



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 56th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RITTER (Panama)

later: Mr. DIRAR (Sudan)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 106: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued)

**AGENDA ITEM 103: OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR
REFUGEES (continued)**

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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

15p.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/42/3, A/42/67, A/42/121, A/42/296-S/18873, A/42/391, A/42/402-S/18979, A/42/488, A/42/496, A/42/497, A/42/498 and Add.1, A/42/499, A/42/504, A/42/506, A/42/556 and Corr.1, A/42/568, A/42/612 and Add.1, A/42/641 and Corr.1, A/42/645, A/42/646, A/42/648, A/42/658, A/42/661, A/42/667 and Corr.1, A/42/677, A/42/685, A/42/690, A/42/725, A/42/734-S/19262, A/C.3/42/1, A/C.3/42/6, A/C.3/42/L.2, L.5 and L.8)

1. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America) said that the protection of individual human rights and fundamental freedoms must remain a top priority of the United Nations. It was the right and duty of the Organization to decry human rights violations wherever they occurred and for whatever reason. No State, party, group, ideology or ideal could justify the systematic abuse of the basic rights of human beings.
2. In South Africa, apartheid continued to hold sway and deny the vast majority of the people their fundamental human rights. The existence of that cruel system had led to a violent response on the part of some of its frustrated opponents which, in turn, had triggered even more government repression. The United Nations had a responsibility to interrupt that cycle of violence and implement a peaceful dismantling of apartheid.
3. According to the report by the Special Rapporteur on Afghanistan (A/42/667), Soviet troops were the main cause of the intense armed conflict in that country and the existence of 5.5 million Afghan refugees. The Afghan people, who continued to resist Soviet occupation, had the right to live free of terror and subjugation and to determine their internal political status free from foreign intervention. Only the withdrawal of Soviet troops could lead to a process of genuine national reconstruction and respect for human rights.
4. The situation of human rights in Iran remained precarious and required ongoing review. Reports by the Special Representative (A/42/648, annex) and by Amnesty International contained numerous credible allegations of serious and systematic abuses of human rights by the Iranian Government including, inter alia, ill-treatment of political detainees, torture, arbitrary detention and summary executions.
5. Unlike the authorities in Afghanistan and Iran, the Government of Chile had demonstrated its good faith by co-operating extensively with the Special Rapporteur on Chile. None the less, his delegation was concerned at the human rights situation in that country, in particular, persistent reports of clandestine groups, allegedly with ties to the Chilean security forces, carrying out abductions, torture and even murder. The Chilean Government must make every effort to halt such actions and prosecute those responsible. While the human rights situation in Chile needed to be addressed, the approach taken to that issue by the General Assembly was not a balanced one: it refused to admit that progress had been made and that the Chilean Government was not the only source of human rights

(Mr. Walters, United States)

violations. Consequently, his Government had had to vote consistently against General Assembly resolutions on Chile. He urged a more objective assessment of the situation in Chile, which could only encourage efforts for a peaceful return to democracy.

6. In El Salvador, the Government's firm commitment to human rights and peace had continued despite natural disasters, acute economic problems and assaults from guerrilla groups. His delegation hoped that the Salvadorian Government's repeated efforts to end the violence would be matched by the illegal armed opposition. He supported the report of the Special Representative (A/42/641), which denounced the guerrillas' indiscriminate use of land mines and their efforts to destroy the nation's economy. Since El Salvador was a functioning democracy, his delegation wondered whether United Nations human rights resources might not be better used elsewhere.

7. His delegation opposed any effort to reopen the case of Guatemala in the General Assembly. Although human rights problems persisted in that country, the Government was committed to solving them.

8. The case of Nicaragua stood in marked contrast to that of Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala whose Governments, while responsible for some human rights violations, did co-operate with United Nations human rights representatives and did not pose any threat to other States. Nicaragua, on the other hand, was a country whose rulers had betrayed their revolutionary promises, creating a totalitarian State with bankrupt social and economic policies. Although growing popular rebellion had driven the Sandinist régime to take certain steps in the direction of democracy and human rights, the machinery of repression remained essentially intact. Freedom in that country would remain only a hope unless the world insisted that the Nicaraguan Government honour its promises.

9. Cuba was another régime which engaged in massive and systematic abuses of human rights. In the wake of mounting evidence of abuse, the Castro régime had taken certain measures in an attempt to improve its deteriorating image: it had released some long-term political prisoners (plantados), opened a few prisons for limited inspection and reached an agreement with the United States to facilitate the exit of some of the many Cubans wishing to emigrate. However, those limited cosmetic measures could not cover up the persistent widespread and systematic violations of human rights, including continuing arrests for political crimes, torture, tight State control of the judiciary, media and publishing activities, and discouragement of religious worship.

10. His delegation acknowledged that there had been some recent progress in the Soviet Union in the field of human rights. After years of refusal, the Soviet Government had agreed to talk with United States officials about a range of human rights issues. The number of ethnic emigrants had increased appreciably and approximately 200 political dissidents had been released from detention. Nevertheless, most of the apparent progress was subject to arbitrary reversal and, in general, the Soviet record on human rights remained highly unsatisfactory. The

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Soviet Government was not complying with the Helsinki Final Act or its other obligations in the area of human rights. Several thousand political prisoners continued to suffer conditions of detention and treatment below internationally accepted norms. Emigration procedures were arbitrary and shrouded in secrecy. Above all, the Soviet system remained fearful of the individual's capacity for independent thought and action. His Government hoped sincerely that the hesitant steps thus far taken by the Soviet Union in the area of human rights would not be the last.

11. In general, the human rights picture in Eastern Europe remained grim. Bulgaria, for example, was continuing its brutal policy of forced assimilation of the ethnic Turkish minority, forcing members of that minority to change their names and abandon their traditions, language and religion. That cruel assault must be halted and he urged Bulgaria to respond to Turkey's offers to discuss the issue seriously. Other Eastern European countries also continued to violate human rights systematically. Throughout the region, the freedoms of speech, emigration, assembly and religion were being denied or severely restricted.

12. The Kampuchean people was being denied the exercise of its fundamental human rights because of the continuing presence of Vietnamese troops. The Khmer people must be allowed to live in peace and the United Nations must insist that Viet Nam end its war against that country.

13. He had touched on only a few of the most glaring examples of systematic denial of human rights. There were many more: rulers world-wide were denying people their God-given rights. The situation might be that of a flight lieutenant overthrowing an elected Government and declaring himself Chairman, or a régime with the word "democratic" in its title which had killed thousands of people. Whatever the reason, the international community must speak out and bring pressure to bear on the offenders, and the Third Committee had a vital role to play in that process.

14. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said that his country shared with the majority of Member States serious concern over the continuing existence of massive and flagrant violations of human rights in many parts of the world. The perpetuation of the criminal system of apartheid by the racist régime of South Africa was an especially serious example, as was the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Namibia and Palestine. Despite almost universal condemnation, the continuing political, economic, military and diplomatic support received from abroad by the perpetrators of such human rights violations had been major obstacles to their elimination.

15. The continuing violations of human rights in Chile and El Salvador required close scrutiny by the international community. Although it appreciated the efforts of the Special Rapporteurs appointed to examine the situation in those countries, his delegation viewed the change in the title of the report on Chile (A/42/556 and Corr.1) as a disturbing precedent and doubted whether that change would contribute to eradicating human rights violations in that country. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71, directed against the Government and people of Mexico, also showed

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

how the wrong signals sent to the real violators of human rights could undermine the work of the United Nations in that field. The United Nations should also devote increased attention to other serious cases of human rights violations, such as the situation in South Korea, or to those cases where aggressive policies threatened the right of peoples to pursue freely the socio-economic development model of their choice.

16. Although the situation of massive and flagrant human rights violations in Turkey had been raised in other United Nations fora, the seriousness of the situation compelled his delegation to address that issue again. According to a statement made in September 1987 by 43 eminent Turkish personalities currently in exile, the Turkish régime was using deprivation of citizenship as a punishment and a means of neutralizing political opponents. The statement had cited a number of examples of the lack of democracy in Turkey including, inter alia, lawsuits against political and democratic organizations, a ban on all political parties active prior to September 1980, the continuing existence of military tribunals, imprisonment and torture of political detainees, mass murders, persecutions and forcible relocations of the Kurdish population, the blacklisting of many Turks and the banning or destruction of publications.

17. One particularly disturbing aspect of the human rights situation in Turkey was the centuries-old policy of assimilating numerous national minorities. The current brutal repression against the millions of Kurds in Turkey was simply a continuation of that policy. Action taken against that minority included long-term prison sentences, torture, police brutality, massive relocation, and prohibition of ethnic languages. Turkish officials had also been actively promoting a theory about so-called "outer Turks", the latest manifestation of a policy designed to justify Turkey's illegal claims against neighbouring countries, including his own. In an August 1987 speech, the Prime Minister of Turkey had made threats against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bulgaria and other neighbouring countries. Since then, the Turkish delegation had failed to provide the authentic text of that speech or an explanation of its meaning, and his delegation reiterated its request for such an explanation. Bulgaria also reiterated its request for an explanation of the circumstances surrounding the death in April 1986 of Bulgarian citizen Ahmed Osmanov, who had been arrested in Turkey on fabricated charges. Instead of clarifying such issues, Turkey continued to exploit the "question of immigrants" and the spurious issue of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. His country rejected Turkey's groundless accusations, which were designed to justify Turkey's far-reaching ambitions and to divert attention from its own disastrous human rights situation. By contrast, his country was in favour of a constructive dialogue on all international matters, including human rights.

18. His country condemned Turkey's continuing illegal occupation of a sizeable part of the territory of Cyprus and called for the strict implementation of the many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on that question.

19. With respect to the statement just made by the representative of the United States, he took exception to the slanderous language used in reference to

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria. Even if the two countries' political views differed, he expected the United States to act in a fair and reasonable manner in its international co-operation on human rights and other issues. While fully aware of the political sympathies of the United States, his Government had nonetheless invited high-ranking officials of that country to visit Bulgaria in September 1987 with a view to engaging in a constructive dialogue. The United States was in a poor position to criticize others, for its society was morally bankrupt. The 3 million homeless people in the United States were a pitiful example of how human rights were being protected in that country.

20. Mr. NAVON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Israel did no more than any sovereign State was expected to do in order to protect its people and territory, a duty which it would continue to fulfil despite the efforts of those who, in various diplomatic fora, sought to deny it the right. The Government of Lebanon would do better to take firm measures to curb terrorism in its own territory and summon up the courage to exercise the authority that true sovereignty conferred, only for as long as it failed to do so would Israel need to continue its security operations against constant terrorist attacks.

21. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that nations everywhere were constantly doing their utmost to ensure the exercise of human rights for all their people. Some faced greater difficulties than others in doing so, a fact that should be recognized in the relevant fora where there was certainly no place for self-righteousness and personal attacks. The attacks just made by the United States representative were all the more offensive in that that country had a record of human rights violations which few others could match. The cheap aside just made about Ghana took no account of the progress made, under the country's current leader, in reversing the decline suffered under the previous administration, a progress recognized by IMF, the World Bank and the Paris Club to which the United States itself belonged.

22. The right to secret elections was doubtless important but for people in many parts of the world the right to food, shelter and health was even more so. The genuine efforts being made in that regard should not be decried, especially by representatives of a Power whose involvement in subversion around the world was a matter of record.

23. Ms. NGUYEN BINH THANH (Viet Nam), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, at a time when her country was clearly ready to turn one page of history, it was dismaying that the United States delegation should engage in such a hostile outburst. The United States should recall its own role in attempts to reduce Viet Nam to a state of subservience and backwardness, not to mention its association with the aggressors against the struggling peoples of South Africa and Namibia and the legitimate Governments of Angola and Nicaragua. It was remarkable, too, that a country which had failed to ratify the International Covenants on Human Rights could make so many assertions on that issue.

24. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was hard to lend credence to the statement, more akin to a horror story, just made by the United States representative. Surely no one could be taken in by such an attempt to discredit the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, and their genuine efforts to enhance democratization, rectify past mistakes and fulfil their commitments under the International Covenants, by a State which disdained all such instruments. In contrast to the socialist countries' record, that of the United States was a true horror story, one in which some 30,000 children were dying because of AIDS and drug addiction and roughly 20 million citizens, including some one and a half million single mothers, were starving. United States failure to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women was perhaps significant in the light of conditions in that country.

25. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that to attribute to an ethnic group a racial origin other than its own, despite its national, cultural and religious background, was sheer racism. His delegation had spoken earlier in moderate terms, about the oppressed Turkish minority in Bulgaria, but that country's representative had regrettably chosen to react by making baseless allegations against Turkey. Bulgaria's oppression of its Turkish minority had been documented by the world press and the reports of international bodies, including the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/42/18). Bulgaria could no longer disguise the true situation and would continue to face serious problems on that score even if Turkey did not constantly raise the matter; the root cause lay in Bulgaria's internal policy.

26. Turkey had from the outset invited the Bulgarian Government to discuss the fate of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, whose rights were enshrined not only in international norms but also in treaties signed by Bulgaria and Turkey, such as the 1925 Treaty of Friendship and the 1968 Immigration Agreement. Bulgaria showed no intention of moderating its position, however; until it did, Turkey must continue to denounce that serious violation of human rights and to assert the right of Turks living in Bulgaria to decide freely on their future.

27. Mr. AHN (Observer for the Republic of Korea), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the remarks made by the Soviet delegation about human rights in his country lacked objectivity and ill became a State with such a dismal record of its own. The Republic of Korea looked forward to improvements in the Soviet Union itself as a result of glasnost and perestroika. It also endorsed the Turkish representative's observations about Bulgaria's violation of the human rights of the Turkish minority in that country. Those responsible for such violations should think before criticizing others.

28. Mr. MAHMOUD (Lebanon), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was significant that the representative of Israel had failed to mention Israeli practices in southern Lebanon, to which he had referred at an earlier meeting. It was precisely Israel's presence and policies, including its refusal to allow the stationing of United Nations forces, that prevented the Lebanese authorities from exercising their legitimate authority in the region concerned. The actions of which Israel complained had begun only after years of frustration caused by Israel's intransigence and arbitrariness, not to mention its own, utterly unjustified, acts of terrorism. Israel was the cause of the problem and it was high time that it complied with international law and the relevant Security Council resolutions and withdrew to its own territory.

29. Mr. PAK (Observer for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the time was long past when United States attempts to lecture sovereign States were tolerated in international fora. The Government and people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were proud of the relationship between their great leader and the people, a relationship not enjoyed by any of the heads of Fascist and oppressive régimes with which the United States associated.

30. Mr. NAVON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Israel had never questioned the Lebanese Government's peaceful intentions. Unfortunately, that Government's exercise of sovereign authority had long been compromised by outside interference. For example, he wondered how Lebanon intended to deal with the threat posed by the so-called Hezbollah movement, which was implacably opposed to any peaceful solution since it deemed Israel a threat to Islam.

31. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Turkish representative had again failed to answer his delegation's concerns regarding the disastrous human rights situation in Turkey. Instead, the Turkish representative had claimed that Bulgaria had refused to allow anyone to look into the situation in its country, but Bulgaria had in fact invited a group of high-ranking officials from a country whose political sympathies did not coincide with those of Bulgaria. According to the Turkish representative, all the information refuting Turkey's absurd charges was false because it had allegedly been obtained under duress. He wondered whether the letter, written in a Turkish detention centre by Bulgarian citizen Ahmed Osmanov, complaining of brutal attempts to make him speak out against Bulgaria, had also been written under duress, and if so under duress by whom. He wondered why that same Bulgarian citizen had suddenly died shortly after writing the letter and why no official explanation had been offered by the Turkish Government regarding the circumstances of that tragic case.

32. His delegation also wondered how to interpret Turkey's assurances of its willingness to pursue normal relations with Bulgaria against the backcloth of belligerent pronouncements and open threats to Bulgaria's sovereignty and territorial integrity made in a speech by Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Ozal. Despite repeated requests, his delegation had still not been furnished with the text of that speech. He wondered when Turkey would answer the questions put by

(Mr. Golemanov, Bulgaria)

Governments, international organizations and non-governmental organizations regarding its own deplorable human rights record. His delegation was not prepared to accept silence as an answer. Before Turkey could rightfully claim to be a champion of the rights of minorities, it must recognize the rights of the Kurds in Turkey.

33. Mr. MAHMOUD (Lebanon), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative had expressed concern about the Hezbollah, or Party of God, only after long years of Israeli practices which had victimized many Palestinians and Lebanese, whereas the Hezbollah had emerged only in recent years. The extremist elements in the southern region and other parts of Lebanon had emerged in response to Israeli practices. Only when the Lebanese Government regained sovereignty over southern Lebanon could it assume responsibility for occurrences in that region.

34. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his comments had apparently gone unheard and that the Bulgarian representative refused to reply to questions regarding the situation of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. Referring to paragraphs 201 and 202 of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), concerning the Turkish minority in Bulgaria and reports that Muslim members of that minority had allegedly been forced to change their names to Bulgarian names, he asked whether those paragraphs constituted approval of the Bulgarian Government's racist policies. The Bulgarian Government's claim that the name changes were voluntary completely contradicted research findings in the area of cultural anthropology. His delegation could not believe that more than 1 million people had decided voluntarily to change their names, something which would be tantamount to renouncing their traditions and personal identities. Paragraph 203 of the CERD report said that it was difficult to see how Bulgaria could be fulfilling its human rights obligations when it disregarded the existence of national minorities and ethnic groups living in its territory.

35. Mr. MORA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States representative had presented a distorted picture of the human rights situation in the world. He had attacked Cuba and other countries and had not even had the courtesy to stay and hear what they had to say in reply. With respect to the accusations made against Cuba, the United States had launched a defamation campaign focused on the Cuban prison system. The United States had referred to the situation of counter-revolutionary prisoners in Cuba, prisoners whom the United States itself had incited to commit terrorist acts, murder and espionage in Cuba. The United States had gone so far as to accuse Cuba of torturing its prisoners, but what was the true face of the United States prison system? One had only to read documents of the House Judiciary Committee or the Federal Bureau of Prisons to see that official United States policy was one of harassment and violence and that prisoners were subjected to cruel punishment and torture. With regard to United States accusations of torture and ill-treatment in Cuban jails, anyone who had any doubts should ask the inhabitants of Cuba whether they knew of a single case of torture or disappearance of a prisoner.

(Mr. Mora, Cuba)

36. The Cuban revolution had been characterized by unwavering loyalty to its principles. The defamation campaign launched by the United States against Cuba was an affront to the Cuban people, who would be the last to allow torture or ill-treatment of prisoners as that would be a contradiction of their principles.

37. Many individuals and organizations had visited Cuban prisons and had seen that prisoners' rights were respected in Cuba. With regard to long-term prisoners (plantados) convicted of murder, sabotage and other crimes against the revolution, such prisoners demanded special privileges and even refused to wear official prison uniform. He wondered whether any prisoner was allowed to behave in such a way in any United States prison. United States jurists had been allowed to visit Cuban jails in conjunction with a recent conference of American jurists held in Havana. Anyone who had any doubts regarding the treatment of prisoners in Cuba could ask them whether they had seen any cases of abuse. What really upset the United States was that the Cuban revolution had happened right under its nose and that it remained stable and unswerving despite all attempts to bring about its downfall.

38. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had already given a detailed reply regarding the CERD report and that its reply had been distributed as an official document. He invited all delegations to read that reply and to consult the corresponding summary records of CERD meetings. The paragraphs of the CERD report quoted by the Turkish representative reflected the opinion of individual CERD experts who had asked questions in accordance with a democratic procedure, which was far more than Turkey could withstand. His delegation had already answered those questions, and others asked in CERD meetings, and was still awaiting answers to its questions from the Turkish representative.

39. Miss BYRNE (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Cuban representative wanted delegates to ignore the fact that the Castro dictatorship had been a tragedy for the Cuban people. Cuba's revolution was a disaster of the first magnitude, as was amply demonstrated by the never-ending flow of refugees from Cuba. Cuban prisoners in the United States were currently rioting in order not to be sent back to Cuba.

40. Not only were Cubans denied basic political and civil rights such as freedom of speech, association and religion, as well as the right to a fair trial and freedom from torture, but they were also saddled with an inefficient, cruel and unproductive economic system. Long lines for basic goods, scarce merchandise, rationing, a deteriorating housing situation and poorly trained medical personnel were the fruits of three decades of Castroite rule. She invited delegates to examine the socio-economic indicators given in various United Nations publications according to which, in 1959, Cuba had ranked near the top among Latin American countries for almost all indicators, whereas it currently ranked near the bottom.

41. As for Viet Nam, it should withdraw from Kampuchea, thereby enabling the Kampuchean people to begin to rebuild their devastated country. Viet Nam should

(Miss Byrne, United States)

also honour human rights at home. The huge communities of Vietnamese refugees all over the world were eloquent testimony to the lack of respect for human rights in Viet Nam.

42. She would not reply to the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union because that statement struck her delegation as having been written on April Fools' Day.

43. Ms. NGUYEN BINH THANH (Viet Nam), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that her delegation would have hoped that the lesson and outcome of the Viet Nam war would have led the United States representative to reflect. It would have been better, in the interests of both Viet Nam and the United States, to try to mend the wounds of war, rather than inflame them.

44. Mr. MORA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States practised a truly hypocritical policy with regard to Cubans wishing to travel to the United States. The United States Government encouraged the illegal emigration of Cubans, in open violation of international norms and Cuban laws, while denying a visa to any Cuban who attempted to gain entry to the United States through official channels. He reiterated that socialism in Cuba was a sovereign and voluntary decision and that anyone who did not agree with that system was free to travel wherever he pleased. The United States, however, refused to grant visas to Cubans who sought to enter the country legally.

45. Cuba did not want the 5 million homeless people that could be found in the United States; nor did it want the millions of drug addicts, the tens of thousands of Indians living on reservations which were nothing more than zoos for showing off a rare and endangered species, nor the inhuman United States prison system, nor the high rates of illiteracy, crime and prostitution. Neither did Cuba want Washington's policy of constructive engagement which condoned the apartheid régime. What Cuba wanted was for the United States to allow it to live in peace with the system which the Cuban people had chosen and which they liked, and which was entitled to respect, as provided in the United Nations Charter.

46. Mr. KHYBERI (Afghanistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Permanent Representative of the United States, and the administration he represented hypocritically allowed themselves to speak of justice and independence, defending the human rights of other peoples and other countries, while those self-styled custodians of human rights were in fact involved in acts of interference, intervention, aggression and destabilization and the organization of death squads for the purpose of toppling legitimate Governments. The people of Afghanistan and of all countries were entitled to exercise their right of self-determination and to find ways of implementing human rights based upon their own aspirations. No one else had the right to impose parameters on them. The United States attitude towards human rights in Afghanistan was hypocritical and demagogic. He wondered whether the United States was trying to defend human rights in Afghanistan by financing undeclared wars, sanctioning CIA covert operations, training armed groups or undermining peace and security in the entire region by supplying Stinger rockets to the counter-revolutionaries.

(Mr. Khyberi, Afghanistan)

47. The Afghan people held the United States responsible for the death and destruction in Afghanistan and for undermining their peace, prosperity and security. Those who were not parties to human rights instruments had no right to speak on human rights.

48. Miss BYRNE (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Kabul régime was a pitiful organization, which was able to remain in power only through the presence of Soviet troops. The one million dead, five and a half million refugees and countless wounded and missing were the result of Soviet efforts to inflict that hated régime on the Afghan people.

49. Mr. KHYBERI (Afghanistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation would have appreciated it if the United States delegation had stated clearly that it was its own Government that was obstructing human rights in Afghanistan, because the United States was the main culprit behind the undeclared war in that country.

50. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, asked why the Permanent Representative of the United States, to whom the various replies had been addressed, was not present. The fact that he had left it up to his subordinates to respond to his statement did not reflect favourably on him as head of his delegation.

AGENDA ITEM 106: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2)

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2.

52. Miss KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution had been amended to read, "Considers that international co-operation in the humanitarian field will facilitate better understanding, mutual respect, confidence and tolerance among States and peoples, thus contributing to a more just and non-violent world;". Operative paragraph 7 had been amended to read, "Decides to consider the question of international co-operation in the humanitarian field under the item entitled 'New international humanitarian order'."

53. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) proposed that the words "if possible on a regular basis" be inserted in operative paragraph 3 after the word "substantially".

54. Ms. UMANA (Colombia) said that the draft resolution had been substantially amended and that her delegation had received the amendments only shortly before the meeting. It had not had sufficient time to consider the revised draft resolution and therefore requested that the Committee postpone action on it until the following day.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2 until the following day.

56. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 103: OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES
(continued) (A/C.3/42/L.77, L.78 and L.80)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.77

57. Mr. VENTEGOOT (Denmark), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.77, said that Bangladesh, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Iceland, the Netherlands and Sudan had become sponsors. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

58. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.77 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.78

59. Mr. VENTEGOOT (Denmark), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.78, said that Bangladesh, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Iceland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Senegal and Sudan had become sponsors. In an attempt to ensure a closer link between the preambular and operative parts of the draft resolution, the sequence of paragraphs had been changed. Changes had been made in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 2, 5, 6 and 14 to reflect developments in the world refugee situation over the past year. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

60. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said that her delegation would be pleased to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.78 on the understanding that operative paragraph 4, in so far as it related to armed attacks on refugee camps, must be read in the light of the conclusion on armed attacks adopted by the Executive Committee of UNHCR, which was endorsed in operative paragraph 5, and was consistent with international law. Her delegation's support of the draft resolution should not be construed as support for the view that it was unlawful under any circumstances to use force against a refugee camp or settlement, even if it was being used in a manner inconsistent with its civilian purpose.

61. Mr. BASHIR (Pakistan) said that, in operative paragraph 14, it was not clear how development-oriented organizations and agencies could assist in the attainment of durable solutions, particularly in respect of voluntary repatriation.

62. Ms. PEARCE (Australia) suggested that the words "in accordance with their respective mandates" should be added after the words "organizations and agencies" in paragraph 14.

63. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.78, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote.

64. Mr. Dirar (Sudan) took the Chair.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.80

65. Mr. RENDON (Honduras), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.80, said that the title should be "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Central America". It was the first time that a draft resolution was being introduced on the subject, although for decades the Central American region had been experiencing the adverse effects of the exodus of thousands of refugees, mainly women, children and old people, who were highly vulnerable. In accordance with the "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America", the sponsors felt that it was appropriate to call on the international community, specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide the fullest possible co-operation in humanitarian work to assist refugees and displaced persons. The draft resolution noted that voluntary repatriation was the best solution to the problem of refugees, and drew attention to the tripartite commissions set up in the region. It recognized that at the same time there were other solutions, such as local integration or resettlement. Many Central American refugees in Mexico were benefiting from local integration programmes and a valuable contribution was being made by other countries of asylum. The draft resolution stressed the importance of the humanitarian, apolitical aspect of the treatment of the problem of refugees and displaced persons. The sponsors, who had been joined by Belize, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Pakistan and Panama, hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

66. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.80 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.40, L.48 and L.62)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.40

67. Miss YOUNG (United Kingdom), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.40, said that, regrettably, the issue addressed in draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.40 was not new. For the third consecutive year, a report had been submitted on the human rights situation in Afghanistan. The report, and the introduction given by the Special Rapporteur, had made it clear that despite certain improvements, in particular in the co-operation offered to the Special Rapporteur, there continued to be grave violations of human rights in Afghanistan. New developments were referred to in the ninth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 2 and 11. Operative paragraph 11 corresponded to a plea made by the Special Rapporteur in addressing the Committee. The gravity of the situation clearly merited the attention of the international community.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.48

68. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.48, said that Antigua and Barbuda had become a sponsor. In his report, the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights had concluded that there continued to be actions in Iran which were incompatible with the international instruments

(Mr. Trouveroy, Belgium)

binding on that country and which justified the continued concern of the international community. The text of the draft resolution noted positive changes which had occurred and expressed deep concern about continuing problems. It endorsed a number of opinions expressed by the Special Representative, particularly in relation to legal obligations and commitments on human rights and the credibility of the testimony received. While noting that the Government of Iran was beginning to co-operate with the Special Representative, the draft resolution urged the Government to extend full co-operation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.62

69. Mr. VILLAGRA (Argentina), supported by Mr. ALVAREZ-VITO (Peru), requested that the deadline for introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.62 be extended until the following day.

70. Mr. Ritter (Panama) resumed the Chair.

71. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. MEZA (El Salvador), Mr. VILLAGRA (Argentina), Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India), Mr. ALVAREZ-VITO (Peru), Mr. KAM (Panama), Ms. EFFANGE (Cameroon) and Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian SSR) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that the deadline for introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.62 would be extended until the following day.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.