United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
*Official Records**

THIRD COMMITTEE
66th meeting
held on
Monday, 30 November 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland)

CONTENTS

* 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.

[illegible] GENERAL
A/C.3/36/SR.66
30 December 1981
[illegible]
[illegible] ENGLISH

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 I and II), XXIV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXII (part I and Corr.1 and 2, and part II), XXXIV (parts I and II), XXXVI and SSSVII; A/36/61, 117, 136 and Add.1 and Corr.1, 138, 179, 187, 209 and Add.1, 214, 216 and Add.1, 255, 284, 354, 355, 378, 383, 421 and Corr.1, 423, 500, 524, 540, 560, 566, 584, 594, 608, 705; A/C.3/36/3, 7, 10; A/C.3/36/L.5, L.6, L.55, L.59/Rev.1, L.60-L.64, L.66, L.67/Rev.1, L.68, L.69/Rev.1, L.70-L.75, L.77, L.78, L.81-L.83, L.87-L.89)

AGENDA ITEM 30: INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/36/471 and Add.1 and 2, 363, 491; A/C.3/36/L.79, L.90)

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

(a) WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEACDE FOR WOMEN: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

(b) VOLUNTARY FUND FORTHE 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 (A/C.3/36/L.48/Rev.2, L.84-L.86)

AGENDA ITEM 129: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TRAFFIC IN DRUGS (continued) (A/36/193; A/C.3/36/L.80)

AGENDA ITEM 138: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued) (A/36/245; A/C.3/36/L.65)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolutions before it under items 12, 30, 88 and 138, beginning with those which had administrative and financial implications.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61

2. Mrs. BOSSING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Ghana and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61, on regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61 was adopted without a vote.

4. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.68

5. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cape Verde, Denmark and India had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.68, entitled "Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers".

6. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that he would not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, since he believed that the Working Group to elaborate an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families had done useful work and produced an accurate, full and detailed report. He wished to state, however, that the elaboration of conventions on the rights of workers should be entrusted to the International Labour Organisation, which had the necessary skill and experience in the field and the machinery needed to monitor the implementation of such instruments.

7. Although his delegation was strongly committed to the protection of the rights of migrant workers, it wondered whether, in view of existing budgetary constraints and the administrative and financial implications (A/C.3/36/L.83) of the draft resolution, the Working Group should really hold an intersessional meeting.

8. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) supported draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.68 and said the only reason why Morocco had not become a sponsor was the no mention was made of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Although her delegation recognized the importance of the work done by the International Labour Organisation, it believed that there was some problems for which only the international community as a whole could provide the desired solution. She pointed out in that connexion that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had recommended the elaboration of an international instrument covering all aspects of the question which had not thus far been dealt with in those prepared by ILO.

9. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.68 should be adopted without a vote.

10. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.73

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the Working Group to elaborate a final version of the draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live would be circulated shortly.

12. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom) announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.73, entitled "Question of the international legal protection of the human rights of individuals who are not citizens of the country in which they live", intended to submit a revised version which would include an additional

(Mr. Fursland, United Kingdom)

paragraph recommending that the General Assembly should take note of the report of the Working Group.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77

13. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) announced that Malawi and Sweden had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77, on the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy. The draft resolution had been revised; the words "abuse of legally produced" in the sixth line of operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by the words "licit production of", and paragraph 5 should be deleted.

14. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Mali had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

15. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her country also wished to become a sponsor.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77, as orally revised, should be adopted without a vote.

17. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78

18. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78, entitled "Observance of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", requested that the sponsors should be given a few moments to revise the text.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.79

19. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.79, on the International Year of Disabled Persons, had requested that its consideration should be deferred until the following day in order to allow for consultations. He invited the Committee to proceed to the consideration of draft resolutions which had no administrative or financial implications.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5

20. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote before the vote, expressed his delegation's concern at the proposal to convert the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile into a voluntary fund for victims of torture. At a time when the human rights situation in Chile was continuing to deteriorate, such conversion would undoubtedly hamper the efforts which the United Nations must exert in that area. The establishment of a fund for victims of torture would be an implicit recognition that torture was a normal, everyday occurrence. Since the Soviet delegation could not subscribe to that view, it would vote against the draft resolution.

21. Mrs. [illegible] (Viet Nam) said that her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5. In view of the worsening human rights situation in Chile,

/...

(Mrs. Binh-Thanh, Viet Nam)

it would be inadvisable to convert the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile into a voluntary fund for the victims of torture. She wished to reaffirm that her country gave its full backing to the struggle which the Chilean people were waging to free themselves and secure recognition of their national rights.

22. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5, and she drew attention to resolution 35/190 of 15 December 1980, by which the General Assembly itself had requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the possibility of extending the mandate of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile.

23. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation was emphatically opposed to the converstion of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile, which would be counter to all the resolutions the General Assembly had so far adopted with respect to human rights and, without the shadow of a doubt, would cause the assistance rendered to the victims of the Chilean Junta to decrease. His country, which had voted against such conversion in the Commission on Human Rights and in the Economic and Social Council, was not about to abandon that position of principle.

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5.

25. Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5 was adopted by 73 votes to 17, with 40 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.55

26. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.55: Bhutan, Cyprus, Congo, Ethiopia, Guyana, Mauritania, Sierra Leone and Viet Nam.

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.55 should be adopted without a vote.

28. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.59/Rev.1, L.69/Rev.1, L.63 and L.66

29. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) expressed satisfaction with the spirit of unity and co-operation which all the African countries had shown in respect of the four draft resolutions, which they had submitted as a whole. She proposed that they should be adopted together, by consensus.

30. Miss NAGA (Egypt) and Mr. DIAGNE (Senegal) supported the Moroccan proposal.

31. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.59/Rev.1: Burundi, Cape Verde, Guyana, Lesotho and Madagascar. Cape Verde, Costa Rica and Madagascar had decided to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.69/Rev.1, to which the

/...

(Mrs. Downing, Secretary)

following changes should be made: at the end of paragraph 1, the words "concerning assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia" should be added; and in paragraph 3, "1981" should be replaced by "1982". The following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.63: Botswana, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, France, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Turkey and United Republic of Tanzania. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.66 were now joined by Botswana, Canada, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, Mauritania, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland, Turkey and United Republic of Tanzania.

32. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.59/Rev.1, L.69/Rev.1, as orally revised, L.63 and L.66 should be adopted without a vote.

33. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.67/Rev.1

34. 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.67/Rev.1 without a vote.

35. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.71

36. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cyprus and Norway had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.71. She drew attention to a change in paragraph 3, where the words "with all due effectiveness" should be deleted.

37. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.71, as orally revised, should be adopted without a vote.

38. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.74

39. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.74 had decided to add the word "hazardous" after the word "banned" in the last preambular paragraph, and to revise paragraphs 2 and 7 as follows:

> "2. Takes note also of the conclusions and recommendations in the report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations which was submitted to the seventh session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations 2/;"
>
> "7. Invites Member States to deal with this subject through appropriate measures, including possible legislation at the national level, where they do not yet exist;".

/...

The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.74, as revised should be adopted without a vote.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.75

42. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that the informal consultations he had held with a number of delegations on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.75 indicated that it would be advisable to delete from paragraph 1 the words "with a view to allocating the item to the Sixth Committee", and to replace the word "Recommends" in paragraph 4 by the word "Decides".

43. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that given the legal nature of adoption and the fact that Islamic legislation would be incompatible with some of the provisions of the draft declaration, she wanted the Sixth Committee to consider the question. She would therefore be grateful if the representative of Sweden withdrew his proposal.

44. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the representative of Sweden for having borne in mind his consultations with many delegations; the question of which body should deal with the draft declaration could be decided later by the General Committee of the Assembly. Considering the number of items already on the General Assembly's agenda, he asked whether the Swedish delegation would consider combining the question with another agenda item.

45. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that because of the importance his country attached to the welfare of children, he wanted the question to be studied in detail and, consequently, as a separate agenda item. It was only after long consultations that he had come to the conclusion that it was unnecessary to decide for the time being which body would deal with the item and that that decision would be best left to the General Committee of the Assembly. Should the representative of Morocco press for his proposal to be withdrawn, he would ask that it should be put to the vote.

46. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) asked that the proposal to restore the words "with a view to allocating the item to the Sixth Committee" should be put to the vote.

47. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that his delegation's preference was for accepting the Swedish proposal. He proposed none the less that paragraph 1 should be amended by adding the words "with a view to possible allocation of the item to the Sixth Committee".

48. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she was prepared to accept that compromise wording if the representative of Sweden also accepted it.

49. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said that the proposal of Ethiopia was acceptable to him and that he hoped that all the delegations he had consulted would likewise find it acceptable.

50. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) said that his delegation fully supported the amendment proposed by the representative of Morocco; the legislation of various Moslem countries was, in fact, incompatible with some of the provisions of the draft declaration in the annex to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.75. Iraqi law made no provision for adoption, but articles 55 to 60 of the Act on juvenile delinquency dealt with family placement, the legal effects of which were similar to those of adoption laws. The provisions of the draft declaration to the effect that national legislation should ensure that the child became an integral part of the adoptive family and that there should be recognition, in the law, of traditional adoption within the family were contrary to Iraqi legislation, which also stipulated that parents wishing to adopt a child must both be or Iraqi nationality. Iraq could therefore not accept intercountry adoption.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the amendment proposed by the representative of Morocco, as amended by the representative of Ethiopia, was adopted without a vote.

52. It was so decided.

53. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.75, as amended and revised, should be adopted without a vote.

54. It was so decided.

Draft decision A/C.3/36/L.87

55. Mrs. RITTERHOFF (United States of America) said that her delegation was particularly concerned at the moment with helping the Secretary-General to maintain a zero-growth budget for 1982-1983. She therefore proposed that draft decision A/C.3/36/L.87 should be amended by adding at the end of the second paragraph the words "and requests the Secretary-General to include this request within the appropriation for section 6 by eliminating an equivalent programme of lower priority". She hoped, in any case, to be given time to consult her Government; she had the impression that other delegations would also like to have consultations before voting on the draft decision.

56. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that it seemed to her that the result of the United States proposal would be to impose a rather difficult undertaking on the Secretary-General.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could revert to the question at the sixty-eighth meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.65

58. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Australia, Chile, Djibouti and Suriname had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.65.

59. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, said that they had studied draft resolution

(Mr. Fureland, United Kingdom)

A/C.3/36/L.65 with interest. The proposal on promoting a new international humanitarian order seemed to them to have the laudable goal of consolidating the methods and instruments adopted in that field. In view of the extremely complex problems involved, however, they believed that Governments would need time to consider the proposal in detail and that it was essential for them to be able to do so within the most competent bodies in the field. They would therefore support draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.65 and intended to participate actively in consideration of the matter in future.

60. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.65 should be adopted without a vote.

61. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78

62. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following States had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78: Austria, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Samoa, Senegal and Sweden.

63. Mrs. LORANGER (Canada) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78 hoped that, like earlier resolutions on the observance of the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it could be adopted without a vote. Since the distribution earlier in the day of the statement of its administrative and financial implications (A/C.3/36/L.89), a number of delegations had informed her of their disquiet about the figures given in that document. She herself had been surprised by the Secretariat's estimates; in particular, she found the amount of $80,800 for arrangements for the award of human rights prizes excessive. Resolution 2217 (XXI), which the General Assembly had adopted in 1966, stipulated that human rights prizes "should not be awarded more often than at five-year intervals". Given the financial difficulties which all Member States were currently facing, her delegation therefore proposed that human rights prizes should be awarded on the fortieth anniversary of the Declaration, in December 1988, rather than in 1983, and that, accordingly, paragraph 2 (c) of the annex to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78 should be deleted.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that if heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78, as orally revised, without a vote.

65. It was so decided.

66. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said, in explanation of his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5, that it had warmly welcomed adoption of the draft resolution. His Government attached very great importance to assistance to victims of torture, and had authorized him to announce that it was prepared to contribute $150,000 to the Voluntary Fund for the first year after its establishment.

67. Mrs. BINH THANH (Viet Nam) said that her delegation had not opposed the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61, the main sponsor of which was Sri Lanka, a country with which Viet Nam had always enjoyed friendly relations. It wished, nevertheless, to explain the Vietnamese Government's position on the convening of the Colombo seminar.

68. The reason why the promotion and protection of human rights were especially cherished by the Vietnamese people was that they were still being denied the right to live in the peace and stability they required in order to rebuild their country, which had been sorely afflicted by war. Experience had shown, unfortunately, that the views of the Asian States on the question of human rights continued to differ owing to the manipulation indulged in by certain Powers which had themselves committed violations of human rights and were determined to impose their version of the facts, to the detriment of their victims. Thus, the facts had been deliverately distorted, and the serious and massive violations of human rights committed by a major Power in the region were being ignored.

69. Her delegation therefore believed that in spite of the manifest good will of the sponsors of the draft resolution, it would be difficult to prevent participants in the Colombo seminar from being misled and to ensure that the meeting contributed to the improvement of the human rights situation in Asia. Her delegation expressed categorical reservations on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61.

70. Mr. MATELJAK (Yugoslavia) siad that his delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5 did not mean that it opposed the establishment of a United Nations Voluntary Fund for victims of torture. It could not, however, support a proposal which, in effect, abolished the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile.

71. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.55, but that his Government believed that paragraph 1 should not lead to encroachment on the legislation of States or be interpreted as urging Governments to bear the entire cost of secondary education. His delegation also believed that paragraphs 2 and 3 could have the undesirable effect of splitting up the International Development Strategy, all of the objectives of which, not just the social objectives, should be supported by developing countries.

72. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation believed that draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.61, L.68, L.77 and L.78, which had financial implications, should be implemented from existing resources, particularly those which had been appropriated for activities that had been completed or were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective; they should not entail additional expenditure. His delegation had not opposed the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.78, on observance of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, since it attached great importance to that matter. It wished, however, to point out that the sponsors had chosen to include a provision on human rights prizes, a provision which should be considered carefully so that the prizes would be awarded to persons who deserved them. The practice of choosing the recipients of the prizes without reference to the views of certain regional groups should, moreover, be ended.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

73. In conclusion, he said that the fact that his delegation had not opposed draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77 should not be interpreted as a change in its position of principle regarding the financing of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

74. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) explained his delegation's position with respect to draft resolutions A/C.3/36/L.74 and A/C.3/36/L.77 which had been adopted without a vote. Although his delegation fully subscribed to the aim of the former draft resolution, on the exchange of information on banned hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products, it had reservations with respect to operative paragraph 4 which seemed vague. The term "doubtful therapeutic value" in paragraph 6 was inadequate because in many countries, including his own, all pharmaceutical products were subject to a registration procedure designed to guarantee their safety and effectiveness before they were marketed. Importing countries could protect themselves against the admission of medicinal products by insisting on WHO certificates.

75. With respect to draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77 on the international drug abuse control strategy, the deletion of operative paragraph 5 would not affect the financial implications in any way. Moreover, operative paragraph 4 indicated that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs would meet annually. His delegation would have preferred the Commission to continue meeting every two years and for it to organize any special sessions required on an ad hoc basis. With respect to the task force mentioned in paragraph 3, his delegation would have preferred the United Nations to refrain from establishing new international drug control bodies.

76. Mr. GONZALEZ de LEON (Mexico) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5 because it could not oppose the establishment of a United Nations voluntary fund for victims of torture; however, it deplored the fact that its establishment would entail the disappearance of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile.

77. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) said that her delegation had not been opposed to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61 without a vote and thanked the Government of Sri Lanka for agreeing to host the seminar to be held in Colombo. However, it reserved its position on the convening of the seminar because its objectives and agenda should be the subject of consultations with all Member States of the Asian region.

78. Mr. ORGUTSOV Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.61, it felt that the Colombo seminar should be organized in consultation with, and with the benefit of the views of, the Member States of the Asian region.

79. Mrs. RITTERHOFF (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.74 but that the co-operation of transnational corporations with the appropriate organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, as mentioned in paragraph 4, should be

(Mrs. Ritterhoff, United States)

carried out through the Governments concerned. Like the Belgian delegation, it was of the opinion that the term "doubtful therapeutic value" in paragraph 6 was too vague.

80. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C/3/36/L.61 on the understanding that the Colombo seminar would be organized and prepared in close consultation with the Governments of all the countries of Asia.

81. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5 because it recognized the highly humanitarian nature of assistance to all victims of torture.

82. Ms. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand) said, with respect to agenda item 12, that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights remained a landmark in the history of international efforts to establish a standard against which action by nations to protect fundamental human rights of their citizens could be measured. However, 32 years after the adoption of the Declaration, it unfortunately had to be recognized that human rights abuses were still widespread.

83. The United Nations had over the years instituted various mechanisms in attempts to respond to some of the most alarming situations of human rights violations. Her country had always supported the United Nations activities in that direction. While its preference had been for a non-selective approach to the policies and practices of Member States in the field of human rights, it had recognized that it was sometimes necessary to keep the situation in certain countries under special review. There were, however, some risks in such an approach; indeed, when examining the human rights situation in one State, the United Nations should not overlook the fact that it had wider obligations in that field and ignore the cases of serious violations in other States because such an attitude would weaken the effectiveness of its efforts to combat human rights abuses all over the world.

84. In the case of Chile, it was to be regretted that there had not been more vigorous response from the authorities of that country to the concern expressed by the international community about the violation of human rights there. The Special Rapporteur reported that there had been little improvement in the human rights situation in Chile and that the Chilean authorities continued to use torture.

85. With regard to El Salvador, the acts of violence had not stopped since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 35/192; since the authorities had not taken adequate measures to improve the situation, human rights continued to be violated and instability persisted.

86. The human rights situation in other parts of the world was also a cause of concern to New Zealand. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had referred to the particularly alarming situation in

(Ms. Fawthorpe, New Zealand)

Iran, where acts of violence and summary executions were increasing and the Baha'i religious community was being persecuted.

87. The human rights situation in South Africa and Namibia was still a matter of great concern to the international community. Apartheid continued to violate human rights in southern Africa and to deny the black and coloured majority the freedoms and rights enjoyed by the white minority. New Zealand supported the efforts of the United Nations to improve the situation in that region. However, the situation in southern Africa must not divert the attention of the United Nations from violations of human rights in other countries.

88. New Zealand welcomed recent moves to strengthen regional co-operation in the field of human rights, in particular the adoption by the Organization of African Unity of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, and the initiative of the Government of Sri Lanka in offering to host a seminar for the ESCAP countries, in Colombo in 1982, to consider appropriate arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights in the region.

89. New Zealand had had no difficulty in endorsing draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.5, in accordance with which the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile had been redesignated as a United Nations voluntary fund for victims of torture. The establishment of such a fund represented a practical step towards alleviating the situation of the victims of such inhuman treatment and helping them to resume a normal life.

90. Another example of practical machinery for dealing with a specific human rights problem was the Working Group on Involuntary and Enforced Disappearances set up by the Commission on Human Rights; New Zealand appreciated its efforts to co-operate actively with the Governments of the countries concerned in finding a solution to the problems associated with disappearances, and strongly supported the extension of its terms of reference.

91. Regarding chapter XXIV of the report of the Economic and Social Council, concerning drug abuse control, her Government believed that the countries of the international community must co-operate more actively in order to settle the serious social problems created by trafficking in drugs.

92. The Government of New Zealand had intensified its efforts in that field and had substantially decreased the use of certain drugs for medical purposes and also reduced their diversion to the illicit traffic. The Government was also planning new measures, including preventive education, in an attempt to reverse the trend toward non-medical use of drugs. In addition, penalties for serious drug-related offences had been increased. While drug control measures at the national level were important, bilateral and multilateral co-operation were an essential complement to national programmes.

93. New Zealand regarded the United Nations as having a special role to play in the over-all co-ordination of narcotics control activities. Measures designed to reduce demand for and improve control over illicit narcotics must go hand in

(Ms. Fawthorpe, New Zealand)

hand with development assistance to provide acceptable economic substitutes for psychotropic substances. The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control continued to play a key role in the implementation of crop substitution programmes.

94. The worsening situation and the spread of illicit trafficking were matters for concern. The sophistication of the methods used and the size of the assets available to those involved presented a challenge to the international community and the United Nations system. Her delegation welcomed the recent measures taken by the competent bodies of the United Nations to deal with all the aspects of that complex problem, in particular the adoption by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its latest session of an international drug control strategy and basic five-year programme of action, and the adoption by the Third Committee of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.77.

95. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus) said that his country attached great importance to the question of involuntary or endorced disappearances, which had been considered by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. In Cyprus, some 2,000 persons were still missing as a result of foreign aggression, which was a very high figure considering that the country's population was only about half a million.

96. His delegation therefore welcomed with great satisfaction resolution 10 (XXXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights and decision 1981/139 of the Economic and Social Council extending for another year the terms of reference of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. It also welcomed the adoption by the Third Committee without a vote of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.71 and hoped that all the Governments concerned would co-operation fully with the Working Group.

97. Disappearances of persons were a distressing contemporary phenomenon. They occurred in all parts of the world, but especially in Latin America.

98. The Special Rapporteur of the situation of human rights in Chile had stated in his report (A/36/594) that a large number of persons arrested by the Chilean authorities still could not be traced or accounted for. In view of the current situation in Chile, his delegation considered that the terms of reference of the Special Rapporteur should be extended.

99. With regard to the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador, the Special Representative appointed by the Commission on Human Rights had confirmed in his report (A/36/608) that human rights violations continued in that country and disappearances were an everyday occurrence.

100. The question of disappeared persons in Cyprus was a purely humanitarian matter and the General Assembly had adopted a number of resolutions in recent years urging the establishment of an investigatary committee which would take impartial, effective and speedy action to resolve the problem as soon as possible. The Secretary-General had finally announced in April 1981 that agreement had been reached between the parties concerned on the establishment of the committee. The investigatory committee was composed of three members:

(Mr. Phedonos-Vadet, Cyprus)

a representative of the Turkish community in Cyprus, a representative of the Greek community and a third person selected by the International Committee of the Red Cross with the agreement of the parties concerned and appointed by the Secretary-General.

101. Unfortunately, owing to procedural difficulties, the Committee had not yet been able to embark on its substantive work. It was essential for the Committee to start work without further delay. His delegation had accordingly submitted draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.72 concerning disappeared persons in Cyprus which was designed to encourage the Investigatory Committee to carry out its task and to facilitate its work.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.