

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records *

UN LIBRARY

DEC 6 1976



UN/SA COLLECTION

THIRD COMMITTEE

61st meeting

held on

Friday, 26 November 1976

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 61st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 72: WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION (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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.3/31/SR.61

2 December 1976

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

76-91354

/...

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

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/31/3/chaps. II, III (sect. F, G and L), IV (sect. A), V, VI (sects. B-D) and VII (sect. D)), A/31/64, A/31/74, A/31/99, A/31/253; A/C.3/31/1, A/C.3/31/4, A/C.3/31/5, A/C.3/31/6 and Add.1, A/C.3/31/10, A/C.3/31/11, A/C.3/31/12, A/C.3/31/L.33) (continued)

1. Miss PADUA (Portugal) said that her country, although a party to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, had not in the past played a very active role in activities concerning the questions of drug abuse and drug traffic. The drug problem had been virtually non-existent in Portugal, with the exception of a few drug addicts. However, hundreds of thousands of people had arrived from the former overseas provinces; they had no work and their morale was very low, and they had introduced the habit of smoking cannabis, which, given the stage of development of Portuguese society, had spread rapidly, especially among young people, who were always eager to try something new. Portugal's lack of experience in that field made it very difficult to start a comprehensive programme to combat drug abuse and drug traffic. Such a programme would require the training of specialized personnel to work in the Police and Customs Departments. It must also include adequate treatment and rehabilitation for drug addicts and above all financial means which, in current circumstances, were beyond Portugal's capabilities.

2. Her Government was aware of the interdependence of countries in the fight against the illicit drug traffic and that really effective help could be provided only by the international organizations with experience in that field. In that regard, Portugal had for the first time attended a meeting of the Commission on Narcotic Drug in Geneva in February 1976. The participation of a Portuguese delegation in the fourth special session of that Commission had been extremely useful, because it had helped to make the other countries involved in the fight against drug abuse acquainted with the Portuguese problem. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs had been provided with estimates of the number of drug consumers (100,000) and drug addicts (30,000) in Portugal and with a breakdown of those figures according to age-group and sex. As a result of those contacts in Geneva, Dr. Sten Martens, former Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs, had visited Portugal the previous summer to assess on the spot the actual magnitude of the problem. The Portuguese authorities were awaiting his conclusions, particularly with regard to technical assistance in the training of specialized personnel in the sphere of psychology and laboratory work. Furthermore, the Portuguese delegation had established bilateral contacts at the fourth special session, especially with the Netherlands and Spanish delegations.

3. Experience showed that drug traffic was always carried out at the international level and that the existence of such traffic in one country was a reason for alarm on the part of all. Portugal was strategically situated between Europe and America, a fact which made it an entrepôt for illicit traffic in drugs.

/...

(Miss Padua, Portugal)

4. With regard to drug production, the climate of Portugal was appropriate for the growing of cannabis. There were extensive plantations of cannabis and the quantities seized by the police were constantly increasing. The Spanish and French authorities had intercepted quantities of that drug coming from Portugal, illegally exported to their countries by Portuguese smugglers.

5. The aspects she had mentioned were not the only source of concern, because the use of amphetamines and opiates was becoming more frequent. Multiple drug abuse was increasing, leading to an increase in crime. To cope with that situation, her Government had already taken a number of concrete steps towards the establishment of appropriate structures to combat drug abuse. Legislation had recently been passed setting up three bodies responsible for the implementation of the Government's policies in that field. The first was an Office directly subordinate to the Prime Minister which was the central co-ordinating body for the action carried out by various departments with regard to drug abuse and drug traffic; the second was a Drug Control and Research Centre in the Ministry of Justice, which was responsible for the repression and control of all criminal actions and for the training of officers working in the control bodies of the Police and Customs Departments. Special police agents, trained in that Centre, would in future reinforce the Police Corps all over the country; the third was a Prophylactic and Rehabilitation Study Centre in the Ministry of Social Affairs which would promote the development of the medical and social services necessary to meet the needs of the population with regard to the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts.

6. Portugal would shortly accede to the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. It would also support draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.33.

7. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country continued to be convinced of the need for further national and international measures establishing close co-operation to combat the problems of drug abuse and the illicit production of and traffic in drugs.

8. His country was a party to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and to the 1972 Protocol amending that instrument. On 8 November 1976 it had deposited with the Secretary-General its instruments of ratification of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. As one of the main producers of pharmaceutical drugs, his country had thus made a significant contribution to the world-wide struggle against drug abuse.

9. At the national level, his country had in recent years taken a number of measures under its action programme for the control of drug abuse. It had started a public information campaign, reinforced the police and customs authorities and introduced severer penalties for drug dealers; it had also introduced more stringent safety regulations with regard to pharmacies and medical doctors. However, all those efforts would be undone if it could not count on the co-operation of the international community. His country therefore appreciated the work of the International Narcotics Control Board and had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.33.

/...

10. Ms. PICKER (United States of America) said that the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, which had entered into force in August 1976 and extended international controls to a group of modern drugs, constituted a milestone on the way to fuller co-operation in the prevention, treatment and suppression of drug abuse.
11. Draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.33 called upon Governments to accede to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances. Her own country could not ratify the Convention because the necessary domestic legislation had not yet been enacted. Nevertheless, it had been complying with the Convention's reporting and control provisions and would continue to do so. Her country supported the goals of the Convention and therefore supported the draft resolution.
12. The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control had recently undertaken new programmes in Burma and Pakistan. She welcomed those initiatives of the Fund and hoped that they would develop along the lines of its highly successful collaboration with the Governments of Turkey and Afghanistan. The Fund could not single-handedly eliminate drug abuse throughout the world. Concerned Governments realized if there was to be a permanent solution to the large-scale illicit cultivation of narcotic plants it was necessary to ensure the economic development of the regions producing those substances. While the Fund could not finance the economic development of the narcotics-producing regions, it could indicate promising paths for development. That assistance, in turn, could help national authorities to focus their discussions of development plans with international financial institutions.
13. Her country was prepared to continue its active support for national and international efforts to counter the spread and harmful effects of drug abuse.
14. Mr. FAURIS (France) observed that one of the basic tasks of the United Nations with regard to drug abuse control was to adapt conventions and other international instruments to the changing conditions resulting from technical developments. Scientific progress had resulted in an increase in the number of substances used for medical or industrial purposes that lent themselves to abuse and illicit traffic. The old international instruments, especially the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, were inadequate because they covered only the old drugs, such as opium, morphine, heroin, cocaine and cannabis. With the appearance of a multitude of synthetic substances it had been necessary to reconsider the problem of control. In order to combat effectively the abuse of those new types of drug, a new instrument had been needed, one that would make it possible to control the substances not covered by the 1961 Single Convention. The International Convention on Psychotropic Substances, signed in Vienna on 21 February 1971, had filled that gap. That Convention made it possible to control effectively hallucinogens, such as LSD and mescaline, amphetamines, and a substantial number of stimulants, soporifics and tranquillizers whose consumption and abuse had increased alarmingly throughout the world.
15. In the preamble to the 1971 Convention it was stated that measures to prevent and combat abuse of psychotropic substances reflected concern to safeguard the

(Mr. Fauris, France)

physical and moral well-being of humanity. For measures against abuse to be effective they must be co-ordinated and universal, and it was also necessary to take rigorous measures to restrict the use of those substances to medical and scientific requirements and to prevent illicit traffic. The 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances drew on the work of the various prevention and control organizations set up under the Single Convention of 1961, in particular the Commission on Narcotic Drugs with regulatory functions, the International Narcotics Control Board with administrative and semi-judicial responsibilities and the World Health Organization, with scientific and technical functions.

16. During the previous year the General Assembly had adopted two resolutions and in one of them, resolution 3443 (XXX) had urged that enough countries should adhere to the Convention to bring it into force. That aim had been achieved since the Convention had received its fortieth ratification and entered into force on 16 August 1976. In its resolution 3445 (XXX) the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to give adequate priority to drug control.

17. In the current year the Third Committee was submitting to the General Assembly the draft resolution in document A/C.3/31/L.33. The text reiterated the appeal to all countries not yet parties to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances promptly to take the necessary steps to accede to it, and requested the Secretary-General to transmit the appeal to the Governments concerned. The text also appealed to all parties to the Convention and to the international drug control bodies to implement its provisions by adopting suitable legislative and administrative measures as provided for in the Convention, and finally it invited the Secretary-General and the Director-General of the World Health Organization to take into consideration the responsibility assigned to the drug control bodies of the United Nations and to the World Health Organization by the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.

18. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped to receive the greatest possible support from the countries represented on the Third Committee.

19. Miss GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that Mexico participated actively in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and had recognized its obligations as a member of the international community in taking on responsibilities as a contracting party to most of the instruments promoting international measures to combat the production and illicit traffic in drugs, and particularly the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.

20. Mexican legislation contained provisions to prohibit and punish traffic in narcotic drugs while also defining measures to protect drug victims. The competent authorities were constantly increasing their efforts to ensure compliance. Mexico also took into consideration factors related to the supply of drugs, such as the reasons why the demand for them arose. That was particularly important since the cultivation of poppy or marijuana and the preparation of narcotic drugs increased in direct proportion to demand. Illicit production would continue to exist as long as there were buyers. Studies made in Mexico showed reduced drug dependency among Mexicans, so that internal demand was

/...

(Miss Gonzalez-Martinez, Mexico)

insufficient to explain the scale on which production and supply had grown in Mexico. It could be deduced therefore that illicit cultivation in Mexico reflected a demand from outside the country; Mexico was therefore obliged to make considerable efforts and invest very large sums in attempts to control the situation.

21. Efforts to stop or at least curtail the illicit production and sale of narcotics should be pursued in the same way, together with work to reduce consumption. Mexico had put that idea forward at the special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs held at Geneva in February 1976 and had stated that the Commission and indeed the whole United Nations system should consider not only the work of investigation, prevention, treatment and cure but also the sanctions to be applied against possessors and users in pursuance of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

22. Prevention of the planting and harvest of illicit drugs posed many problems for Mexico. The producers, whose efforts to escape the vigilance of the authorities were constantly becoming more determined and more effective, dispersed cultivation sites and constantly moved them to more inaccessible localities and reduced their area so as to make them more difficult to find. The large number of plants destroyed obliged drug traffickers to increase the number of plants, hoping thus to have a better chance of obtaining production. The complex orographic composition of Mexico and the fact that it bordered the largest world market had led international gangs to believe that they would find an operating base in Mexico, and that had produced a new and harmful wave of criminality in the country, which had not originated in Mexico and most cases did not involve Mexican nationals.

23. In detailing the successes obtained by the Mexican Government between February 1975 and February 1976 in combating drug abuse it should be noted that during that period 20,185 poppy plants and 13,871 marijuana plants had been destroyed in areas of 5,742 and 5,368 hectares respectively. If the figures were compared with those for the period immediately preceding, they showed a considerable increase in the number of plants destroyed and the area in hectares which they covered. She hoped the final figures for the rigorous campaign at present being pursued would show still further progress.

24. Mexico's efforts against illicit traffic in drugs was just as intensive. During the same period 1975-1976, the authorities had succeeded in apprehending 16 international gangs operating in Mexican territory and had thus been able to put a stop to the traffic in which those gangs had been engaging, and give useful information to other countries. In addition, some 1,700 kilos of opium, 600 of heroin and 370 of cocaine had been confiscated, which was more than twice the amount of each of those drugs seized in the preceding period. It must be emphasized that cocaine, heroin and opium seized in Mexico originated outside the country and were in transit to a third country. Psychotropic substances were prepared from imported raw materials and almost always were made for export. During the period mentioned, five times more amphetamine powder had been destroyed than during the period 1974-1975.

/...

(Miss Gonzalez-Martinez, Mexico)

25. Mexico was still combating the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and in that task had always received full co-operation from the United Nations. With regard to bilateral co-operation, Mexico and the United States were a practical example worthy of note, as had been stated officially in both countries on numerous occasions.

25a. Her delegation would have pleasure in supporting draft resolution A/C.3/31/SR.33 together with any attempt to increase the world effort to put a stop to the production, manufacture, traffic in and consumption of narcotic drugs.

26. Mr. GUNA-KASEM (Thailand) said that the introductory statements by Mr. Messing-Mierzejewski to which his delegation had listened with considerable interest, had enabled him to have a clearer understanding of the over-all picture of the narcotic drug problem. The drug problem which originated in an area adjacent to Thailand, had been accentuated by the war conditions there, although it had been recognized that the problem was no longer confined to one country or region. Thailand had tried its best at the national level to suppress the abuse of narcotics and psychotropic substances and the illicit traffic in them and had increased activities in law enforcement, preventive education, treatment and rehabilitation. At the international level, Thailand had actively participated in various measures and programmes of action in co-operation with other countries and international organizations. One example was the United Nations/Thailand Programme for Drug Abuse Control operated jointly by the Thai Government and the United Nations Division of Narcotic Drugs in co-operation with WHO, ILO and UNESCO. Moreover the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control had financed projects designed to encourage the use of substitutes to curtail poppy cultivation, the introduction of improved agricultural techniques, and programmes of public information and education. That showed that the Fund was playing a significant role in the global efforts against drug abuse and that the international community should support the campaign.

27. At the regional level, the five member countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, had signed the Declaration of Principles to combat the abuse of narcotic drugs, the main aim of which was to promote co-operation not only among the member States of ASEAN but also with other international bodies involved in the prevention and eradication of drug trafficking and abuse. Thailand had hosted an international seminar attended inter alia by the heads of drug enforcement agencies from 18 countries of South-East Asia, Europe and North America, and representatives of Interpol, the International Narcotics Control Board and the United Nations. The object of the seminar was to devise a system of direct contact among national law enforcement or narcotics control agencies to prevent and suppress collaboration between producers of illicit drugs and international syndicates. In that way, the Government of Thailand had shown its firm determination to abide by its international obligations and to co-operate with other States and the United Nations in the common endeavour to find a permanent solution to an increasingly important international problem. Finally, he stated that Thailand joined in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.33.

/...

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the list of speakers in the general debate on narcotic drugs should be closed at 1 p.m. that day.

29. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 72: WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C/L.5/512/Rev.1 (ST/ESA/24); A/31/198; A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1) (continued)

30. Mrs. MEHDI (Pakistan) recalled that a few days earlier her delegation had submitted a draft resolution (A/C.3/31/L.22) on behalf of the Group of 77. Subsequently, suggestions and amendments had been received from a number of delegations, and the Group of 77 had given careful consideration to them. As a result, those suggestions and amendments which had been in consonance with the spirit and the aims of draft resolution L.22 had been accepted and those which contradicted the priorities established in that draft resolution had been rejected by the Group of 77. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 wished to emphasize that the purpose of that draft resolution was not to promote confrontation between the developed and the developing countries but, on the contrary, to obtain the support of the developed countries. In operative paragraphs 8 to 10 of the draft resolution it was recognized that some developed countries had expressed willingness to respond to third world priorities.

31. Lastly, in view of the fact that the aim of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 was to suggest ways of improving the human condition through socio-economic means, and that the draft resolution had been subjected to the most intense consideration, the sponsors hoped that there would be no further delay in its adoption.

32. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that, in the view of her delegation, the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 was one of the most important that the Committee had before it at the present session. In the field of social development it was an historic event, for it was the first time that a draft resolution on the world social situation recognized the fundamental role of the new international economic order in bringing about social progress, and it was realized that economic development would have to finance social progress. On the other hand, the draft resolution also emphasized the role of social development in bringing about economic development. It was the hope of the delegation of the Philippines that the interaction between economic and social factors would be increasingly accepted in the Committee's discussions of the world social situation.

33. At the national level, the draft resolution emphasized that the primary responsibility for the development of the developing countries rested with the developing countries themselves, which was amply and forcefully reflected in the ninth paragraph of the preamble and in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4. On the other hand, the draft resolution recognized the international dimension of social development in that the desired pace of social progress in the developing countries was impeded by the difficulties they were encountering as a result of an unjust world economic order. It was therefore necessary to observe and implement the decisions on the establishment of the new international economic order and on the International Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

/...

(Mrs. Shahani, Philippines)

34. It was the hope of her delegation that the Secretariat would give the importance it deserved to the request to the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 11 of the draft resolution.

35. The humanitarian and the social aspects of development should go hand-in-hand in the new international economic order. The delegation of the Philippines was of the view that draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 was a modest but important step forward taken in the Committee towards the unification of the new international economic order and a new human order. It hoped that the draft resolution would receive the broadest possible support.

36. Referring to the proposal in document A/C.3/31/34 that the Social Development Division, including the Promotion of Equality between Men and Women Branch, should be transferred to the Donaupark Centre in Vienna, she said that her delegation was of the view that that should not be a concern only of the Fifth Committee but also, to a great extent, a concern of the Third Committee, since the move to Vienna did not have only financial implications but very important implications for the programme of social development and the programme for women. She suggested that the Chairman should convey to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee the request that the Fifth Committee should delay its action on the proposed move until the Third Committee had discussed the subject under item 75 of its agenda and reached a decision on it. In the view of her delegation, a decision which might profoundly affect the programme for social development and the programme for women could not, in good conscience, be taken without the Third Committee being consulted. The questions of the preparations for the Third Development Decade and of the need to implement the unified approach to development as well as the implementation of the World Plan of Action adopted at the World Conference of the International Women's Year should be examined in the context of the major developments in the United Nations and of the resolutions adopted, since social development and the women's issue were items of great interest to developing and developed countries and also to countries with centrally planned economies. What her delegation was asking was that the Third Committee should be heard on a subject which might affect its future welfare. The General Assembly must discuss the implications of that move not only from the budgetary and financial point of view but also within the context of its long-term responsibilities for the promotion of social development and the status of women.

37. Miss GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 had been the subject of careful negotiation in the Group of 77 and it reflected the view that the social situation could only be envisaged globally in the economic, social and political context of development.

38. In the view of the delegation of Mexico, the draft resolution reflected that view and emphasized the obstacles which the developing countries had encountered in their effort to achieve full integrated development. The establishment of a new international economic order was one of the paths which the developing countries must take to achieve a just and equitable relationship with the developed countries, without the present disparities characterizing each group. Nevertheless, a just

/...

(Miss Gonzalez-Martinez, Mexico)

and equitable relationship between States could be achieved through mutual co-operation and respect between all States, both developed and developing, whatever their economic, social and political systems.

39. In the view of the delegation of Mexico, draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 could be put to the vote immediately, as the representative of Pakistan had said. On the other hand, the delegation of Mexico was in complete agreement with the arguments put forward by the representative of the Philippines and it therefore requested the Chairman to transmit that request to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee so that no decision on document A/C.3/31/34 might be proposed until the Third Committee had examined item 75 of its agenda.

40. Mr. WEISS (Austria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said with regard to the statements by the representatives of the Philippines and Mexico that in resolution 3529 (XXX) the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly at its thirty-first session - together with detailed information as to the administrative, operative, financial and social implications involved in a possible transfer of United Nations units to Vienna - a comprehensive report with regard to the optimum utilization of the Donaupark Centre in Vienna, a report which had been prepared in consultation with all the interested United Nations units. The examination of that report therefore corresponded to a mandate from the General Assembly which could not be altered or delayed by any Committee.

41. That item was before the Assembly for the third time. The principle that the United Nations should use the facilities at Vienna had already been agreed. The time had now come to take specific decisions on the individual units to be transferred in accordance with the guidelines adopted the previous year, and it was urgent for a decision to be taken during the current year because the staff affected needed time to prepare their move to Vienna. In addition to those procedural questions, in the view of the Austrian delegation there were a number of reasons against splitting the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs by carving out a separate unit for the realization of the objectives of the Women's Decade. The more a unit was fragmented, the less effective it would be. The plans of the Secretary-General set out in document A/C.5/31/34 called for a concentration of all social and humanitarian affairs in one strong unit. Women's rights and the development process could only be examined in the context of social and humanitarian affairs for they were an inseparable part of the social issues of the time.

42. For those substantive and procedural reasons, his delegation believed that the discussion of the Secretary-General's report on the utilization of office accommodation and conference facilities at the Donaupark Centre in Vienna should not and could not be delayed by a linkage with the much broader issue of women's rights. It therefore suggested that the various delegations should make their comments on that aspect of the Donaupark report in the debate in the Fifth Committee, where all aspects of the Secretary-General's suggestions would be thoroughly examined. It also suggested that the Committee should continue with the

/...

(Mr. Weiss, Austria)

discussion of the items on its agenda and not discuss items which were not before it. In that connexion, he referred to rule 97 of the rules of procedure, which provided that committees should not introduce new items on their own initiative.

43. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) supported the statements made by the representatives of Pakistan, the Philippines and Mexico concerning the revised draft resolution and expressed the hope that the Committee would have no difficulty in adopting it as a contribution to the development of the question of the world social situation.

44. As to the points raised by the representative of Austria with regard to the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, she took the view that the Third Committee, which should concern itself with social matters and with matters relating to women, should examine all the consequences of the said transfer. She would therefore be pleased if the Chairman were to facilitate such an examination by transmitting the request to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

45. Mr. FOLDEAK (Hungary) strongly supported the statement by the representative of Austria. The problem of the transfer to Vienna of certain sections of the United Nations should be studied carefully by the Fifth Committee in accordance with its agenda.

46. Miss BEAGLE (New Zealand) endorsed the appeal of the representative of the Philippines, since she felt that all delegations should be able to state their views on the proposed transfer of important sections of the Secretariat to Vienna. She reserved her delegation's right to state its views on the substance of the matter at a later stage.

47. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) explained that she had not proposed the establishment of a separate unit for women and that she had been referring only to the transfer of that branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs which dealt with questions concerning women.

48. Mrs. BIRIUKOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she did not understand why a question had suddenly been raised concerning the transfer of certain sections of the Secretariat to Vienna. That question did not fall within the competence of the Third Committee, but rather within that of the Secretary-General and the Fifth Committee. She agreed with the representative of Austria that that item was included in the Fifth Committee's agenda. Furthermore, what was most important was not where a section of the Secretariat was located, but rather how it functioned and how effective were the measures that it adopted and applied.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that he had taken note of the request made by the delegations concerned and of the position taken by Austria and the Soviet Union. He would contact the Chairman of the Fifth Committee and would transmit the request to him, after which that Committee would take a decision on the matter.

/...

A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1.

51. The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

52. Ms. PICKER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that her delegation had abstained for both procedural and substantive reasons. With regard to procedure, her delegation considered it most regrettable that, on a resolution of such a length, complexity and presumed importance, those delegations which had submitted it had not seen fit to undertake informal negotiations in an effort to achieve consensus. Those grounds alone would be sufficient for her delegation's refusal to support the resolution.

53. With regard to substance, her delegation had a number of objections pertaining to several preambular references and, particularly, to operative paragraphs 5-8 and 10. Many of those objections involved explicit and implicit references to the resolutions of the sixth special session of the General Assembly, on which her Government's reservations were well-known.

54. In so far as paragraph 8 might be considered to be directed at the United States, her delegation was not prepared to entertain any criticism about failure to carry out measures which the United States had not accepted and with which it did not agree. Moreover, some paragraphs of the resolution implied that social targets could be approached only in the framework of a model known as the new international economic order. Her delegation did not agree with that view. On the contrary, paragraph 1 reaffirmed the right and responsibility of each State and people to determine freely its own objectives of social development and to set its own priorities. Development must include both economic and social components. Her country agreed that economic improvement and co-operation were necessary if social targets were to be met, but it did not subscribe to only one method for achieving improved economic relationships and co-operation.

55. She was concerned at the manner in which the Third Committee was debating the world social situation and the corresponding report. She emphasized that social change was not the concern of the developing countries alone; it was not their monopoly. The developed countries also had targets of social improvements for their people, targets which had to be nationally established and which differed according to their respective history, culture and heritage. But they had a common bond in seeking to meet the basic needs and aspirations of their peoples. Yet the developed countries had not all been allowed to participate in developing a substantive and important resolution dealing with that common bond.

56. Her delegation had hoped to work towards the common objective - that of identifying and implementing social goals - and sincerely regretted that it had not been allowed to do so.

57. Mr. HEINEMANN (Netherlands) said that, in order to have reached a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1, it would have been necessary to hold detailed consultations on the subject-matter of the resolution. The members of the European Communities had been prepared to hold such consultations, which would have enabled them to comment on a number of paragraphs. They had therefore abstained on procedural grounds. They wished, however, to reaffirm the positions that they had expressed in various forums on matters dealt with in the draft resolution.

58. He also pointed out that he had been noting the number of delegations that had abstained in the vote and that, according to his calculations, there had been more than 10 since, in addition to the members of the European Economic Community, the total should include Israel, the United States and Japan.

59. Miss MASSIP (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1, in view of its support for the general principle embodied in the resolution. Her delegation had certain reservations, however, with regard to the seventh preambular paragraph and to paragraphs 5 and 6. Those paragraphs indicated that, only if the pre-conditions were created for economic growth could progress be made in the social sphere. Her delegation felt that that affirmation was liable to be misinterpreted to mean that, until those economic conditions had been created, no progress of any kind would be possible in the social sphere. She felt that it was much more useful at the current stage to concentrate on immediate measures to be taken with a view to promoting social development.

60. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1, principally because it endorsed the underlining premises. His delegation shared the view that the existence of colonialism, imperialism and foreign occupation continued to have adverse consequences on the world social situation.

61. Bulgaria agreed with the affirmation set forth in the preamble that social distress and poverty could be removed only if the pre-conditions were created for comprehensive and equitable economic growth and social development. His country also endorsed the allusion to the pernicious influence of the old international economic order because of the injustice and inequality of relations among States that it entailed.

62. The draft resolution just adopted correctly reaffirmed the right and responsibility of each State and people to determine freely its own objectives of social development, to set its own priorities and to decide in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations the means and methods of their achievement without any external interference. It also noted with satisfaction the policies and programmes adopted by many developing countries, within their over-all development plans, despite the grave financial and other external constraints.

63. Also of great importance was the fact that the draft resolution recognized the need for continued efforts at the national level towards the promotion of social progress and development aiming at the fulfilment of basic needs of all segments of the population through measures leading to more equitable redistribution of income and wealth, the elimination of hunger and malnutrition,

/...

(Mr. Bahnev, Bulgaria)

a reduction of unemployment and underemployment and the improvement of the distribution of health, housing, education and other social services.

64. The basic premise of that draft resolution was the interdependence between economic and social considerations.

65. The representative of the United States had accused all those present in the Committee of giving only lip service to the interests of development and had charged that human rights were disappearing in the name of development. The basic thesis of the United States delegation had consisted in affirming and reiterating that the essence of freedom lay in the creative capacity of the individual and in finding the means of bringing that energy to the fore.

66. One might ask how well the system praised by the United States actually functioned. It was true that in the United States Constitution there existed declarations concerning the rights of individuals; however, there was no mention of economic and social rights. The freedoms proclaimed were in reality based on the principle of private property, and in the final analysis the concept of freedom became freedom of exploitation under the capitalistic system. It was undeniable that there was racial discrimination in the United States, as was demonstrated by the precarious labour situation of Negroes, which was always worse than that of the white population. It was useless to talk of freedom when the people were denied the essential right to work. The unemployment thus created in turn brought about social ills, disease and crime. A crime was committed every six seconds in the United States. It was also useless to speak of civil rights when occurrences as shameful as Watergate took place.

67. The concept of freedom in socialist countries was completely different, since it was based on the freedom of the vast majority of the population. Freedom had to be effective, and that required full equality and economic democracy. All those principles were embodied in Bulgaria's Constitution.

68. His delegation was convinced that the only way to implement the resolution was through genuine co-operation among all States, which was not only proclaimed in the United Nations Charter but had also been one of the conclusions of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held at Helsinki.

69. Mrs. BEN AMI (Israel) said that Israel agreed with the principles of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 and was convinced of the interdependence of economic and social aspects with regard to social progress. It felt, however, that in view of the nature of the contents of the draft resolution, the question should be considered by the Second Committee or, in any case, that the Third Committee should have studied it through a working group that would hold the necessary consultations and formulate pertinent suggestions. Her delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1

/...

70. Mr. HALL (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 but wished to express certain reservations regarding the impossibility of establishing pre-conditions for social progress. It also felt that the wording of paragraph 8 could have been toned down. In any case, Australia's vote in no way altered its well-known position with regard to the new international economic order.
71. Mr. WEISS (Austria) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1, it wished to place on record its reservations concerning the wording of paragraphs 5, 6 and 8.
72. Mr. CARTER (Barbados) said that he had not been present when draft resolution A/C.3/31/L.22/Rev.1 had been put to the vote but that he would have voted in favour of it.
73. The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Committee of the unnecessary expenses incurred by the Secretariat Conference Services because of delays in or cancellations of meetings, and he urged the members to try to avoid such situations. He proposed that a time-limit should be set for submitting draft resolutions on agenda item 12.
74. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) said he assumed that the time-limit applied only to draft resolutions on the question of narcotic drugs and not to agenda item 12 in its entirety.
75. The CHAIRMAN replied that the time-limit mentioned referred to the submission of draft resolutions on any aspect of item 12.
76. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that a group of delegations, including his own, planned to submit a draft resolution on the situation of migrant workers, and he requested that they should be given a reasonable amount of time to do so.
77. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the request made by the representative of Algeria, the time-limit should be set at 6 p.m. on 29 November.
78. It was so decided.
79. Mrs. BIRIUKOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply with regard to a statement made at the meeting held on 24 November (A/C.3/31/SR.59), said that in the opinion of her delegation, consideration of the report of the Economic and Social Council was closely related to the agenda item concerning the adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, the item on the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights, and the item on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Her delegation's position was based on the fact that the activities of United Nations agencies in the field of human rights were aimed at elaborating effective and

(Mrs. Biriukova, USSR)

constructive measures to put an end to flagrant and large-scale violations of human rights throughout the world.

80. Guided by the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was party to all international instruments established with that objective in mind: the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and the Covenants on Human Rights. In its fight for universal respect for human rights, the Soviet Union had the support of the other socialist countries and of the countries that had succeeded in throwing off the yoke of colonialism.

81. The Soviet Union's consistent policy in the field of human rights was defined by the very character of the Soviet socialist State, in which real power had been put in the hands of the people and a people's socialist democracy that guaranteed human rights and fundamental freedoms for all had been established.

82. The multinational Soviet State was free from all forms of exploitation and oppression and had been strengthened by the fraternal friendship of all the peoples and nationalities of which it was composed. Within that family of free and equal republics and in accordance with the will of their peoples, the communities of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania occupied their rightful place. As Mr. Brezhnev had stated, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was a society of equal peoples in the best sense of the word.

83. At the fifty-ninth session of the Committee, held on 24 November 1976, the representative of the United States of America, instead of making a concrete contribution to the achievement of human rights, had engaged in a crude distortion of the truth and had made a contemptible attack on the Soviet Union and other States. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics categorically rejected all attempts to cast doubt on its policy in the field of human rights. The representative of the United States of America had made no reference to that country's unemployment, its racial discrimination, the 25 million who lived below the poverty line, the invasion of privacy, the corruption and all the other constant, flagrant violations of human rights which took place every day in the United States. Moreover, the United States of America adamantly refused to assume its specific international obligations and responsibilities and was not a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid or the International Covenants on Human Rights.

84. The representative of the United States of America had referred only to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, since he had also mentioned Lenin, she pointed out that Lenin had stated that democracy in the context of capitalism was a sham, a distortion which benefited only a rich minority.

85. The lack of effectiveness of United Nations activities in the field of human rights referred to by the representative of the United States of America

/...

(Mrs. Biriukova, USSR)

raised the legitimate question where the responsibility for that lack of effectiveness lay. All Members of the United Nations should in fact participate in the implementation of its decisions, and if, for example the United States of America were not providing constant support to the racist régimes in southern Africa, the flagrant violations of human rights in that region would have long since been ended. Moreover, the United States had not supported the resolutions adopted by the Third Committee on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, on the Programme of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination or on the situation of human rights in Chile.

86. The representative of the United States had also made unfounded attacks in connexion with the draft resolution proclaiming the inalienable right of all persons to live in peace and security which had been submitted by a large number of non-aligned countries and subsequently adopted by the Commission on Human Rights.

87. It was well known that the Soviet Union had always implemented all the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and it insisted that those provisions must be similarly implemented by all parties, including the United States of America.

88. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, contrary to what the representative of Saudi Arabia had said, the statement of the Permanent Representative of the United States had not been selective. It had referred to blatant, continuous cases of oppression in all continents. However, it had seemed appropriate to refer in more detail to the most serious cases.

89. With regard to the freedom of the Baltic States, it should be remembered that three independent States had been occupied by force and annexed to the Soviet Union. The United States of America would never recognize that annexation.

90. The USSR was very defensive on the subject of human rights. It spoke a great deal about freedom and human rights in socialist countries. However, if what it said was true, one wondered why thousands of persons wished to emigrate from that paradise. Totalitarian States such as the Soviet Union were insensitive to human rights and left the individual defenceless against tyranny by the State. Lenin had said that people had no need for liberty and that in a State worthy of the name there was no liberty.

91. The United States of America was prepared to discuss human rights issues with any totalitarian State. In that field the USSR and all other totalitarian States were at a considerable disadvantage.

92. He warned the USSR that détente was not simply a question of arms limitation talks but must also cover the important field of human rights. The United States would insist on observance of the Helsinki agreements on human rights and would defend the cause of human rights everywhere in the world.

/...

93. Mrs. BIRIUKOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reminded the representative of the United States that the Baltic States had been united with the USSR by the free and voluntary choice of their inhabitants. With regard to the reference to Lenin's concept of liberty, she pointed out that Lenin had always held that liberty existed only when everyone effectively enjoyed it and not when it was the monopoly of a capitalist, exploitative minority.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.