. Miss VOURAKIS (Greece) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution because it indicated the seriousness with which the international community viewed the problem of involuntary or enforced disappearances. Her delegation also supported the establishment by the Commission on Human Rights of the working group entrusted with examining such questions. Everyone was aware of the hope placed in the work of that group, and many awaited the results of that first phase with great interest; it was indeed only a beginning and her delegation was sure that the Commission on Human Rights would accord the question all due attention in the future.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.76

30. Mr. SPINELLI (Italy) said that his delegation had been holding consultations with others in the hope of having the draft resolution adopted without a vote. Accordingly, he suggested that its consideration should be postponed until the following meeting in order to allow those consultations to continue.

31. Mr. RANGASHARI (India) endorsed the suggestion made by the representative of Italy. It appeared that delegations were close to agreement, and if consideration was postponed until the following meeting, the Committee might be able to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone consideration of the draft resolution.

33. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77

34. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that at a previous meeting the representative of Morocco had proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

35. Ms. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had held consultations with the representative of Morocco and had arrived at an agreed text, which Morocco and the Niger had joined in sponsoring. First, the sixth preambular paragraph had been amended to read:

"Referring to the relevant provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, of the Protocol of 1972 amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 which form the basis of all international drug abuse control efforts,".

Secondly, paragraph 2 had been amended to read:

"2. Repeats its appeal to all States which have not yet become parties to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, to the Protocol of 1972 amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971, to take the necessary steps to accede to those conventions and thus ensure their universal application;".

Thirdly, the following new paragraph 5 had been added:

/...

(Ms. Roser, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

"5. Invites States concerned to take appropriate measures to discourage the powerful economic interests which are propagating a false and deceitful image of drug use with the aim to increase the number of drug abusers and to legalize the abuse;"

Fourthly, in the light of that new paragraph 5, the fifth preambular paragraph had been deleted. Fifthly, the former paragraph 5 had become paragraph 6 and the following new paragraph 7 had been added:

"7. Underscores the need of producing countries to receive greater assistance from interested Governments and concerned international organizations to facilitate drug abuse control, including crop-substitution policies or law-enforcement programmes;"

The remaining operative paragraphs would then be renumbered 8 to 11.

36. Mr. CARDWELL (United States) said that only through global efforts to eradicate illicit drug traffic and drug abuse could the international community begin to envision a solution to the problem. His delegation had been pleased to sponsor draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77 on international co-operation in drug-abuse control. He emphasized the need for a close collaboration of all Governments with the International Narcotics Control Board, the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the other narcotics bodies in the United Nations system, particularly by supplying them with the information they needed to carry out their tasks. That need could not be overemphasized, since United States drug agencies could not carry out their work without adequate statistics on national trends. He urged all Member States to co-operate with the United Nations agencies concerned. The international programme for drug-abuse control, when completed, should provide a comprehensive global strategy to eradicate the illicit production of and demand for narcotics. National strategic papers would also assist in the battle against drug abuse. He underscored the appeal for increased financial support for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, particularly for multisectoral projects which were achieving such positive results as crop substitution, an important facet of the drug-abuse programme.

37. Miss KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) said that her delegation should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77.

38. Mrs. SANTANDER-DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced the following additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77: Austria, Morocco, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

39. Mr. GURAKAN (Turkey), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77, said his country had often stated that unless all aspects of the question of drug abuse were addressed, the world would continue to face a menace. The sacrifices and burdens of the battle against drug abuse should be shared equally. His delegation had made suggestions designed to improve the text of the draft resolution and noted with appreciation that some suggestions had been reflected in the text. It would

/...

(Mr. Gurakan, Turkey)

have preferred, however, to see a more fully balanced document. There were positive elements in the draft resolution, such as paragraph 4, which emphasized the protection of the legitimate interests of producers who were making sacrifices in order to control the spread of drug abuse. India had provided valuable information on the background of the Economic and Social Council resolutions on drug abuse; however, there was a recent trend towards giving different interpretations to the resolutions. His delegation felt that the term "traditional supplier countries" was self-explanatory. He hoped that all countries would implement the Economic and Social Council resolutions in accordance with their true objective.

40. Mr. RANGASHARI (India) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution because it attached great importance to drug-abuse control and the role of international co-operation. He recalled that India was one of the countries making sacrifices in order to participate in international drug control, since it was the largest producer of licit opiates. It had cut down its volume of production during the past three years by 44 per cent, an action which had led to serious economic dislocation. Since India was a developing country, the burden on it was immense. During consultations, his delegation had made suggestions which had been incorporated into paragraph 4. His delegation attached great importance to Economic and Social Council resolutions 1979/8 and 1980/20. All countries should take steps to implement those resolutions and to assist traditional supplier countries as much as possible in order that the burden might be shared. He agreed with the representative of Turkey on the interpretation to be placed on the words "traditional supplier countries" and with the opinion of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in the matter. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

41. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation shared the opinion of Turkey and India with respect to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution and Economic and Social Council resolutions 1979/8 and 1980/20.

42. Ms. WELLS (Australia) said that her delegation wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution. Paragraph 4 reflected Australia's support in particular for Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/20. Efforts to achieve a lasting balance between the supply of licit opiates and the demand for them should be made in a spirit of co-operation, recognizing the complexity of the problem. Those efforts would be enhanced by the implementation of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and of the Protocol of 1972.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that the consensus of the Committee appeared to be that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.77, as revised, should be adopted without a vote.

44. It was so decided.

45. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation adhered entirely to the principle of maintaining a balance between the demand for and the supply of licit opiates, since France was one of the traditional

(Mr. Giustetti, France)

supplier countries. France had adopted a policy of reducing the areas devoted to the cultivation of opiates, and during the period 1978 to 1979 it had reduced them by 25 per cent.

Draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.78

46. Mr. McKINNON (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, proposed the following revisions. In the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "arising out of situations referred to in paragraph 1 (e) of its resolution 32/130" should be inserted after the words "flagrant violations of human rights". In the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations" should be inserted after the words "in exercising good offices". In paragraph 1, the words "arising out of situations referred to in paragraph 1 (e) of its resolution 32/130" should be inserted after the words "flagrant violations of human rights". In paragraph 3, the words "with its consent and as quickly as possible" should be inserted after the words "the Government concerned".

47. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Canadian amendments seemed reasonable in principle but did not eliminate the main defect of the draft resolution. The draft resolution proposed that the Secretary-General should be given functions which would give him carte blanche although he did not have those functions under the Charter. Consequently, there was a danger that the Committee might be acting contrary to specific provisions of the Charter. His delegation recalled that when Canada had submitted its draft resolution on 3 December, it had quoted the Secretary-General's statement, in his report, that he entered into direct contact with relevant Governments only when he had specific instructions from a United Nations body. In the case of the draft resolution under discussion, the Secretary-General would act on his own initiative. Certain situations might result in a dilemma for the Secretary-General, since he might be forced to choose between violating the Charter and failing to comply with the request contained in the draft resolution. Moreover, the draft resolution went further than the resolution adopted by consensus by the Commission on Human Rights at its last session. Since the draft resolution was related to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/130, paragraph 1 (e), the Commission on Human Rights, in the context of the over-all analysis requested, should be able to consider all proposals, including the proposal on "good offices", and work out an agreed approach. He appealed to Canada to continue consultations aimed at reaching a mutually acceptable solution, in accordance with the Charter in order to avoid the risk of direct conflict with the Charter and to avoid placing the General Assembly in a difficult situation. Another difficulty involved the fact that the question of "good offices" was being considered in the Sixth Committee in connexion with the peaceful settlement of disputes among States in accordance with, inter alia, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; there seemed to be a lack of consistency in the two approaches.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.