



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 57th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 129: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE DRUG TRAFFIC (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 138: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 30: INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 88: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE (continued)

- (a) WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (c) DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND AGAINST COLONIALISM, APARTHEID, ALL FORMS OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, FOREIGN AGGRESSION, OCCUPATION AND ALL FORMS OF FOREIGN DOMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 89: STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/36/3, chaps. II, V, VIII, XIX, XXIII (parts 1 and 2), XXIV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXII (part I and corr.1 and 2 and part 2), XXXIV (parts 1 and 2), XXXVI, XXXVII)

AGENDA ITEM 129: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE DRUG TRAFFIC (continued) (A/36/193)

AGENDA ITEM 138: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued) (A/36/245)

AGENDA ITEM 30: INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS (continued) (A/36/471 and Add.1, A/36/491)

1. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that his delegation wished to emphasize the particular importance it attached to implementation of the right to education as a fundamental human right. Examination of that subject at the two previous sessions of the General Assembly, in the debates in UNESCO's Executive Board during the current year and in other international forums, together with the progress report submitted by the Director-General of UNESCO (A/36/524), provided a basis for useful exchange of views on ways and means of ensuring the right to education.

2. The need to implement that basic human right on a world-wide scale was a matter of general concern. Legal recognition of its particular importance among the fundamental human rights and freedoms was reflected in many international instruments. In his country's view, however, legal recognition was not enough. Effective implementation of the right to education must be the constant concern of the United Nations and of Member States seeking to achieve the objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. The Strategy itself and other documents recently adopted by the United Nations unequivocally called upon States to implement measures to that end, the aim being to provide free education at all levels, to further cultural development and to increase scientific and technical skills. More and more documents were emphasizing the need for wider and more equitable access to education as a means of reducing inequalities and increasing the possibilities of achieving economic and social progress.

3. It was clear from the relevant documents that education should be one of the General Assembly's essential concerns, and the discussion and documentation on item 12 provided an appropriate procedural framework for examining the question. Full enjoyment of the right to education was not a mere ethical desideratum but a requirement for regenerating mankind's creative capacity, raising cultural levels and improving the quality of life.

4. The major practical concerns of States in the field of education were many and varied and it was therefore urgently necessary to make continuing, stimulating education available to the whole population as a key factor in the promotion of economic, social and cultural progress. Rigid and obsolete education systems that

/...

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

were out of touch with reality were a serious obstacle to development. The continued existence of such systems, together with the illiteracy of over 800 million human beings and the lack of equal access to education for a great many people, made it a matter of urgency to engage in a constructive dialogue aimed at securing the effective enjoyment of the right to education. The report submitted by the Director-General of UNESCO rightly stressed the absolute priority of the task of eradicating illiteracy and the pressing need to democratize educational systems.

5. In Romania, article 21 of the Constitution stipulation that citizens should enjoy the right to education and that it should be ensured by compulsory education, by making education free at all levels and by a system of State scholarships. The Education Act of 21 December 1978 further stipulated that citizens had the right to education irrespective of nationality, race, sex or religion and without any other restriction that might be discriminatory. It also ensured access to all levels and forms of education in accordance with the requirements of the economic and social development of the country and with the citizen's own wishes and aptitudes. Children began their schooling at the age of six, and education continued virtually throughout the citizen's lifetime. The right to education was embodied in a broad range of schemes for further training and in many guarantees of a social and economic nature. The State had established a wide network of schools at all levels and provided fellowships and other facilities for students. A quarter of the population was pursuing education in one form or another and the percentage was increasing, as were the funds provided each year by the budget. By 1985 the system of 12-year compulsory education would be universal.

6. His country's President, Mr. Ceaușescu, had emphasized the role of education in enabling the Romanian people to achieve their long-term objectives. His delegation firmly believed that full enjoyment of the right to education could be envisaged only in close association with the goals of economic and social development within each State and the establishment of a new international economic order. Implementation of the right of everyone, without discrimination, to education and to work, should figure prominently in every State's endeavours to promote and protect human rights. A draft resolution (A/C.3/L.55) concerning implementation of the right to education in view of the need for united efforts by all States to promote and protect that right had been circulated and would be introduced to the Committee in due course.

AGENDA ITEM 88: UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE
(continued) (A/C.3/36/L.50, L.51, L.53)

- (a) WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.3/36/L.47, L.57)
- (b) VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1)
- (c) DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND AGAINST COLONIALISM,

/...

APARTHEID, ALL FORMS OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, FOREIGN AGGRESSION, OCCUPATION AND ALL FORMS OF FOREIGN DOMINATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 89: STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
(A/C.3/36/L.54)

7. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) said she wished to suggest the addition at the end of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.50 of a clause which would read: "And that, in particular, the Third Committee should be able to consider the world survey the outline of which had been issued as document A/36/590."
8. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that the draft resolution, which addressed itself both to the substance of the question and to the need for better organization of the discussion on it in the United Nations, was the kind that was needed. It was a reminder of the Third Committee's responsibilities in the matter of the integration of women in development, and he hoped that at the next session of the General Assembly the General Committee, to which it was to be referred, would give the Third Committee every assistance in reassuming its legitimate responsibilities with respect to consideration of questions concerning social development.
9. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that the suggested addition implied that the world survey on the role of women in development would be prepared in 1982 in time for the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. If so, she wondered to what extent it would be possible for the Commission on the Status of Women to participate in the preparation of the survey, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, since it was not scheduled to meet until 1982.
10. Miss NAGA (Egypt) said that she wished to propose three amendments to the draft resolution. The first would reduce paragraph 1 to the recommendation that "documents concerning the integration of women in development should be made available to the Third Committee under the relevant item." The second would delete from paragraph 2 all the words after "General Assembly". The third would insert a new paragraph 3 which would read: "Also expresses the desire that the world survey on the role of women in development should be made available to the Third Committee before being considered."
11. Miss LORANGER (Canada) said that there had been a number of activities since the adoption of the Declaration of Mexico referred to in the first preambular paragraph. She then more proposed that the paragraph should be drafted on the following more general lines, to avoid reference to any particular activity: "Recalling the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace,". The second preambular paragraph should then start with the words: "Recalling further".
12. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), referring to the proposal for a new paragraph 3, said that she presumed the Egyptian representative meant that the world survey should

/...

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

be submitted to the Third Committee, in which case the paragraph should read: "Also expresses the desire that the world survey on the role of women in development should be submitted to the Third Committee before it is considered by the Second Committee;"

13. Mrs. SELLAMI-MESLEM (Director, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs), speaking as Director of the Advancement of Women Branch, said that the emphasis in the draft resolution was on questions concerning the integration of women in development, which, as indicated in operative paragraph 1, was being considered by both the Second and Third Committees. Since, however, the Second Committee, in resolution A/C.2/36/L.25/Rev.1, had requested the Secretary-General to submit a progress report on the preparation of the survey outlined in document A/36/590 to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, it should be made clear in draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.50 that the progress report should also be submitted to the Third Committee. She therefore suggested that it might be more appropriate to redraft operative paragraph 1 on the following lines rather than amend it in accordance with the proposal of the Egyptian representative: "Recommends, in the light of paragraphs 80, 81 and 82 of the above-mentioned report, that questions concerning the integration of women in development should be considered by both the Second and the Third Committees and that the documents relating to those questions should also be made available to the two Committees, so that their consideration by one of the two Committees would benefit constantly from the views of the other;". It was not, as the representative of Morocco had suggested, that the Third Committee should see the report before the Second Committee, but that both Committees should be consulted on the world survey. Her suggestion would also obviate the need for the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by the representative of Egypt.

14. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that, while the suggestion made by the Director of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs was an interesting one, it was the first time she had heard a suggestion put forward by a member of the Secretariat. She could not consider any proposal from the Secretary and suggested that the Director should find a delegation to submit her idea.

15. The CHAIRMAN agreed that it was unusual for a member of the Secretariat to put forward a suggestion, but the situation was unusual. He suggested that the sponsors, the movers of the amendments, and delegations and any other persons interested should discuss the matter informally.

16. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had reached an agreement with the delegation of Egypt and others that had proposed amendments to it.

17. Miss NAGA (Egypt) said that her delegation and others had agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution on a number of amendments. Operative paragraph 1 would now read: "1. Recommends, in the light of paragraphs 80, 81 and 82 of the above-mentioned report, that documents concerning the integration of women in development should be made available to the Third Committee under the relevant item;". Operative paragraph 2 would be amended to read: "2. Expresses the desire

/...

(Miss Naga, Egypt)

that this recommendation should be brought to the attention of the General Committee of the General Assembly;". There would be a new operative paragraph 3 which would read: "3. Expresses also the desire that the Third Committee should be seized of the world survey on the role of women in development, the outline of which is contained in document A/36/590;". The present operative paragraphs 3 and 4 would be renumbered accordingly. She hoped that the Committee would now be in a position to adopt the draft resolution.

18. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) thanked the other sponsors and those delegations that had proposed amendments for finding a common ground acceptable to all. The sponsors had found no difficulty in accepting the Canadian amendment because it summarized all the texts that had previously dealt with women in development. She wished to inform the representative of Morocco that there would be no difficulty in requesting the Secretary-General to ensure that the Commission on the Status of Women would be consulted in the preparation of the world survey because the Commission would be meeting in February 1982; in other words, there would be sufficient time for it to consider the draft outline.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.50, as orally amended, without a vote.

20. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.51

21. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that the sponsors had made certain changes in the text. In the last line of the third preambular paragraph, the word "new" should be deleted and the initial letters of the words "international development strategy" should be capitalized. In operative paragraph 3 the words "all the United Nations bodies and agencies concerned with the advancement of women, in particular" should be inserted before "the Centre".

22. Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.51, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.53

23. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.53 was a surprising one. In drafting it, the sponsors had had in mind women - wives, not husbands - but certain speakers, notably the representative of Mexico, must have influenced the drafting, because it seemed to be aimed at the interests of husbands, not wives. The first preambular paragraph meant in effect that Governments should include more women in delegations, embassies and permanent missions to international organizations, but the third preambular paragraph concerning regulations for accompanying spouses obviously referred to the wives of diplomatic, consular or international officials, and the fourth preambular paragraph expressed concern that women were still under-represented on the professional staffs of international organizations. If the draft resolution was really concerned with the

/...

(Mrs. Warzazi, Morocco)

under-representation of women in the various spheres in question, the operative part should have invited Governments and States to take the necessary measures to ensure more effective and greater participation of women in political decision-making, and a further paragraph should have been added inviting the Secretary-General and the Directors-General to recruit women. In fact, the implication of the draft was that women members of diplomatic missions or consular posts, or staff members of intergovernmental organizations, were seeking permission for their husbands to work in the countries to which they were posted.

24. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while the first and second preambular paragraphs seemed satisfactory, the draft resolution as a whole, and particularly the operative part, was not consistent with its own title or with the agenda item. It merely raised a complex legal problem. The question of spouses working in host countries outside missions and international organizations was a highly complicated legal question, depending on rules in both the sending and the host country. The families of diplomatic and international staff, as well as the staff themselves, enjoyed certain privileges and immunities under international law, including immunity from the jurisdiction of the host country. The Sixth Committee had recently adopted a resolution designed to strengthen the diplomatic privileges and immunities protecting diplomatic staff and their families, but the draft resolution under consideration was in conflict with existing regulations under international law in that field. It could cause difficulties for many countries and it did not solve the problem it purported to, namely equal rights to pursue a career.

24a. In the circumstances, his delegation could not support the draft resolution. The questions involved could be solved bilaterally when the need arose. Despite its title, it was in fact concerned with a limited and specific category of women with a particular status under international law. The Committee should be careful not to take any action that would conflict with action taken by the General Assembly.

25. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that, apart from the first two preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution appeared to bear no relation to its title. He suspected that its sponsors were concerned with securing permission for their spouses to work in the United States. That was perfectly reasonable, but was a matter to be dealt with between Governments and not through the United Nations. He also wondered about the implications of the draft resolution for developing countries. His Government would certainly find it difficult to provide opportunities for the spouses of staff assigned to Pakistan to pursue careers. The question of taxes would open a veritable Pandora's box.

26. He suggested that further discussion should be postponed until the legal and other considerations inherent in the draft had been thoroughly studied, and that the sponsors might consider the questions raised during the discussion but should not insist on action until the problems had been resolved.

27. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria) endorsed the points made by the previous speakers. Her Government was in favour of equal rights for women in pursuing careers, but she did not feel that the draft resolution would promote that objective. Moreover, it had

/...

(Miss Obafemi, Nigeria)

serious legal implications with which she did not think the Third Committee was competent to deal. She supported the suggestion by the representative of Pakistan that the sponsors should not press for a decision at the present time and that the interested delegations should be allowed to continue their discussions with a view to producing a draft that would be acceptable to all parties.

28. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had no serious difficulties with the draft resolution and his country already met the provisions of the first three preambular paragraphs. Resolutions had already been adopted in the United Nations on the subject of the fourth preambular paragraph. The operative paragraph, however, needed more careful consideration. It might cause difficulties in Ethiopia, which was one of the least developed countries, since there were several embassies and international organizations, and consequently a fairly large international community, in Addis Ababa.

29. He joined the representative of Pakistan in asking the sponsors not to press for a vote or decision at the present meeting. The draft resolution as it stood was confused and had no direct bearing on the subject with which it was supposed to be concerned.

30. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that since there was no agenda item on equal rights to pursue a career, the sponsors felt that the draft resolution had been correctly submitted under the item on the United Nations Decade for Women. While it was true that current measures to ensure equality between the sexes were primarily intended to improve the status of women, the purpose of the current draft was to help both sexes. The situation which it was intended to correct affected mainly professional women, but was increasingly a problem for men as well. With regard to the text's legal implications, the Vienna Conventions on diplomatic immunity placed no obstacles in the way of adoption of the draft resolution. States could negotiate formal or practical arrangements on a bilateral basis because the draft resolution did not require unconditional granting of work permits, but merely asked that each case be taken into consideration.

31. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus) said that the draft resolution would be impractical for small States with restricted job markets. While it was not binding, many States, such as Cyprus, felt a moral obligation to implement United Nations resolutions and would thus be placed in a position of having to explain why they were unable to implement the provisions of the text. The draft resolution was intended primarily for large countries and would create difficulties for small States. His delegation was therefore unable to support it.

32. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that in order to accommodate the wishes of some delegations, he would suggest that the words "favourably applications for" in the operative paragraph should be replaced by "possibilities to grant, if requested." That would leave it up to the host countries to study what possibilities existed in their labour markets and elsewhere.

33. Mr. YUSUF (Somalia) said that while his delegation had no problem with the draft resolution, it would suggest that the words "and dependents of working age" should be added after "spouses" in the operative paragraph.

/...

34. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that this third preambular paragraph referred to legal and administrative regulations which might seriously hamper the possibilities of pursuing a career. There were States, such as Pakistan, which had no such legal and administrative regulations in that regard but which had social and economic problems that could have the same effect. Despite the commendable effort made by the representative of Sweden to amend the draft, his delegation still found various elements in it that required further consideration. He therefore urged the representative of Sweden and the sponsors either to withdraw it or to postpone consideration of it until further consultations had been held.

35. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that in order to accommodate the wishes of some delegations, the sponsors would agree to amend the first phrase in the third preambular paragraph to read "Noting that in many countries, legal and administrative regulations ...". In any event, the sponsors were prepared to hold consultations at a suitable time with delegations that were interested in the draft resolution.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.53.

37. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.47

38. The CHAIRMAN said that he understood that consultations were still proceeding on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.47. Accordingly, its consideration would be postponed until the Committee's next meeting.

Draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.49 and A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1

39. Mr. RANGASHARI (India) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.49, namely, India, Jamaica and Nigeria, Together with the German Democratic Republic and the United Kingdom, were members of the Consultative Committee on the Voluntary Fund, which had studied the matter of the location of the Fund. The members of the Consultative Committee had felt that they should not make recommendations on its location since that was a matter for the General Assembly to decide and since it was clear that Member States had divided opinions in that respect. They felt that a common ground should be found, and it was for that reason that consultations had been held with interested delegations. Because of the time-limit for submission of draft resolutions, the text had been submitted, but it had been agreed to postpone its introduction pending the outcome of the consultations. The sponsors had striven to obtain wide support for the Fund in order to ensure generous contributions in the future. They did not want to see the future of the Fund jeopardized by administrative difficulties. As a result of the consultations, the sponsors had agreed to withdraw draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.49 and to support the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1, which they hoped could be adopted without a vote.

40. Miss OBAFEMI (Nigeria), supported by Miss SHARPE (Jamaica), said that she fully supported the statement just made by the representative of India and that she too hoped that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1 would be adopted without a vote.

/...

41. Mr. BROUWERS (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1, of which the Bahamas, Morocco, Oman, Samoa, Senegal and Somalia had become sponsors, said that the draft resolution was a result of intensive consultations held with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.49. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1 were grateful to the delegations of India, Jamaica and Nigeria for the spirit of co-operation which they had shown. While there were divergent views in the Committee on the future of the Voluntary Fund and its possible relocation, there was clear support for the activities which the Fund had been able to carry out thus far. The purpose of the compromise text was to ensure that those activities would continue to be carried out effectively in the coming years. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1 therefore hoped that it be adopted by consensus.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.52/Rev.1 without a vote.

43. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

44. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee must still take a decision on the procedural question of whether the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights, Mr. José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo, should be invited personally to present his interim report on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador (A/36/608).

45. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his delegation supported the comments made by the representatives of Morocco and Brazil during the most recent meeting at which that question had been discussed. Since the Special Representative had fulfilled the request that he should submit an interim report to the current session of the General Assembly, in accordance with resolution 32 (XXXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights, his delegation did not consider it timely to set a new precedent by inviting the Special Representative to present that report, in person, especially since many delegations opposed the idea.

46. Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba) said that, in view of the particularly grave violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms reported in El Salvador, as described in paragraph 2 of resolution 32 (XXXVII), and since the interim report had already been circulated, her delegation was firmly in favour of inviting the Special Representative to present the report to the Committee in person.

47. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said that, in his delegation's opinion, there was no justification for inviting the Special Representative personally to present the interim report to the Committee. Commission resolution 32 (XXXVII) indicated merely that the Special Representative should submit an interim report to the current session of the General Assembly. If the Commission had intended him to present that report in person, budgetary provisions would have been made for his trip to New York and a statement of the relevant financial implications would have been annexed to the Commission's report. In his delegation's opinion, the argument whereby the words "submit" implied that the Special Representative should present

/...

(Mr. Lagos, Chile)

the report in person reflected an incorrect interpretation, to say the least. His delegation therefore supported the interpretation set forth by the representatives of Brazil, Morocco and Argentina.

48. In addition, since the Commission on Human Rights had not even deemed it necessary for the Special Representative to present his report in person to the Commission's next session, and since the report was only provisional, the expense of bringing him to Headquarters should be avoided, especially in view of the Organization's current financial difficulties. Furthermore, inviting the Special Representative to present the report in person would set a serious precedent in connexion with the authors of future reports.

49. Lastly, he pointed out that there was no justification for inviting the Special Representative, because the intention behind the invitation was clearly to reap some political benefit from his visit. Chile refused to play that game, which was unrelated to the Committee's true concerns.

50. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that, as one of the sponsors of the resolution appointing the Special Representative, his delegation felt that the matter under consideration was so urgent that a personal introduction to the report on the situation in El Salvador was necessary and would be invaluable.

51. He observed that such an invitation would not set any precedent, because rapporteurs frequently introduced their own reports in committees. For example, in 1975 the Committee had invited the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile to present the Working Group's report. Moreover, he pointed out that the relevant decision (A/10284, part I) had been adopted without a vote. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the decision taken in connexion with the Special Representative should also be taken without a vote, particularly since the representative of El Salvador had previously indicated that his Government would not object to a personal presentation.

52. On the basis of the Committee's previous decision, he formally proposed that it should similarly take the following decision:

"The Third Committee decides to invite the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights for the investigation of the human rights situation in El Salvador, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission in accordance with Commission resolution 32 (XXXVII) of 11 March 1981, to assist the Third Committee in its consideration of the Special Representative's interim report (A/36/608)."

53. Mr. ROSALES (El Salvador) recalled the comments made at the Committee's 48th meeting by the representative of Mexico to the effect that he (Mr. Rosales) had spoken in a disrespectful way of the resolution on El Salvador adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session and the resolution subsequently adopted by the Commission on Human Rights on the same subject. He repeated that any resolution which violated normal procedures, which was unbalanced and

/...

(Mr. Rosales, El Salvador)

tendentious and which encouraged extremist positions, lacked validity and would help to put an end to violence.

54. His delegation's attitude would have been different had the General Assembly adopted a balanced, objective resolution which did not contain interventionist elements and which would thus further the cause of peace.

55. In addition, the representative of Mexico had expressed that the Special Representative had been admitted to El Salvador only in his personal capacity. Yet those were precisely the terms of his visit, as both the Special Representative and the Division of Human Rights were aware. It would have been both inconsistent and absurd for El Salvador to agree to the Special Representative's having any special status on the basis of a resolution which it did not consider to be valid.

56. Lastly, the representative of Mexico had said that he (Mr. Rosales) had referred to the Committee as a theatre. What he had actually said was that some delegations tried to turn it into a theatre for the personal appearance of the Special Representative, which they would use to disseminate unconstructive propaganda, and he had sought to alert the Committee to that intention.

57. The representative of Mexico had not commented on the observations which he, (Mr. Rosales) had made in connexion with the selective and discriminatory nature of the consideration of human rights in the United Nations. He pointed out that his statement had been general, that he had not referred to any particular country, and that he had merely described El Salvador's position on a resolution which concerned it. Accordingly, it was surprising that the representative of Mexico had felt that reference had been made to him personally. His behaviour could be understood only if one assumed that, because of the part he had played in the preparation of the relevant resolutions, he had a proprietary feeling about them and, accordingly, reacted personally when anyone spoke of those resolutions in a manner that displeased him. Such activism should be invested in a better cause, for example, that of universalizing the discussion of human rights and thus eliminating political selectivity.

58. Obviously there was a lack of respect when coarse or injurious language was used in a statement, and such language should of course be avoided. However, denying the validity of a resolution which had been rejected at the outset and which was irrelevant did not represent any lack of respect.

59. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the discussion of the item under consideration would in future be thoughtful and constructive and would respect the positions of all sides.

60. Mr. CARCEÑO MORGAN (Guatemala) expressed formal reservations in connexion with the suggestion that the Special Representative should be invited personally to present his report. Since the interim report had not yet been considered by either the Economic and Social Council or the Commission on Human Rights, a personal presentation in the Committee would be contrary to established practice and

/...

(Mr. Carceño Morgan, Guatemala)

procedures. Moreover, there was no need for such a presentation, since the interim report had already been circulated as an official document of the United Nations.

61. Mr. GONZALEZ DE LEON (Mexico) repeated that his delegation considered it to be essential for the Special Representative to present the interim report in person. As the representative of the Netherlands had stated, such appearances were no novelty, since reports of that kind were generally introduced personally. It was for that reason that the relevant resolution had not stipulated that the Special Representative should present the interim report in person.

62. As to the budgetary considerations on which arguments against the Special Representative's appearance were based, he asked the Director of the Division of Human Rights whether the Division could assume the cost of the Special Representative's trip to New York, which would probably not amount to more than \$1,000. Moreover, as he understood it, the Special Representative was traveling to places other than El Salvador, and he therefore asked the Director whether the Special Representative might not be in or near New York on the appropriate dates. If that was the case, there would be no budgetary considerations to preclude his appearing before the Committee in person.

63. In conclusion, his delegation supported the comments made by the representative of the Netherlands, who was fully authorized to interpret the Commission's intentions, considering the role the Netherlands played both in the Commission and in the context of the international protection of human rights.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.