

2063rd meeting

Friday, 11 October 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2063

In the absence of the Chairman, Miss Dubra (Uruguay), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections D to F), IV (section J), V (sections A to C, D, paragraphs 436 to 478, 487 to 492 and 494 to 506, and E), VI (sections A.1 to 5 and 7, E and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued) (A/9603, A/9637, A/9733, A/9764, A/9767, A/9785)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee to speak on the section of the report of the Economic and Social Council dealing with human rights questions (A/9603, chap. V, sect. C).

2. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) asked how the Committee would discuss the rather broad item before it; would it discuss only the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirtieth session,¹ dealt with in

¹ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 5.*

chapter V, section C.2 of the report of the Economic and Social Council, or would it discuss the report as a whole?

3. The CHAIRMAN said that she would prefer to follow the order of work decided on at the previous meeting as far as possible.

4. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) asked whether the Committee would begin by considering the question of human rights as such or would first discuss any draft resolutions which it might have before it at the next meeting and then go on to a more general discussion.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that it was too early to say how the Committee would deal with the item, as so far no draft resolutions had been submitted and no members had asked to speak. However, it was the Committee's practice when taking up an item to make general statements and to discuss any draft resolutions at the same time. She urged those members who wished to speak to inscribe their names on the list as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

2064th meeting

Monday, 14 October 1974, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2064

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections D to F), IV (section J), V (sections A to C, D, paragraphs 436 to 478, 487 to 492 and 494 to 506, and E), VI (sections A.1 to 5 and 7, E and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued) (A/9603, A/9637, A/9707, A/9733, A/9764, A/9767, A/9785, A/C.3/L.2106)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had before it a note by the Secretary-General on the question of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (A/9767), prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3059 (XXVIII) which had requested the Secretary-General to inform it of the consideration which might have been given to the question, under the report of the Economic and Social Council. She noted that the Committee had before it a draft resolution on the question (A/C.3/L.2106) and announced that the representatives of Australia, Belgium and Japan had become sponsors of the draft.

2. Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) said that his delegation wished to facilitate the progress of the Committee's work by introducing at the current stage draft resolution A/C.3/L.2106, of which it was a sponsor. It reserved the right to make general observations at a later stage on chapter V of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

3. Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stated that no one should be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. That article should be the point of departure for any consideration of the problem at hand, which was of increasingly grave concern, as reflected in General Assembly resolution 3059 (XXVIII), paragraph 1 of which rejected any form of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The practice of torture seemed to be slowly but gradually spreading, while the defences against it in the modern world were weakening.

4. In any discussion on torture, several distinctions should be kept clearly in mind. Torture practised by one individual

against another was reprehensible in itself, but was only remotely related to the practice of torture as a systematic State policy carried out by individuals under orders from higher authorities. It was that later form of torture in particular which should be totally eradicated. Moreover, torture could take the form of psychological as well as physical ill-treatment, intended to break an individual's mind as well as his physical resistance. His delegation was aware of the difficulty caused by the fact that something which everyone knew to exist and wished to eliminate could not be comprehensively defined. In the circumstances, efforts to eliminate the practice of torture could follow two approaches. One approach would be an absolute prohibition, as envisaged in article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (see General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) complemented by denunciations once it had been clearly established that torture had been used for any reason whatsoever. The second approach would be to attempt to provide remedies for, and strengthen the defences of, those unfortunate individuals who found themselves to be the victims of that inhuman practice.

5. The draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.3/L.2106) was based on the second approach. The sponsors believed that the strengthening of the rules governing the conduct of those exercising authority over the detainee would be a first step towards providing effective remedies and protection for the victims of torture. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to assist the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, to be held in 1975, to come to grips with the problem of torture.

6. The first two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution designed to provide the Congress with information concerning the safeguarding of persons within the legal jurisdiction of Member States from torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Member States were also requested to make observations on the most relevant articles of the draft principles on freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention submitted to the Commission on Human Rights at its eighteenth session. The sponsors realized that the draft principles, which had been prepared in 1962, had subsequently been revised in the light of observations received from Governments. Nevertheless, in view of the lapse of time since then, it would be appropriate to solicit once more the observations of Member States on the most pertinent articles. In order to facilitate the work of the Committee, the sponsors wished to request the Secretariat to circulate in the form of a conference room paper¹ the revised text of the articles in question and to make available, if possible, copies of the *Study of the Right of Everyone to be Free from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention and Exile*,² in which the draft principles were contained.

7. Operative paragraph 3 called for urgent attention to be given to the question of the development of an international code of ethics for police and related law enforce-

ment agencies, from which the sponsors did not exclude the armed forces in so far as they were concerned with the safeguarding of internal security. In that connexion, the Congress would be greatly assisted by the excellent work already done by the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control. The draft resolution, in operative paragraph 5, further requested WHO and other competent organizations, including UNESCO, to give the benefit of their specialized knowledge to the Congress by drawing up an outline of the principles of medical ethics which might be relevant to the protection of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The sponsors believed that there were principles of ethics governing the physical and mental care of individuals kept in confinement which should be observed by all those involved in the process of detention. The participation of the organizations most qualified to provide the necessary information and suggestions in that regard was not only desirable but necessary.

8. It was the belief of the sponsors that the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners,³ an authoritative set of rules which had stood the test of time and had gained increasing recognition among Member States and United Nations organs, should be expanded and strengthened. That belief had been reflected in the views expressed by a number of the expert members of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its twenty-seventh session. The strengthening of the Standard Minimum Rules would provide the victim of torture with an objective instrument to which he could refer in any attempt to ensure that he was accorded equitable treatment. Those responsible for the care of the detainee would also be provided with that same objective instrument. They were often persons acting on instructions from higher authorities and could find themselves in a difficult psychological and moral position when it came to executing those orders. Being in possession of the Standard Minimum Rules would help them solve the problems with which they are often faced because of the actions and instructions of higher authorities.

9. His delegation expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously by the Committee.

10. Mr. NOTHOMB (Belgium) recalled that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, in a statement to the 2244th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, had said that recently public opinion in Belgium, like the Belgian Government, had been deeply disturbed by various reports showing the increase throughout the world of cases of torture and ill-treatment inflicted on persons held in detention. The Minister had further stated that the Belgian delegation would firmly support all initiatives the Assembly might take in denouncing and proscribing such practices.

11. Despite the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3059 (XXVIII) on the question of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punish-

¹ Document A/C.3/XXIX/CRP.1, which was circulated at the next meeting.

² United Nations publication, Sales No. 65.XIV.2.

³ *First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders: report by the Secretariat* (United Nations publication, Sales No. 1956.IV.4), annex I.A.

ment, the situation in that sphere had not improved. Indeed, torture, which one thought of as characteristic of the Middle Ages, was now more than ever a matter of grave concern, as the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had pointed out at its twenty-seventh session.

12. His delegation welcomed the draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.2106. It was pleased that the draft entrusted an important task to the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, in which Belgium placed great hope. The draft resolution had the considerable merit of requesting WHO to draft, in close co-operation with other competent organizations, including UNESCO, an outline of the principles of medical ethics which might be relevant to the protection of detainees against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In that connexion, his delegation wished to state formally that it considered that the phrase "in close co-operation with such other competent organizations . . . as may be appropriate" in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution should be construed as implying the possibility of participation by the International Committee of the Red Cross; the Committee had incomparable experience in that field and between 1969 and 1972 it had co-operated in preparing those provisions of the Draft Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 which dealt with the treatment of prisoners and the protection of medical personnel.

13. Mr. VON STAUFFENBERG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country attached particular importance to the problems of human rights dealt with in chapter V, section C, of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/9603). Those problems should constitute a central aspect of the work of the United Nations. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, in his statement to the 2239th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, had pledged that, as a new member of the Commission on Human Rights, the Federal Republic would co-operate responsibly in that body's efforts to safeguard human rights.

14. With regard to the action taken by the Economic and Social Council on the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirtieth session,⁴ his delegation welcomed Council decision 15 (LVI), which authorized the Commission to establish a working group composed of five members to study situations which revealed a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights. It was convinced that the working group would be able to do useful preparatory work for the Commission.

15. The numerous communications received by the Division of Human Rights regarding specific violations of the human rights of individuals and groups and the information obtained from non-governmental organizations and through the mass media confirmed that one of the most serious and widespread forms of ill-treatment of human beings at the present day continued to be the application of torture, in particular with regard to political prisoners and political opponents. The consideration of individual cases by United Nations bodies was certainly one important

aspect of the struggle against such practices, but it was now time to adopt a more general and fundamental approach in order to combat and eradicate the widespread use of torture.

16. Torture was currently practised in different forms and in different degrees. If it was to be successfully combated, world public opinion must be mobilized and the United Nations must find a convincing answer to that challenge to one of the most elementary principles of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights. His delegation appreciated resolution 7 (XXVIII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (A/9767, annex I), but felt that merely improving the machinery of the United Nations for the review of allegations of violations of human rights would not be sufficient to protect individuals against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment. It should also be borne in mind that the most effective action could and should be taken at the national level. Such actions should be directed towards providing for penal sanctions and for legal and administrative safeguards to deter the use of torture. The problem was political as well as legal in character. Where public authorities considered themselves to be above the law and where there existed no respect for the rule of law, there would be the temptation to resort to extreme measures. The United Nations itself could not bring about the abolition of torture but it could help create an awareness among Governments throughout the world of the need for action in that field.

17. His delegation particularly welcomed resolution 1865 (LVI), by which the Economic and Social Council authorized the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to study the historical and current development of the right of peoples to self-determination. The universal realization of that right in Africa and in all other parts of the world was considered by the Federal Republic of Germany to be a key principle for the achievement of both national and international order. Its application constituted an essential prerequisite for the full enjoyment of other human rights and fundamental freedoms. Universal application of the right to self-determination would also enhance its validity and significance for the future development of the situation in Germany. He recalled in that connexion the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, in his address to the General Assembly, that the existing division could not be accepted as history's final dictum on the German nation, a dictum which would be spoken by the German people themselves. The Minister had gone on to say that the Federal Government was continuing its policy of working for a state of peace in Europe in which the German people would regain its unity in free self-determination. The Federal Republic of Germany deplored the use of force except in self-defence. In accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, the two International Covenants on Human Rights and the principles of general international law, it would continue to uphold the fundamental right of the German people to exercise freely and peacefully its right to self-determination. What had grown historically could not be artificially divided and forever cut into pieces by short-range considerations of power politics and ideology.

⁴ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 5.*

18. His delegation believed that human rights had to be defended constantly and universally, and that the right balance must be found between respect for national sovereignty, on the one hand, and the need to promote and protect fundamental human rights, on the other. The two International Covenants on Human Rights—one of which had already been ratified by the Federal Republic—were complementary, and the interrelationship between the two categories of rights with which they dealt should be borne in mind in any effort to protect and promote human rights. A human being could not fully appreciate the value of individual freedom if he suffered from hunger; nor could he appreciate the value of material well-being if he was subjected to torture or otherwise deprived of his human dignity.

19. Concerted action was constantly required at both the national and the international levels. In Europe, for example, it should be borne in mind that certain fundamental problems of human rights have not yet been solved. Freedom from arbitrary treatment, freedom to move about within one's own country and to leave it and return to it, freedom of information and even the basic right of life were not fully secured everywhere in Europe. For that reason, among others, the Federal Republic of Germany attached great importance to the Geneva Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. A lasting state of peace in Europe, in order to be genuine, must have the support of the peoples concerned, and required the recognition and guarantee of fundamental human rights.

20. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that her delegation was pleased to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.3/L.2016. She recalled that in 1956 the Commission on Human Rights, at its twelfth session, had recognized the need for studies of specific rights and groups of rights and that it had decided first to study the right of everyone to be free from arbitrary arrest, detention and exile.⁵ A member of the Philippine delegation had served as Chairman and as Rapporteur on the Committee established by the Commission to study that subject. The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2016 took note of the draft principles elaborated by that Committee. She further recalled that in 1961, at its seventeenth session, the Commission on Human Rights, in resolution 2 (XVIII),⁶ had requested the Committee to undertake a new separate study on the right of arrested persons to communicate with those whom it was necessary for them to consult in order to ensure their defence or to protect their essential interests. The draft resolution before the Committee therefore formed part of the long and determined effort by the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to ensure the legal protection of human rights in criminal law and procedure.

21. In 1958 the Philippine Government had sponsored a seminar in Baguio City on the protection of human rights in criminal law and procedure.⁷ It realized that peace and order were essential to development, for without them economic growth would be stunted and there would be an unfavourable climate for business activities. At the same

time it recognized that the prevention of inhuman treatment of prisoners and the maintenance of peace and order were complementary. In its efforts to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, it had introduced in the previous year important penal and police reforms.

22. Mr. STÅHL (Sweden) said that while the question under consideration had been discussed in the United Nations for some time, General Assembly resolution 3059 (XXVIII) could be considered a milestone in the fight against torture because it was the first resolution dealing exclusively with the subject. His delegation was, of course, fully aware of the limitations of a resolution, even when it had been adopted unanimously, but it considered resolution 3059 (XXVIII) as a platform upon which efforts could be joined to combat the practice of torture. It was gratified to note that interest in the question seemed to have grown considerably as indicated by the conference on torture organized by Amnesty International and held in Paris in December 1973 and by the many references to the subject during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly.

23. The question of torture had some very special aspects when compared to other problems of human rights. While the realization of human rights in general entailed the problem of differing interpretations of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, there could be no doubt about the common rejection and abhorrence of torture. Because of the strength of that common abhorrence, no country could ever admit to practising torture even if very strong evidence that it had done so was put forward, and that made it extremely difficult to come to grips with the problem. In contrast to the situation regarding capital punishment, about which Governments and individuals could openly maintain different views and on which Governments could be asked to submit information, it would be very difficult to collect information from Governments about the existence or practice of torture, or to obtain any official statistics on the subject. However, that did not mean that nothing could be done, individually or collectively, to solve the problem. It was the firm belief of his delegation that every Government wanted to do its utmost to ensure the rejection of torture. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2016, which his delegation co-sponsored, was therefore of interest to all Governments.

24. The aim of the draft resolution was not to accuse any particular country or group of countries, as that would have been self-defeating, but to achieve progress in the formulation of principles and guidelines. As operative paragraphs 4 and 5 indicated, the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders and the World Health Organization were considered suitable forums for the discussion and elaboration of such principles. The task which was to be given to them was an important one and the co-operation of all countries would be required if positive results were to be achieved. His delegation therefore stressed that the question should be considered as a separate item by the General Assembly, as decided in resolution 3059 (XXVIII), and proposed that it should be taken up at the General Assembly's thirtieth session. By then Governments would have had ample time to consider how they could contribute to a joint effort.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 3, annex I.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 8, chap. III.

⁷ For the report see ST/TAA/HR/2.

25. Mrs. WATANABE (Japan) said that in co-sponsoring the draft resolution, her delegation noted with satisfaction that the question of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was viewed from a humanitarian point of view and that no reference was made to specific instances or regions. The Japanese Constitution, in articles 36 and 38, prohibited the practice of torture. Her delegation's support for the draft resolution was based on the same spirit as that which was reflected in the Japanese Constitution, and was motivated by the hope that the text would provide a strong incentive to the rejection of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

26. Mrs. CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation was particularly pleased that high priority had been given in the Committee's agenda to the consideration of the report of the Economic and Social Council. The report, which was always one of the first items on the General Assembly's agenda, had in previous years been relegated to the end of the Third Committee's agenda, thus limiting the opportunities for in-depth consideration of questions dealt with in the report which were not inscribed as separate items. New and important problems and situations often arose, and some problems sometimes became more acute in the period between the end of the Economic and Social Council's summer session and the beginning of the General Assembly's plenary session, and there were often important developments in United Nations action during that period. Her delegation therefore hoped that the wise decision taken that year on the order of consideration of agenda items would be confirmed in subsequent years.

27. A further improvement in the organization of the Committee's work could be achieved if an account of deliberations of bodies which met after the summer session of the Economic and Social Council could be provided to the Committee in a short annex to the Council's report. That applied particularly to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, whose decisions normally reached the General Assembly long after they had been taken. It was true that at the current session resolutions 7 (XXVII) and 8 (XXVII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had been made available to the Committee in a note by the Secretary-General (A/9767), but that had been specifically requested in General Assembly resolution 3059 (XXVIII). Her suggestion referred to all the deliberations of bodies which met during the summer and she would welcome comments from other members of the Committee and from the Secretariat.

28. The success of the United Nations in the establishment of principles, standards and norms for the protection of human rights was widely recognized. The various declarations and conventions had been elaborated and adopted in a relatively short time, considering the difficulties involved in establishing norms to be applied in a diverse international community. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex) and the International Covenants on Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) were particularly important because they not only established common norms to

be respected by States within their national territories but also provided for procedures of international control of the implementation of those norms.

29. However, the achievements of the United Nations in the implementation of international instruments and in fact-finding activities on the one hand and with respect to the over-all situation of human rights on the other could not be assessed so favourably. Implementation was limited and slow to develop and in some areas and for some rights had so far been ineffective; racial discrimination was a case in point. It was a source of increasing concern that gross violations of human rights continued to be reported. The world economic situation, which was already hampering further progress in the recognition of economic, social and cultural rights, particularly in the developing countries, was giving rise to new concerns.

30. Experience had shown that when States were asked to comment on reported violations of human rights in their territories, three attitudes were taken: the reported violations were simply denied; the principle of non-interference in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of States was invoked; or the temporary character of the deprivation of certain basic rights was claimed as a justification. Meanwhile, there were growing reports of gross violations of human rights in various parts of the world. It would be difficult to determine to what extent that was a sign of a critical deterioration in the over-all situation of human rights and to what extent it indicated a more alert and sensitive public opinion. But as far as the most inhuman violations of human rights were concerned, the amount of available information was so large and the reliability of its sources so widely recognized that there was reason to believe that the international community was now experiencing an alarming deterioration of the situation. That provoked strong reactions in public opinion, as could be seen in the repeated references to the subject at the current session during the general debate at plenary meetings. She was referring in particular to the right affirmed in article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the use of the words "no one" in that article could only mean that any human being, whatever his status, and whatever the circumstances, had the right to be humanely treated. It also meant that neither the sovereignty of States nor the public interest could be accepted as justification for maltreatment of human beings. Inhuman treatment could occur in many situations, but it was in cases of detention or imprisonment that it was likely to reach the intolerable degree of torture and to occur more frequently because prisoners were undefended. That was indicated in recent reports on cases of torture and other inhuman treatment of political prisoners. In those circumstances, the consideration given to the matter by various United Nations bodies and in particular by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was timely. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2106 was also timely, and her delegation supported it because it dealt in general terms with an urgent problem which arose in various parts of the world and because it ensured continuity in United Nations action with respect to the administration of justice. She recalled that her delegation had undertaken initiatives under resolution 3144 (XXVIII), which was mentioned in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

31. Turning to consideration of the action to be taken by the United Nations to put an end to gross violations of human rights, she expressed her delegation's support of the views expressed in section XI of the Introduction to the Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization (A/9601/Add.1), concerning the efforts which should be made to ensure the protection and advancement of human rights. The means available to the United Nations for the implementation of principles and norms were certainly inadequate, considering the harsh realities of the world; only the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination operated on a permanent basis. The establishment of *ad hoc* bodies to study specific situations seemed to contribute more to the collection and dissemination of new information and the mobilization of public opinion than to the solution of particular problems. Three courses of action should be taken to strengthen the role of the United Nations. There should be early consideration of alternative approaches and ways and means of strengthening the role of the United Nations, as provided for in

General Assembly resolution 3136 (XXVIII); there should be full and speedy application of the procedures for dealing with communications, as established by Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII); and there should be wide utilization of reliably attested information from all sources, including non-governmental organizations, as indicated in resolution 7 (XXVII) of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (A/9767, annex I).

32. The first course of action would be followed at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, and it should be carefully prepared by the Secretary-General. With regard to the second course of action, she drew attention to the statement in the introduction to the report of the Secretary-General concerning the value of a discreet approach to Governments on humanitarian grounds.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

2065th meeting

Tuesday, 15 October 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2065

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections D to F), IV (section J), V (sections A to C, D, paragraphs 436 to 478, 487 to 492 and 494 to 506, and E), VI (sections A.1 to 5 and 7, E and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (*continued*) (A/9603, A/9637, A/9707, A/9733, A/9764, A/9767, A/9785, A/C.3/L.2106-2108, A/C.3/XXIX/CRP.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ecuador had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2106.

2. Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee) noted that the representative of the Netherlands, in introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.2106, had, with a view to facilitating the work of the Committee, requested the Secretariat to circulate as a conference room paper the text of the draft principles on freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, and to make available copies of the *Study on the Right of Everyone to be Free from Arbitrary Arrest, Detention and Exile*.¹ Although the study, being out of print, could not be provided to the Committee, the Secretariat had been able to circulate the revised text of the draft principles in document A/C.3/XXIX/CRP.1 which reproduced the introduction and part I of a note² by the Secretary-General which had been before the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-seventh session.

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.2107, concerning the

protection of human rights in Chile, and announced that Belgium had become a sponsor of that resolution.

4. Mr. ETUK (Nigeria), referring to the report of the Secretary-General (A/9733), expressed his delegation's sympathy with the people of the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia and the Sudano-Sahelian region. The drought in that region had affected four of Nigeria's states badly but through the concerted efforts of the Nigerian Government and of private citizens in the rest of the country its effects had been mitigated. It had therefore not been necessary for Nigeria to apply to the international community for assistance. However, in response to the United Nations appeal, the Nigerian Government had donated over \$4 million in cash to six countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region and had also donated food-stuffs at a total cost of \$1 million, excluding transportation. By 22 June 1974, over 22,000 tons of relief supplies from international organizations had been transported through Nigeria to the affected countries. The Nigerian Government had provided priority berthing, loading and storage facilities free of charge for all ships carrying relief supplies, had rendered assistance in the loading and unloading of relief consignments at airports and had made available road and rail transportation. In addition, the Nigerian Government had made donations directly to the relevant United Nations agencies.

5. The experience of the drought had highlighted the importance of pre-disaster planning and preparedness, as indicated in the report of the Secretary-General on assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations (A/9637). Prevention was better than cure, and there was a

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No. 65.XIV.2.

² E/CN.4/1044.