

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records*



UN/JA COLLECTION

THIRD COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Monday, 5 November 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOBY (Egypt)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 87: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 88: TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT (continued)

- (a) QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS FROM BEING SUBJECTED TO TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT (continued)
- (b) UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS BY MEMBER STATES AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT (continued)
- (c) DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 82: 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 (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week 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.3/34/SR.35
16 November 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 87: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued) (A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, L.16/Rev.1, L.18 to L.23, L.25 and L.26)

1. Mrs. SIBAL (India) noted that draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.19 was procedural, whereas draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.16 and L.18 dealt with important matters that could have far-reaching effects on the work carried out by the United Nations in the field of human rights. In her delegation's view, the item should be considered from the global point of view, as provided for in draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.15/Rev.2. The General Assembly would thus be able, at its thirty-fifth session and following the consideration of the item by the Economic and Social Council, to decide on the usefulness of the measures proposed in documents A/C.3/34/L.16, A/C.3/34/L.18 and A/C.3/34/L.19.

2. Accordingly, her delegation wished to propose the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly,

"Requests the Commission on Human Rights, in the context of the over-all analysis and of the study it is to undertake at its thirty-sixth session in pursuance of, respectively, operative paragraphs 2 and 9 of General Assembly resolution A/34/ ... , to examine also the proposals contained in documents A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1, A/C.3/34/L.18 and A/C.3/34/L.19, together with the views expressed on these proposals at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, and thereafter to make recommendations to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session."

3. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) said that her country's proposal (A/C.3/34/L.18) had been the subject of a full and frank debate within and outside the Committee, during which it had been made clear that the proposal was constructive and was not motivated by any aggressive considerations. A number of changes had, however, been suggested, some of which merited careful study since they broadened the scope and impact of the original proposal. Since the amendments could not be considered in detail at the current session and since, moreover, there did not appear to be sufficiently broad agreement for the adoption of the Canadian proposal, her delegation would withdraw draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.18.

4. The discussion itself had, however, yielded encouraging and positive results. In particular, the good offices function of the Secretary-General had been affirmed, the need to deal immediately with humanitarian crises had been emphasized, and the responsibility of the Secretary-General for furthering the human rights of all peoples in the interests of the world community and of the States Members of the United Nations had been stressed. In general, the sense of the need for effective vehicles to promote human rights had been reinforced.

/...

5. Mrs. FLORES (Cuba) said that draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 was the outcome of lengthy consultations designed to secure wide support for the text. In the revised version of the draft resolution, the first five preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 3 and 5 were new. The sponsors had not, however, been able to agree to certain suggestions made by other delegations. In particular, it had been suggested that other topics for study should be included in the list which appeared in paragraph 12. The sponsors had no objection to that idea, but many topics were already listed in the draft resolution and they should be treated as matters of priority. There was no reason why the Secretary-General should not be asked at a later stage to study other topics, such as those which had been suggested.

6. She announced that the delegations of Equatorial Guinea and Mali had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2.

7. Mr. DANOVI (Italy) said he would have difficulty in supporting the draft decision proposed orally by India. Of the three draft resolutions which would be referred to the Commission on Human Rights for consideration, that submitted by Canada (A/C.3/34/L.18) had been withdrawn, while draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.19 was purely procedural. Any Member State could request the inclusion of items in the agenda of the General Assembly without the need for a prior decision by the Commission on Human Rights in that regard. Moreover, the Commission on Human Rights had already been requested, in 1977, to consider a proposal concerning the establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1, therefore, was the only one of substance referred to in the draft decision proposed by India.

8. He appreciated that the Indian proposal would require further consultations and that an immediate vote on it would be inadvisable. He suggested that, in accordance with the General Assembly's rules of procedure, a vote be postponed. The purpose of the changes which he wished to introduce into draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1 was to increase the possibilities of reaching agreement. There was no need to make those changes if the draft was only going to be referred to the Commission on Human Rights. He reserved the right to propose those changes when a decision had been taken on the Indian representative's proposal.

9. Mr. ERMACORA (Austria), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, suggested that in the third line of paragraph 12, the word "first" should be added before the word "study".

10. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) asked whether, the Indian representative insisted on her proposal since draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.18 had been withdrawn. The Committee merely had before it two rather modest proposals and there was no point in referring them to the Commission on Human Rights for detailed consideration. The proposal submitted by Costa Rica and Uganda (A/C.3/34/L.19), which was procedural, had been under consideration by the Commission on Human Rights for years and there was no point in referring it back to the Commission again. If the Indian delegation insisted on its proposal, the question perhaps was whether it did so out of truly constructive motives. The Committee should not take a hasty decision in that connexion.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

11. With regard to the Cuban statement on draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, he pointed out that other proposed amendments to that draft resolution had been submitted and that it would be advisable to allow more time for their consideration. It was important to achieve a consensus on a draft resolution of such importance, and he therefore proposed that the Committee should wait a little longer before taking a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2.

12. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said her delegation appreciated the efforts made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 to arrive at a text that would be acceptable to a large number of delegations. Her delegation was prepared to support it as it stood, notwithstanding certain doubts similar to those of Austria regarding paragraph 12.

13. Costa Rica was prepared to support draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1 but would like Italy to add a reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination before the reference to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, because that was the natural sequence of those instruments.

14. Her delegation would have difficulty in accepting the Indian proposal (A/C.3/34/L.19), since it dealt solely with a matter of procedure and it would be a waste of time to refer it to the Commission on Human Rights.

15. Her delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.20.

16. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation agreed on the desirability of a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2. It appreciated that the sponsors of the draft resolution had made a number of concessions and had introduced changes in the wording. Further changes could, however, be made to satisfy all delegations and more time should therefore be allowed so that they could be considered. If that were not possible, he would simply propose that, in paragraph 9, the word "study" should be replaced by "consider", which would be more in keeping with the functions of the Commission on Human Rights.

17. He could understand why the representative of India had proposed that the Commission on Human Rights should consider the proposals in draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1, L.18 and L.19 within the context of the over-all analysis of the alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, but he could not see why those draft resolutions should be linked to paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 or, in other words, to the study which the Commission on Human Rights was to carry out at its thirty-sixth session.

18. The question of the resources of the Division of Human Rights had nothing to do with the creation of a post of High Commissioner for Human Rights, nor with the creation of a post of Under Secretary-General, nor with the redesignation of the Division as a Centre, nor with the fact that the criterion applied by the General Assembly for the redesignation of a division as a centre was that the division in

(Mr. O'Donovan, Ireland)

question should have at least 20 Professional staff members. The Division of Human Rights had 45 Professional staff members and, consequently, there was nothing to prevent the Division from becoming a Centre, as the resources at its disposal were already more than sufficient for that purpose. In a note to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had explained that a centre was a division to which the international community wished to give greater prestige. He did not believe that any delegation would not wish to give greater prestige to the Division of Human Rights and fully supported the proposal of Italy.

19. Mrs. ILIC (Yugoslavia) supported the proposal of India and considered that it would be advisable to complete the over-all analysis being undertaken by the Commission on Human Rights. Different proposals regarding ways and means for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights should be examined and a detailed analysis should be made of that process and of the various proposals for submission to the General Assembly the following year.

20. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho) said that she wished to see the proposal of India in writing as it affected draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.19 in which her delegation was most interested. Her delegation hoped that no decision would be taken on the Indian proposal as more time was required for its study.

21. Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the hope that the representative of India would consider withdrawing her proposal in view of the circumstances. He believed that it was unnecessary to refer the proposal to the Commission on Human Rights and that the redesignation of the Division should be examined by the General Assembly. The proposal involved no financial implications and referred to a matter involving protocol which the General Assembly should itself resolve without the advice of other organs.

22. His delegation wished to submit an amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, which would add, after the words "human right", in the first line of paragraph 8, the words "as emphasized in the International Covenants on Human Rights". As the right to development was being considered by the General Assembly for the first time, it would be appropriate to refer to the International Covenants as the source of that concept.

23. Mr. OZADOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, which had been submitted by a large group of non-aligned countries, as it stressed fundamental concepts which were contained in resolution 32/130. He also supported the proposal of India that the Commission on Human Rights should be requested to examine the proposals contained in the draft resolutions, bearing in mind that statements by delegations on the draft resolution in question during the previous week had shown a wide divergence of views. The Commission on Human Rights had made it clear that, with goodwill, divergences of views between States could be overcome and mutually acceptable decisions adopted.

/...

24. Mr. CALERO-RODRIGUES (Brazil) asked whether, in view of the withdrawal of the Canadian proposal, it would be appropriate to recommend the adoption of the Indian proposal.

25. The basis of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1 was to be found in the fourth preambular paragraph, which stated that the activities of the human rights sector of the United Nations Secretariat should be enhanced. That was an aim which was supported by all members of the Committee and which would be promoted by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15. In the Italian proposal it was suggested that the Division of Human Rights should be redesignated as a Centre for Human Rights and the Secretary-General was invited to ensure that adequate resources were allocated to the Centre. No organ became more effective through a change of name; in the last resort, it would increase administrative costs and reduce the attention devoted to the basic function of the Division. Moreover, in the Secretariat, the designation "centres" generally applied to subsidiary organs away from Headquarters, such as information centres.

26. In regard to draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.19, his delegation did not at the present time consider it necessary to suggest that the question of the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights should be included in the agenda of the next regular session of the General Assembly. In that connexion, any delegation could request the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda. The question of creating a post of High Commissioner should be considered from time to time until conditions were favourable for taking the proposal further but, at the current stage, his delegation doubted the usefulness of adopting such a proposal.

27. His delegation was satisfied with draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.20 regarding national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights and would support it.

28. His delegation had no major objections to draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2, although it had certain reservations, in particular with regard to paragraph 12, which would further increase the work of the Secretary-General. Nor did he believe that the provisions of paragraph 7 were essential to guarantee human rights and complete personal dignity.

29. Mr. BEKELE (Ethiopia) supported the proposal of India and considered that the Commission on Human Rights was best able to judge the course which it should follow. It would also be interesting to learn the opinion of the Commission on Human Rights on the Italian proposal for the redesignation of the Division of Human Rights as a Centre for Human Rights. With regard to the suggestion of the representative of Ireland that the word "study" in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 should be replaced by the word "examine", it was by no means certain that the sponsors would wish the Commission to examine the existing human and other resources. He therefore considered that the word "study" was correct in the context.

(Mr. Bekele, Ethiopia)

30. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had attempted to define the concept of the right to development as a human right which was founded on an international covenant. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not share that view and considered that it was a fundamental concept which required no definition. It would be sufficient to leave the text of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 as it stood.

31. He shared the views of the representative of Brazil regarding draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.19 and A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1.

32. Mrs. de ROSENHOUSE (Guatemala), referring to the surprising proposal of the delegation of India that draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.19 and A/C.3/34/L.16 should be referred to the Commission on Human Rights, said it was her view that the Committee should not take any hasty decision on the matter. She suggested that the delegation of India should withdraw its proposal or, alternatively, that the Chairman should postpone the vote so that the matter could be studied thoroughly.

33. Her delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2.

34. Ms. KEKEDO (Papua New Guinea) asked whether the delegation of India wished to retain its proposal following the withdrawal by the delegation of Canada of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.18. It would not be appropriate for the Committee to take a decision on the Indian proposal until a written text was available. She indicated her delegation's interest in draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.19 and A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1, which would be affected by that proposal.

35. Mrs. SIBAL (India) pointed out that, as draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.18 had been withdrawn, the text of the Indian proposal would not refer to that document. Her delegation considered that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.19 might have wished the text to be examined by the Commission on Human Rights in view of the fact that India had suggested that the creation of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General should also be studied by the Commission on Human Rights. As that was not so, the draft decision proposed by India would refer only to draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1.

36. While the Italian proposal was a modest one, India's position was based on the need for a careful and attentive study of, and approach to, the whole question of improving the working of the Commission on Human Rights. There was a clear connexion between the study proposed in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 and the draft decision proposed by her delegation, as the delegation of Italy had recognized when it had referred to that study in paragraph 2 of its draft resolution. The first part of paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 would request the Commission on Human Rights to study the human and other resources available to the Division of Human Rights and, on that basis to make recommendations to the General Assembly. The purpose of such recommendations was to improve the working of the Division, whatever means the Commission on Human Rights might regard as appropriate for that purpose.

37. India saw a connexion between existing resources and future recommendations. The logical thing would be to examine the question as a whole and subsequently not

/...

(Mrs. Sibal, India)

to take any decision entailing a partial approach. For the same reasons, the Italian proposal should be studied by the Commission on Human Rights. The current resources would give an idea of the situation of the Division of Human Rights. That was the logical starting point for any future decision, which might be based on one of the proposals made in that regard, on all of them or on a combination of two or more suggestions.

38. Ms. KOYE (Jamaica) agreed completely with the representative of India and believed the Committee should adopt her proposal. The crucial part of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1 was paragraph 2, which invited the Secretary-General to assure that adequate financial and other resources were allocated to the proposed Centre, in the light of the results of the study requested by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2.

39. Mrs. FLORES (Cuba) suggested that, in order to save time and reach a consensus, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 should meet for 15 or 20 minutes to study the specific proposals made by various delegations. They could consult either during a brief suspension of the meeting or later when it had risen.

40. She had been told, moreover, that the French text of paragraph 7 of that draft resolution did not correspond to the English and Spanish texts. If that was so, the text would have to be corrected.

41. Her delegation agreed with the Indian delegation on the need to refer to the Commission on Human Rights the proposals that had been made, especially draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.16/Rev.1, which should not be considered separately but rather within the context of the over-all analysis being made by the Commission on Human Rights.

42. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that, in order to find a formulation that could be adopted by consensus, his delegation wanted to propose several amendments to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2.

43. In the eighth preambular paragraph, his delegation proposed that everything after the words "of the Commission on Human Rights" should be deleted. In the tenth preambular paragraph, everything after the words "to ensure the dignity of human beings" should be deleted.

44. Paragraph 7 should be amended to read: "Recognizes that in order to fully guarantee human rights and complete personal dignity, it is necessary to guarantee the right to work and the right to education, health and proper nourishment, through the adoption of measures at the national and international levels, including the establishment of a new international economic order based on respect for human rights";

45. Paragraph 8 should be replaced by the following text: "Emphasizes that the exercise of the right to development implies a reign of peace and the establishment of an international economic order based on respect for human rights".

(Mr. Cardwell, United States)

46. Paragraph 9 should be replaced by the following text: "Requests the Secretary-General to fulfil the request of the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1979/36 to examine, in the light of the increase in the workload of the Division of Human Rights, the question of the staffing and other resources of the human rights sector of the Secretariat, bearing in mind that it should always be at a level which will allow it to discharge its duties efficiently;".

47. Paragraph 12 should be replaced by the following text: "Requests the Secretary-General, taking into account relevant information available within the United Nations system, and also taking into account General Assembly resolution 32/130, paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (g), to prepare, and present to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, a study on the nature and extent to which the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms are affected by present international conditions, including those contained in paragraph 1 (e) of resolution 32/130".

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the long list of speakers, he had the impression that the Committee was not yet ready to take any decisions on agenda item 87, in which case, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.15/Rev.2 could hold their consultations at any time before the following meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 88: TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT (continued) (A/34/146, A/34/243, A/34/389 and Corr.1 and A/34/566; A/C.3/34/L.24, L.28)

- (a) Questionnaire on the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (continued) (A/34/144)
- (b) Unilateral Declarations by Member States against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (continued) (A/34/145 and Add.1 and 2)
- (c) Draft Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (continued) (A/34/431)

49. Mrs. PADUA (Portugal), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.28, on behalf of the delegations of Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands and Portugal, said that, after the unanimous approval in 1975 of the Declaration against torture, the General Assembly had on a number of occasions requested the World Health Organization to consider the possibility of drafting a code of medical ethics for the protection of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment, against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The relevant General Assembly resolutions were mentioned in the first and third preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution.

50. The World Health Organization, which had first referred to the subject in its report to the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, had later transferred that task to the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences, which had drafted the principles

/...

(Mrs. Padua, Portugal)

that had later been endorsed by WHO and transmitted to the General Assembly in document A/34/273, mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph. The principles supplemented the Declaration of Tokyo, adopted in 1975 by the World Medical Association; that text was also contained in document A/34/273.

51. The operative part of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.23 sought to achieve an extensive circulation of the draft principles among the Governments of Member States, interested specialized agencies, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, in order to obtain a wide range of opinions and comments. That would permit the General Assembly, at its thirty-fifth session, to take the necessary action on the question. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

52. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that Italy had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24, as the representative of the Netherlands had indicated when introducing the draft resolution. That information had not been published in the Journal of the United Nations.

53. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her country had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24.

54. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that at the 33rd meeting the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24 had introduced a minor correction in paragraph 3, replacing the words "thirty-fifth session" by the words "thirty-sixth session".

55. Replying to a question put by Ms. RICHTER (Argentina), he confirmed that the sponsors of the draft resolution had inserted the words "on the basis of the questionnaire" after the words "he has received" in the third line of paragraph 6.

56. Mr. OKOTH (Uganda) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24.

57. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that, in the second line of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24, the word "a" should be replaced by the word "the".

58. The CHAIRMAN, with the approval of the sponsors, said that the Moroccan suggestion had been accepted. He further said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24, as amended, without a vote.

59. Draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.24, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.28 without a vote.

61. Draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.28 was adopted without a vote.

62. Mrs. de ROSENHOUSE (Guatemala) said that her country had intended to join the list of sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.3/34/L.24 and A/C.3/34/L.28, but had been unable to do so because of the voting.

63. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said he hoped that the circulation by the Secretary-General of the draft Code of Medical Ethics, mentioned in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.28, would include among the recipients the Sixth United Nations Congress for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Prisoners.

64. Mrs. ELMIGER (World Health Organization) said that WHO had followed with great interest the discussion on the question of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and in particular, the discussion on the draft Code of Medical Ethics. The preparation of the draft Code had proceeded at a slow pace. That was partly because, according to its constitutional mandate, WHO was an intergovernmental body concerned with medical ethics in the broad sense, and not in the sense of rules of professional relationships with patients.

65. Draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.28 requested that the draft Code be circulated to Member States, to the specialized agencies concerned and to interested intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council for their comments and suggestions. At its January 1979 session, the Executive Board of WHO had considered and endorsed the draft Code. She recalled that the Executive Board was a body of individuals technically qualified in the field of health, and designated by the member States. The draft Code of Medical Ethics had been circulated to all member States, although without a request for comments. The comments and suggestions now requested in the draft resolution would no doubt be of value to the General Assembly in finalizing its work in that complex field.

66. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria) said that her delegation would be happy to see the World Medical Assembly included among the organizations to which the draft Code of Medical Ethics would be circulated.

67. The CHAIRMAN said that the consideration of subitems (a) and (b) of agenda item 88 had been concluded.

AGENDA ITEM 82: 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 (continued) (A/C.3/34/L.27)

68. Mrs. MORRISON (Lesotho), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.27, acknowledged the help of the African Group and the Group of 77 in preparing the draft. She expressed her disagreement with the different treatment which had been given to the revised English text of the draft resolution, for which there appeared to be no reason since revisions had always been permitted.

69. She announced that Burundi, Cape Verde, the Congo, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, and that the United Republic of Cameroon had withdrawn from the original group of sponsors.

70. The following corrections should be made to the text of the draft resolution. Firstly, in the first part of the third preambular paragraph, the words "of the letter dated 14 June 1978" should be deleted and the words "text of the resolutions adopted by the Ninth" should be replaced by "text adopted by the Tenth". The third

(Mrs. Morrison, Lesotho)

preambular paragraph would thus read: "Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the text adopted by the Tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, and of the final Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana, Cuba, from 3 to 9 September 1979,". Secondly, in paragraph 5, the words "and the Government of France" should be inserted after the words "Comoro Government".

71. To reconcile the wishes of the greatest possible number of countries, the sponsors had agreed to revise paragraph 14 of the draft resolution, the last part of which would read "in its struggle to restore its rights to self-determination and independence in accordance with the United Nations Charter". The word "its" would thus be deleted from the English text.

72. At the beginning of paragraph 17, the French text should use an expression equivalent to the English "Further calls".

73. The CHAIRMAN said that two points in the French text of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.27 differed from the original English text and should be corrected. The reference to non-governmental organizations had been omitted from the second line, and the words "recognized by the OAU" should be added to the reference to national liberation movements in the last line.

74. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) and Mrs. FLORES (Cuba) said that their delegations had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.27.

75. Mrs. THANH (Viet Nam), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the 34th meeting, the representative of China, replying to the representative of the German Democratic Republic, had chosen to speak of "Viet Nam's aggression against Kampuchea", and she wished to make some clarifications.

76. The régime of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary was responsible for the tragic situation in which the people of Kampuchea currently found themselves. It was the disastrous result of four years of hell under a régime supported and supplied by Peking's hegemonistic reactionary forces, whose objective was to transform Kampuchea into a military base to attack first Viet Nam and then all the countries of South-East Asia.

77. Peking could not use the pretext of Viet Nam's supposed aggression against Kampuchea to evade its responsibility for the death of the 3 million Kampuchean murdered by Pol Pot's supporters, nor could it divert public attention from the crimes perpetrated by its 600,000 soldiers, who had caused the deaths of tens of thousands of Vietnamese during the war of aggression unleashed on 17 February 1979.

78. Faced with that Machiavellian plan of aggression and slaughter, the peoples of Viet Nam and Kampuchea should, as in the past, join together to defend their national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Both peoples would benefit from the political, moral and material assistance of all the forces of peace and justice in the world, including the German Democratic Republic. The same was true of the struggle of other oppressed countries, namely Nicaragua, Iran and Uganda, which had been amply supported by all progressive mankind.

/...

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

79. The CHAIRMAN informed the members of the Committee of the programme of work drawn up by the Bureau. Consideration of agenda item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council) was to have been begun, but since some reports connected with the item would not be available before the second half, or perhaps the end, of November, the Bureau had decided that it would be better for the Committee, after concluding its consideration of agenda items 74, 82, 84 and 87, to begin consideration of agenda items 76 (World social situation) and 77 (Implementation of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development), at the end of the week beginning 5 November. During the week beginning 12 November, the Committee would have to interrupt its consideration of those two items to begin consideration of agenda item 83 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), to which it would devote four meetings. As seven meetings had been arranged for that week, the remaining meetings would be devoted to agenda items 76 and 77. During the week beginning 19 November, the Committee would begin consideration of agenda items 72 (International Youth Year) and 81 (Policies and programmes relating to youth) and would then consider agenda item 80 (e) (World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women), taking advantage of the presence in New York at that time of the Secretary-General of the World Conference. During that same week, the Committee would also begin consideration of agenda item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council).

80. He reminded representatives that, at the beginning of the session, the Committee had decided that all draft resolutions with financial implications should be considered by the Committee before 30 November. That decision was in accordance with the decision taken by the plenary Assembly that all draft resolutions with financial implications should be submitted to the Fifth Committee by 1 December 1979 at the latest.

81. During its last two weeks of work, starting on 26 November 1979, the Committee would have to consider agenda items 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council), 79 (International Year for Disabled Persons), 78 (Question of the elderly and the aged) and 80 (United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace). The Committee would also have to consider reports from its two Working Groups; should those reports have financial implications, the draft resolutions on the work of the Working Groups would have to be considered before 30 November.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.