

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION
*Official Records**



THIRD COMMITTEE
72nd meeting
held on
Wednesday, 7 December 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 72nd MEETING

Chairman: Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica)

CONTENTS

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

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A 3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/32/SR.72
9 December 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/32/215; A/C.3/32/L.37, L.38/Rev.1, L.39, L.42, L.43, L.45, L.46, L.48, L.49 and L.50)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. She invited those delegations that wished to do so to explain their vote before the vote on that draft resolution.
2. Mr. MOLINA (Dominican Republic) said that his country faithfully observed the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and felt that the full enjoyment of human rights should be guaranteed universally and completely. The draft resolution before the Committee, however, ignored the recent resolution of the Organization of American States which stated that in view of the progress and good faith shown by Chile, it need no longer submit reports on the human-rights situation. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.
3. Mr. HALFHUID (Surinam) said that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was scrupulously guaranteed in his country. Surinam's speedy ratification of the International Covenants on Human Rights was a logical outcome of its internal legal system and its practices in that area. All human rights and fundamental freedoms were indivisible and interdependent, and their violation affected all Members of the United Nations. For example, the recent assassination of Stephen Biko and the events surrounding his death had shattered any hope that blacks could receive justice in South Africa. There were also reports of the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of innocent people in other countries which had as yet failed to attract the due attention of the Committee or the Commission on Human Rights. His Government deplored all violations of human rights everywhere and took seriously any resolution condemning a particular country for its alleged violations.
4. Accordingly, Surinam had carefully studied draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37, and although it was anxious to support any proposal which might lead to full normalization of the political situation in Chile, it found it impossible to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 deliberately ignored the co-operation of the Chilean authorities, which had contributed to an over-all improvement in the human-rights situation in Chile, an improvement recognized by the Ad Hoc Working Group itself; nor did it take note of the fact that the powers of the secret police in Chile had been terminated. The final preambular paragraph, while mentioning a decrease in the number of political prisoners and in the number of detainees, nevertheless attributed that improvement to the efforts of the international community, and his delegation felt that it was neither wise, nor objective nor fair to slight the positive decisions and acts of the Government of Chile in that respect. Had the sponsors of the draft resolution recognized the efforts of the Chilean authorities, the result might have been an improvement in the rather strained relations between the Chilean Government on the one hand and the Commission on Human Rights and the Ad Hoc Working Group on the other. Instead of appealing to the Government of Chile to intensify the process of normalization

/...

(Mr. Halfhuid, Surinam)

of the human-rights situation in that country, the sponsors had taken the familiar and easy path of condemning that Government in the harshest possible terms. The adoption of a draft resolution which disregarded political changes that had already occurred would only exacerbate the situation in Chile. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

5. Mr. SALAZAR (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica had never been an enthusiastic supporter of ad hoc working groups to study human-rights violations, even though the country investigated might be guilty of the charges levelled against it, because such investigations tended to be selective. Some of the sponsors of the draft resolution seemed to be motivated by a sincere concern over the human-rights situation in Chile, which his delegation shared; on the other hand, the intense interest which other sponsors had shown in events in Chile, in contrast with their attitude towards violations of human rights elsewhere in the world, justified the suspicion that their attitude was based on political considerations. By ignoring many instances of human-rights violations in other parts of the world and focusing upon a single country, the draft resolution not only distorted the truth but turned the cause of human rights into a pretext for politically motivated accusations against a Government which was not to some sponsors' liking. His delegation did not wish to deprive the Commission on Human Rights of any instrument which some delegations might, however wrongly, consider effective, but it objected to the Working Group's political bias and to the fact that it had not been authorized to carry out the same functions in the accusing countries and their sympathizers.

6. His delegation had always favoured machinery which would be more global and less partial, more permanent and less transitory. It had therefore supported the establishment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights and was not surprised that it was precisely the most enthusiastic defenders of the Ad Hoc Working Group which were most stubbornly opposed to that proposal. His delegation had originally supported the Ad Hoc Working Group, by way of exception, because the seriousness of the situation in Chile at the time had warranted it and because no more suitable machinery had been available. It regretted that that ad hoc machinery had failed to justify the confidence placed in it, although he did not wish to impute fault to all those who had been members of the Group at one time or another. Part of the problem was that the Group's fixed-term mandate had been turned into an unending nightmare. It was pointless to extend the mandate of the Working Group, for it was doubtful that any Government would voluntarily submit to the kind of ordeal experienced by Chile.

7. The draft resolution was supposedly based on the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (A/32/227), but in fact it contained conclusions entirely unrelated to the report. However, even the report itself was politically biased and selective and inevitably cast doubt upon the impartiality of the conclusions and recommendations which the Ad Hoc Working Group had reached. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

8. Mr. FRIDAY (Grenada) said that although his country strongly supported human rights, they must not be used as a screen to shield evil subversives who sought to undermine domestic peace and overthrow Governments. The draft resolution strongly reflected the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (A/32/227) and showed that some

/...

(Mr. Friday, Grenada)

effort had been made to normalize the situation in Chile despite some violations of human rights. As document A/C.3/32/6 showed, the Chilean Government itself had solemnly promised to pursue efforts aimed at gradual normalization. In other words, the situation in Chile was evolving in a positive manner as a result of purely domestic efforts, and it was therefore unfair to pass arbitrary judgement on the country without giving due consideration to all the relevant circumstances in consultation with all the parties concerned. Furthermore, Chile should not be made a scapegoat for flagrant violations of human rights elsewhere in the world.

9. Nevertheless, Grenada shared the concern of the international community over human-rights violations everywhere and would have welcomed a draft resolution capable of speeding the normalization of the situation in Chile. It disagreed, however, with the underlying thrust of some parts of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 and would therefore abstain in the vote.

10. Mr. CASAS (Colombia) said that he disagreed with the draft resolution's unnecessarily exaggerated language directed against the Government of Chile. His delegation acknowledged Chilean efforts to normalize the situation in the country through the release of political prisoners. The human-rights problem in Chile today was no more serious than it was in many other countries, and his delegation therefore felt that criticism had been applied selectively. The representative of Chile and other representatives had satisfactorily answered the assertions in the report of the Working Group.

11. His delegation had reservations regarding certain paragraphs of the draft resolution, for reasons which it had already indicated in the Committee, especially those paragraphs which implied interference in the internal affairs of Chile. It also had misgivings regarding the economic sanctions which might be inferred from paragraph 5 (c) of General Assembly resolution 31/124, repeated in paragraph 8 (c) of the draft resolution, and objected to paragraph 8 (a), which extended the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group. His delegation had reservations with respect to the functioning of the Working Group, which had been guilty of interfering in Chile's political and economic life, and agreed with the representative of Costa Rica that a High Commissioner for Human Rights should be established in order to create fair ground rules for such inquiries.

12. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the paragraphs indicated if they were put to a separate vote. It did not, however, overlook such problems as that of missing persons and wanted to ensure respect for human rights in Chile. It would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution, with the reservations indicated.

13. Mr. BOZA (Peru) said that the draft resolution under consideration had much in common with the draft resolution on Uganda in document A/C.3/32/L.49, on which his delegation wished to reserve its position. However, there were significant differences between the two. The draft resolution on Uganda, in paragraph 2, expressed the hope that the relevant organs of the Organization of African Unity would give appropriate consideration to the massive violations of human rights which were referred to in the first preambular paragraph. Reference to the regional organization was, in fact, its major virtue. The draft resolution on Chile, on the other hand, totally ignored the role which the relevant and

/...

(Mr. Boza, Peru)

authoritative regional organization, the Organization of American States, should play. It lacked the necessary balance because it failed to recognize that Chile, as the Ad Hoc Working Group itself had admitted, had made progress with respect to the human-rights situation. For that reason, and because the draft resolution was not an effective instrument for restoring human rights in Chile, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

14. Mr. CABELLO (Paraguay) said that his country fully supported human rights everywhere but felt that the draft resolution contained some very serious defects. It was totally lacking in balance and had been drafted in language which, to say the least, was unusual. Firstly, the preambular part ignored the consensus on human rights which had been reached in the Organization of American States, whose resolutions should have been taken into account. Secondly, it ignored the conclusion of the Working Group itself to the effect that progress on human rights had been made in Chile. Thirdly, it pretended that only international pressure had promoted progress in Chile, while overlooking the co-operation provided by the Chilean Government. Yet the Committee should encourage such co-operation and should respect national sovereignty and avoid ideologically motivated attacks. One reason why many delegations in the Committee had favoured the establishment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights was precisely the lack of objectivity in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

15. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37, said that, since Chile was a party to the International Covenants on Human Rights, the only body competent to deal with the human-rights situation in that country was the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The international community naturally had a responsibility to ensure that a group of experts entrusted with the investigation of human-rights violations showed the necessary impartiality and objectivity. Yet the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group constituted flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a State and was based on information of doubtful reliability or objectivity obtained outside the country. The findings cast some doubt on the Group's integrity. Even if the allegations in the report concerning the country's economic and social life were well-founded - to take the most extreme situation - it was not for a group of experts or for other countries to pass judgement on the justice and effectiveness of national policies. Furthermore, draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 did not reflect the widely acknowledged improvement in the situation in Chile.

16. For those reasons, her delegation would abstain in the vote. It would, however, continue to condemn all violations of human rights, in Chile or elsewhere.

17. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) expressed deep regret at the fact that draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 did not acknowledge the Chilean Government's efforts to restore to normal the human-rights situation in Chile. The new Government had been seeking to pacify the country, to free the persons detained during the state of siege and to permit its political opponents to leave the country.

/...

(Mr. Giambruno, Uruguay)

18. Despite the attacks made on the Chilean Government for ideological reasons, it had responded in good faith to the communications addressed to it. Clearly, however, all its efforts had been to no avail: the draft resolution repeated the same hackneyed phrases seen in previous resolutions on the subject. The Latin American countries had pointed out to the Committee that they had very responsible and effective regional machinery for investigating human-rights matters and had appealed to the international community not to prejudge the issue, but their appeals had been in vain.

19. Clearly, many Member States did not understand the real situation of the Latin American countries. For more than a century, Chile had been instrumental in upholding human rights in the continent. Moreover, it had participated in the formulation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and had been in the vanguard of the struggle to defend the principles of the Charter. Chile had a conscience of its own and did not need pressure from the international community.

20. The attack against Chile had not been confined to condemnation, but had gone so far as to constitute interference in the country's internal affairs. Despite the allegations that the proposed High Commissioner for Human Rights would also "interfere" in internal affairs, he wished that there had been just such an office to assist the Chilean Government in restoring normality, while showing it the respect that all Governments deserved.

21. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 contained no shred of impartiality, justice or understanding. If it was adopted, the world's faith in the United Nations would be dealt a severe blow. That was no way to assist the Chilean exiles or to mitigate the sufferings of those inside the country. He felt compelled to state with profound sadness that the United Nations was taking a wrong course. He hoped that no country would find itself in the situation of being judged by such a tribunal as the Working Group, and that in future, whether in the General Assembly or the Commission on Human Rights, similar cases would be considered in a calmer and less politicized atmosphere. For those reasons, his delegation would cast a negative vote on the draft resolution, hoping that it was the last time that the United Nations would act in a way that ignored the purposes and principles of the Charter.

22. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) expressed deep concern about the situation with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. He had hoped that the Committee would heed the voices of Latin America, whose regional machinery, the Organization of American States, had served as a model for the League of Nations and the United Nations. He had welcomed the trend towards universality in the world Organization but regretted that what it gained in extent it appeared to be losing in depth. In draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.49, concerning the protection of human rights in Uganda, better balance had been shown by acknowledging the competence of the Organization of African Unity, the body best fitted to consider the problem. Similar consideration should have been given in the case of Chile to the competence of OAS, whose members were aware of Chile's long democratic tradition and its search for social justice.

/...

(Mr. Vela, Guatemala)

23. The plaudits bestowed on the Ad Hoc Working Group for its alleged objectivity were hardly deserved. The Working Group had expressed regret that the Chilean Government had not permitted it to enter Chile. Yet the Group had sought to interfere in Chile's internal affairs. The Chilean Government had eloquently rejected the Group's findings, pointing out that it had been over-zealous in judging its task.

24. The language used in the draft resolution reflected an excess of irresponsibility and contained undeniably subjective elements. Never in the past had a State been judged so selectively; there was much available evidence that had not been taken into account. He was personally familiar with the situation in Chile and knew what impartial observers had acknowledged: that although Chile, like every other country, had its dissidents, by and large the Chilean people were satisfied with the new situation.

25. He regarded the Chilean Government's response as completely valid. That Government was entitled to reject a judgement which it considered to be biased. The approach taken by the Working Group had clearly been the wrong one, and the United Nations must be willing to learn from that mistake; efforts should be made to seek another course. His delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 and hoped that all those who recognized the existence of regional rights would do likewise.

26. Mr. DIEZ URZUA (Chile) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37, for a number of reasons.

27. Firstly, the draft resolution represented a clear case of selectivity, in open contradiction to its first preambular paragraph, which referred to the universal observance of human rights in accordance with the principles of the Charter. References to universality in the context of the item before the Committee created an inescapable impression of hypocrisy.

28. Secondly, the draft resolution ignored the real situation in Chile and the fact that its underlying causes were being eliminated. The text was based solely on political criteria, deliberately ignoring developments during the past year.

29. Thirdly, the draft resolution was contrary to the spirit of the Charter and other international instruments, which had established international machinery in order to co-operate with States in situations where human rights appeared to be at stake. The draft resolution did not recognize the patent efforts of the Chilean Government to co-operate with the United Nations, nor did it reflect any desire on the part of the Organization to co-operate with the Chilean Government; on the contrary, its abusive language sounded like that of a criminal prosecution.

30. Fourthly, several provisions of the draft resolution constituted overt interference in the internal affairs of Chile, exceeding the scope of international jurisdiction in human-rights matters and contravening the terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

/...

(Mr. Diez Urzua, Chile)

31. Fifthly, the submission of the draft resolution violated Article 55 of the Charter, which called for international co-operation based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination.

32. Sixthly, the text completely ignored the rules governing due process, thereby seriously violating the rights of a founding Member of the United Nations and establishing a negative precedent for future co-operation with other countries in the consideration of human rights in their territories.

33. Seventhly, the draft resolution showed a complete lack of respect for regional arrangements and disregarded the resolution recently adopted by OAS, which had a strong tradition of upholding human rights without discrimination or politicization.

34. Eighthly, the text was aimed not at implementing human rights throughout the world but at achieving political ends; it was not based on the principles to which all Member States were committed but was the sad result of international bargaining.

35. His delegation called upon all delegations that were truly interested in the situation of human rights in Chile and throughout the world to consider the consequences of their vote. He appealed in particular to other developing countries which might at some future time find themselves under attack from a combination of great Powers belonging to all ideologies, as Chile was today.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37.

37. At the request of the representative of Chile, a vote was taken by roll call.

38. Sierre Leone, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet

/...

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Central African Empire, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Surinam, Thailand, Zaire.

39. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37 was adopted by 98 votes to 12, with 28 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives wishing to explain their vote to do so.

41. Mrs. DINCEN (Turkey) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. However, it would have abstained on the ninth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 5, 7, 8 (c) and 9 if they had been put to a separate vote.

42. Mrs. RICHTER (Argentina) said that her delegation supported all United Nations efforts to ensure the enjoyment of human rights. However, those efforts should be made within the framework of co-operation among States. Her delegation had had difficulties which prevented it from supporting draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. It agreed with the statement by a Latin American delegation that the draft lacked the necessary objectivity. Moreover, it deplored the fact that the argument of lack of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was used for reasons that bore no relation to humanitarian considerations.

43. Her delegation continued to support the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, which was a keystone of Latin American policy and of special importance when the situation concerned a neighbour with which her country had a long frontier.

44. Mr. FAURIS (France), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the statement made at a recent meeting by the representative of Belgium, on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community, had contained the essence of the comments which his delegation had wished to make on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. In supplementing that statement he wished to repeat his delegation's disapproval of the slow manner in which the Chilean Government was dismantling its machinery of repression. It also regretted the delay in restoring a normal situation in which Chilean citizens could be guaranteed the free exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The attitude of the Chilean authorities continued to show signs of a policy which threatened the inalienable rights of the human person.

/...

(Mr. Fauris, France)

45. His delegation had, however, taken note of certain improvements in the situation of human rights in Chile. In contrast to previous years, the absence of a formal condemnation in the text represented recognition of a change to which the Committee could not remain indifferent. It was nevertheless a matter for regret that it had been necessary to mention, in paragraph 8 (c) of the draft resolution, practices regarding which France continued to have reservations.

46. His delegation continued to be surprised at the selectivity shown on the question of human rights. There was a contradiction in applying strictures to one country which was similar to others when the latter, at the slightest provocation, invoked the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. France continued to believe in the universal character of human rights.

47. France had not found it necessary to await the specific recommendations referred to in paragraph 8 (b) on possible humanitarian, legal and financial aid to those imprisoned or forced to leave their country. France had already taken action on a substantial scale, as almost 5,000 Chilean subjects were living in France as political refugees. His condemnation of totalitarianism and arbitrariness was based on the fact that man was the ultimate purpose of the State and not the State the ultimate purpose of man.

48. Mr. OTAKA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. It was highly regrettable that the Chilean Government persisted in its refusal to permit the Ad Hoc Working Group to enter the country. At the same time, his delegation appreciated the recent efforts made by the Government of Chile, including the release of important political prisoners, which had led to a considerable improvement in the situation.

49. In view of those efforts, his delegation considered that the reference in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to "constant and flagrant violations of human rights" - language taken from General Assembly resolution 31/124 - seemed to be too strong. It also had reservations with regard to paragraphs 8 (b) and (c) because it felt that they were not quite appropriate. If those subparagraphs had been put to a separate vote, his delegation would have abstained.

50. Mrs. APONTE (Venezuela) said that her delegation, which condemned violations of human rights wherever they occurred, had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37. Her country had given careful consideration to the situation developing in Chile and had noted the progress made there as a result of the pressure of the international community. Nevertheless, she wished to draw attention to the statement in the report of the Economic and Social Council that there still existed elements in that situation which made international action necessary. Furthermore, the Organization of American States had recognized that progress had been made, and had decided to maintain its vigilance with regard to the situation in Chile. Her delegation hoped that owing to the progress made in Chile it would be possible for the Committee to remove the item from its agenda and to devote its efforts to other matters.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had now concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.37.

/...

52. Mr. WOLFF (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.46 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft sought to achieve a solution to the problem of international narcotics abuse. The main intention was to focus increased attention on the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. The United Nations Division of Narcotic Drugs had recently reported a world-wide spread in the abuse of cannabis and a marked increase in heroin abuse and in the abuse of psychotropic substances. One finding of the Division had been that, in countries in which opium was traditionally consumed by middle-aged and older persons, the situation had become complicated owing to the increasing use of heroin by the young.

53. In order to achieve a greater consensus on the draft resolution, the sponsors had made modifications to meet the objections raised by a number of members. The changes would be incorporated in a revised text to be circulated shortly.

54. He noted that in recent years less attention had been given to the question of the demand for narcotic drugs and to the reasons why people used them. The draft resolution was not concerned with the licit production of narcotics and did not accuse any particular country or group of countries. The sponsors were requesting countries that were not already affected by the problem to join in the common effort because drug abuse was growing throughout the world; even developing countries were beginning to face the problem. It was therefore a unique opportunity for all Member States, rather than only those which belonged to a special organization, to participate in a programme to help to alleviate the suffering caused by drug abuse.

55. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50 on behalf of the delegations of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and Thailand. He said that the draft resolution, in effect, contained four texts, dealing respectively with illicit traffic in drugs, illicit demand, ratification of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances and the budget provisions of the United Nations. In order to produce a draft on which consensus might be reached, the co-sponsors had included the last two ideas in a very diluted form.

56. Outlining the main differences between the three draft resolutions before the Committee on that subject, he said that draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.46 dealt specifically with United Nations machinery; draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.48 dealt with the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC); and draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50 concentrated on measures proposed to Governments and on co-operation between international organizations and Governments.

57. The basic ideas underlying draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50 were the need to limit drug production to the levels required for pharmaceutical and scientific purposes, the need to stop the drug traffic, and the need for preventive programmes and for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. Since resolute action by Governments at both national and international levels was essential, the draft resolution called for improved exchange of information and international co-operation. It was his delegation's hope that the necessary funds would be appropriated from the regular budget in order to enable United Nations bodies to

/...

(Mr. Merkel, Federal Republic of Germany)

continue their valuable work in that field. Appropriate reference had been made throughout the draft resolution to relevant articles of existing international instruments and resolutions of the Economic and Social Council. Particular reference had been made to the relevant recommendations of the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, as the drug problem was related directly to crime. His country was one of the main producers of psychotropic substances and therefore had a special interest in the ratification of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, to which attention had been drawn in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. He thanked delegates from different regional groups whose advice and experience had been very helpful during the drafting of the text. The co-sponsors hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

58. Mr. WOLFF (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.48 on the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and its programmes related to economic and social development, said that an important element of the draft was the request for voluntary contributions to UNFDAC. Many nations working on a bilateral basis had achieved much, but there was a strong need for an efficient UNFDAC and the sponsors hoped that the draft would be adopted unanimously.

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/32/L.48 and L.50 and to postpone a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.46 pending the circulation of the revised text.

60. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation had repeatedly stressed the view that the Economic and Social Council was the body most competent to take a decision on issues relating to drug abuse control. It noted that, in draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.48, reference was made to resolutions on which his delegation had abstained.

61. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50, he drew attention to the recommendations mentioned in the second preambular paragraph and said that they should be transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for consideration in the Economic and Social Council. Referring to paragraph 2, he said that his country did not participate in the International Criminal Police Organization or the Customs Co-operation Council and that his delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

62. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.48 was adopted by 115 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

63. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50 was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

64. Mr. HEINEMANN (Netherlands) said that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.50 without prejudice to the position of his Government on the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.

/...

65. Mrs. APONTE (Venezuela) said that she would have voted in favour of both draft resolutions, had she been present.

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of draft resolutions A/C.3/32/L.48 and L.50.

67. He stated that the Comoros had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.39.

68. Draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.39 was adopted without a vote.

69. Mr. HEINEMANN (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his Government had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.39 but did not intend to ratify the ILO instruments referred to in paragraph 1. While the objectives of those instruments coincided with those of his Government, they did not meet the standards applied in his country's legislation on migrant workers. On 24 November 1977, his Government had signed the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers. He also had reservations regarding the words "irrespective of their immigration status", in paragraph 2 (c). Nevertheless, the purpose and tenor of the draft resolution as a whole met with his Government's approval.

70. Mr. FAURIS (France) said that French legislation did not permit his Government to ratify ILO Convention No. 143.

71. Mr. CASS (United Kingdom) said that a White Paper issued by his Government had given a number of reasons why the United Kingdom could not ratify the ILO Convention referred to.

72. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.39.

73. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) requested the Secretariat to provide the Committee with further information on the seminars and meetings mentioned in draft resolution A/C.3/32/L.45, annex, B, within the framework of the International Anti-Apartheid Year planned for 1978.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.