

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1982/SR.56
17 March 1982

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Thirty-eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 56TH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 10 March 1982, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

Report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities on its thirty-fourth session (continued)

Question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment, in particular:

(b) Question of missing and disappeared persons (continued)

Question of human rights in Chile (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES ON ITS THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION (agenda item 20) (continued) (E/CN.4/1512, Chapter I A, draft resolutions I, II and III; E/CN.4/1982/L.28; E/CN.4/1982/L.31; E/CN.4/1982/L.46)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Commission to take a decision on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 20.
2. Mr. PACE (Secretary of the Commission) stated that the financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the Sub-Commission appeared in Annex II of document E/CN.4/1512, in paragraphs 3 and 4, 13 and 14 and 17 to 19 respectively.
3. Mrs. ODIO BENITO (Costa Rica), introducing draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28 relating to the report of the Sub-Commission on the work of its thirty-fourth session, said that the preambular part referred to General Assembly resolution 36/135 and the grave concern expressed by many delegations about the human rights situation in modern society, which was shared by the Sub-Commission in its resolution 12 (XXXIV). In the draft resolution, the Commission requested the Sub-Commission to consider the terms of reference for the mandate of a United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights and to submit its proposals to the Commission at its thirty-ninth session. It further decided to resume consideration of the question of the establishment of a post of High Commissioner under the item "Further promotion and encouragement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, etc."
4. The Gambia, Norway, Panama and Senegal had become sponsors of the draft resolution.
5. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) introducing document E/CN.4/1982/L.46, an amendment to draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28, observed that the main purpose of the draft resolution was to request the Sub-Commission to formulate the terms of reference of a High Commissioner for Human Rights. However, operative paragraph 1 went further since, by approving Sub-Commission resolution 12 (XXXIV), members of the Commission would be endorsing the idea of establishing the post of High Commissioner, a very controversial issue which had been only superficially studied by the Commission. Some delegates were favourable to the idea on principle, others were equally opposed on principle; some regarded a High Commissioner as a kind of super-diplomat, others as just another international official and still others as a valiant knight whose very existence would improve the human rights situation throughout the world. Members of the Commission should therefore first reach a consensus on the idea of the post itself before examining the implications of all kinds.
6. Brazil was not sure that the Sub-Commission was the appropriate body to formulate the terms of reference for the High Commissioner because it seemed to have a **very precise** idea of his role already and was likely to overlook certain negative aspects of the matter; however, it was not clear to what other body the Commission could entrust the task. It should at least give some guidance to the Sub-Commission about how the latter was to formulate the terms of reference of the High Commissioner.

7. The amendment in document E/CN.4/1982/L.46 was the outcome of many contacts between his delegation and other members of the Commission which had not, however, resulted in total agreement. He himself was convinced that the Commission should not take an immediate decision about the establishment of a post of High Commissioner and that the adoption of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28 would be only a Pyrrhic victory since it might impede the very functioning of the new system which it was sought to establish.

In its amendment, his delegation proposed the addition to the preambular part of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28 of a new paragraph advocating the adoption by consensus of all major decisions concerning the protection of human rights, the deletion of the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, the adoption of which would have the effect of endorsing the idea of establishing a post of High Commissioner, and the amendment of operative paragraph 2 to give the Sub-Commission a certain amount of guidance concerning the formulation of the terms of reference of a High Commissioner. The Sub-Commission should first base itself on the Charter of the United Nations, since some delegations opposed the establishment of the post for constitutional reasons. It should then take into account the pertinent international instruments concluded under United Nations auspices, since it was on the basis of those instruments that it could define the functions which might be attributed to such a post. Lastly, it should base itself on the practice of the United Nations system as it had developed over the years. It would be better to ask the Sub-Commission for a "first" study on a "possible" text, since it was possible that the study would be sent back to the Sub-Commission after consideration by the Commission and, in any case, the idea of establishing the post of High Commissioner had not yet been approved.

8. His delegation was still opposed to the idea of establishing a post of High Commissioner for Human Rights but it was not impossible that it would reconsider its decision. For the time being, it merely wished an impartial study to be carried out on the nature of such a post. It therefore hoped that the sponsors of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28 and the other members of the Commission would give its amendment a favourable reception.

9. Mrs. CAO PINNA (Italy), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28, said that the sponsors had endeavoured to reconcile the two texts, but the amendment proposed by the Brazilian delegation went beyond the limited scope of the original draft resolution. As was stated in the first two preambular paragraphs, the concern of the sponsors had been to respond to recent requests from the General Assembly and the Sub-Commission, and the draft resolution was primarily procedural. The fourth point in the Brazilian draft amendment raised the most serious difficulties, since it referred to the practice of the United Nations system for the promotion and protection of human rights, which limited the scope of the draft, and did not necessarily meet the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the protection of human rights. Furthermore, the text was inconsistent with the first Brazilian amendment. In addition, the sponsors did not see why the Sub-Commission should undertake a "first" study on a "possible" text.

10. The sponsors were convinced that the Sub-Commission's study would give the Commission a useful starting point at its thirty-ninth session for following up General Assembly resolution 36/135, which had been adopted by consensus.

11. Consequently, the sponsors requested the Brazilian delegation not to press its amendment. Nevertheless, in a spirit of compromise, they would agree to adopting the first three points of the amendment if there was a favourable response to its appeal.

12. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) regretted that he was unable to accept that proposal and decided to maintain his amendment.

13. Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.31, said that the text related to the Sub-Commission's report on its thirty-fourth session and was the outcome of lengthy consultations with many delegations. Its main purpose was to request the Sub-Commission to continue to fulfil its functions and duties with due regard to the decisions of the Commission, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly defining its terms of reference, and to give the Sub-Commission guidance in carrying out its work. The draft resolution also referred to the comments made during consideration of the Sub-Commission's report and asked it to take them into account (operative paragraph 2). Lastly, the sponsors made a certain number of specific recommendations designed to improve the efficiency of the Sub-Commission's work (operative paragraphs 3 and 4).

14. He expressed his gratitude to delegations which had participated in drafting the resolution and hoped that it would be favourably received by all members of the Commission.

15. Mr. HUTTON (Australia), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.31, said that its purpose was clear and its wording accurately reflected the views expressed by the Sub-Commission during the discussion on agenda item 20. The draft resolution was balanced since, on the one hand, due recognition was accorded to the Sub-Commission's work and, on the other, it was requested to abide by its terms of reference. There was also an important reference in one of the paragraphs of the draft to the reservations expressed by some members of the Commission about the way in which alternates to the Sub-Commission had been appointed.

16. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.31 was a logical follow-up to Commission resolution 17 (XXXVII). That resolution had been adopted by consensus the previous year and he hoped that members of the Commission would act likewise in the present case.

17. Mr. JERKIC (Yugoslavia), referring to the Brazilian draft amendment (E/CN.4/1982/L.46), proposed the addition in point 4, of the words "the concept contained in General Assembly resolution 32/130" before the words "as well as the practice ...".

18. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) said he subscribed to the idea underlying the Yugoslav subamendment. Nevertheless, his delegation could not agree to incorporate it in its amendment because, being controversial, it would hinder its adoption. He therefore asked for a separate vote on the Yugoslav proposal.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Commission to take a decision first on the draft resolutions which the Sub-Commission had proposed for adoption by the Commission (E/CN.4/1512, chapter I A, draft resolutions I, II and III).

Draft resolution I: Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations

20. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) requested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote. Explaining his vote before the vote, he said that in his delegation's view it would be premature to set up special machinery before the Special Rapporteur had completed his study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations. Furthermore, he doubted whether Governments could legitimately be requested to transmit information on the subject every year. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

21. Draft resolution I was adopted by 35 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution II: Question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of apartheid and colonialism

22. Mr. SALAH-BEY (Algeria) requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

23. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution II was adopted by 24 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

24. The PRESIDENT announced that a separate vote had been requested on paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

25. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution II was adopted by 30 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

26. Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution III: Exploitation of child labour

27. Draft resolution III was adopted without a vote.

28. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.23 before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against it for various reasons. The Soviet Union considered that the establishment of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would be incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, and would do nothing, from the legal standpoint, to strengthen international co-operation in the field of human rights. Furthermore, the draft resolution ran counter to General Assembly resolution 36/135 on which it claimed to be based, since the General Assembly had requested the Commission, and not the Sub-Commission, to examine the question. The Assembly had requested that the matter should be examined under the agenda item entitled "Further promotion and encouragement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the question of the programme and methods of work of the Commission; alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms - national institutions for the promotion and the protection of human rights". The Assembly had requested that account should be taken of the views expressed by Member States at its thirty-sixth session and divergent views had in fact been expressed on the subject. Lastly, the sponsors of the draft resolution had not tried to work out a compromise text, thus limiting the freedom of choice of the members of the Commission.

29. At the request of the representative of Italy, a vote was taken by roll-call on the oral subamendment proposed by Yugoslavia to the Brazilian amendment in document E/CN.4/1982/L.46.

30. Togo, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Against: Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Panama, Senegal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, China, Cyprus, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Jordan, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Togo, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

31. The oral subamendment proposed by Yugoslavia to the Brazilian amendment in document E/CN.4/1982/L.46 was adopted by 14 votes to 12, with 17 abstentions.

32. At the request of the representative of Italy, a vote was taken by roll-call on the Brazilian amendment (E/CN.4/1982/L.46), as amended by the Yugoslav subamendment.

33. The Federal Republic of Germany, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Pakistan, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Senegal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Fiji, Ghana, Jordan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Togo, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

34. The Brazilian amendment (E/CN.4/1982/L.46), as amended by the Yugoslav subamendment, was adopted by 16 votes to 15, with 12 abstentions.

35. At the request of the representative of Senegal, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28, as amended.

36. Australia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Ethiopia, Philippines, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Cyprus, India, Togo, Zimbabwe.

37. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.28, as amended, was adopted by 29 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.31

38. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.31 was adopted without a vote.

QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL PERSONS SUBJECTED TO ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT, IN PARTICULAR:

(b) QUESTION OF MISSING AND DISAPPEARED PERSONS (agenda item 10) (continued)
(E/CN.4/1982/L.17; E/CN.4/1982/L.19)

39. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Commission to comment on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.17 and drew their attention to its financial implications (E/CN.4/1982/L.19).

40. Mr. MARTÍNEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution, the purpose of which was to extend for one year the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances of Persons. It would co-operate unreservedly with the Working Group provided that, while acting discreetly it directed its work exclusively to humanitarian issues and aid to the families of missing or disappeared persons.

41. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.17 was adopted without a vote.

QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHILE (agenda item 5) (E/CN.4/1982/L.37; E/CN.4/1982/L.43)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37

42. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico) introduced draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 on behalf of its sponsors (Algeria, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Mexico, Netherlands and Yugoslavia).

43. Some considered that the adoption of resolutions on the human rights situation in Chile, either in the General Assembly or in the Commission, was merely a routine matter, since the military authorities in Santiago continued to do as they pleased. Others were surprised that the General Assembly and the Commission devoted so much time to Chile. His answer to that was that the Commission had a duty to make it public knowledge that after eight years of military power the Chilean Government continued to oppose the machinery set up to protect human rights, and obstinately refused to carry out the obligations stemming from the international instruments it had signed. Chile's position was paralleled only by that of South Africa.

44. The submission of an amendment to draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 could only lead to empty discussions; any attempt to convince the Commission to stop devoting a special item to Chile and to ask it to restrict its activity to considering the situation in that country in general under agenda item 12 would be a politically motivated initiative. That would permit the Santiago authorities to show that the machinery set up in the sphere of human rights was breaking down and that the situation considered in their country had improved or did not exist.

45. Mr. MARTÍNEZ (Argentina), speaking on a point of order, requested that the representative of Mexico should keep to the content of the draft resolution he was introducing, and not refer to amendments of which nothing was so far known.

46. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico), referring to rule 50 of the rules of procedure, moved that the debate on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 be closed and that the draft resolution be put to the vote.
47. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had submitted an amendment and that he wished to comment on it. He suggested that the Commission should first vote on the amendment and then on the draft resolution.
48. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico) objected that the text of the amendment had not been distributed and that no one knew anything about it, as the representative of Argentina had observed.
49. Mr. PACE (Secretary of the Commission) said that the Uruguayan delegation had communicated the following amendment to draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 to the secretariat the previous evening at 11.32 p.m.: at the end of operative paragraph 8, the full stop should be deleted and the following phrase added: "Under the item entitled 'Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories'".
50. Mr. HEREDIA PEREZ (Cuba), referring to rule 52 of the rules of procedure, pointed out that an amendment could not be discussed unless its text had been distributed to the members of the Commission at least 24 hours previously. The Uruguayan amendment had not been so submitted. He therefore suggested that the Chairman put the motion for closure of the debate introduced by the representative of Mexico to a vote, in accordance with rule 50.
51. Mr. MARTÍNEZ (Argentina) objected that the debate had not yet been opened, and that it should be determined whether or not the amendment submitted was a substantive one.
52. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) stressed that his delegation's amendment was not substantive; it did not seek to amend the text of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37, but merely to specify under which agenda item the question of human rights in Chile would be considered. Since the amendment was not a substantive one, rule 52 of the rules of procedure was not relevant.
53. Mr. SALAH-BEY (Algeria) reminded the Commission that the Chairman had announced that a vote would be taken on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 at the current meeting; those delegations which had wished to submit amendments had therefore had the necessary time to do so. Moreover, the Uruguayan amendment was clearly a substantive one. The previous year his delegation had already given its views on a similar question and stated that there were no grounds for "normalizing" the review of the situation in Chile, since progress in that country had not justified more favourable treatment. He endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of Mexico and Cuba and asked for a vote on the draft resolution.
54. Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines) objected that, minutes before, the Commission had just voted in favour of an amendment introduced a matter of minutes earlier. It would not therefore be consistent if it refused to consider the Uruguayan amendment by deciding to close the debate. His delegation would vote against the closure of the debate.

55. Mr. MARTINEZ (Argentina) observed that draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 had only just been introduced by the representative of Mexico and that delegations now had the right to comment on it and to submit amendments without being prevented from doing so by the closure of the debate.
56. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) proposed that the Commission should vote to determine whether his delegation's amendment was substantive or not.
57. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico) asked for a vote on the motion for closure which he had introduced under rule 50 of the rules of procedure, since under rule 52 the Uruguayan amendment was not admissible.
58. Mr. MARTINEZ (Argentina) objected that the Commission could not vote on two different proposals at the same time concerning two different rules of procedure.
59. The CHAIRMAN, acknowledging the objection of the representative of Argentina, said that he would put to the vote first the motion by the Mexican delegation to close the debate and then the question of the admissibility of the Uruguayan delegation's amendment.
60. The motion by the Mexican delegation to close the debate was adopted by 20 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.
61. Mr. PACE (Secretary of the Commission), replying to requests by several delegations for clarifications, said that the motion by the Mexican delegation was to decide whether the draft amendment proposed by the Uruguayan delegation was admissible since it had not been distributed in accordance with rule 52 of the Commission's rules of procedure, which laid down that substantive amendments could be discussed no earlier than 24 hours after copies had been circulated to all members.
62. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote against the motion by the Mexican delegation; to adopt that motion would be to alter the rules of procedure, in that the period of 24 hours laid down would apply not to the distribution of draft amendments but to their being handed in to the secretariat. The rules of procedure could not be invoked in the introduction of such a motion, which might create a dangerous precedent.
63. Following consultations with the Chairman, Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE LEÓN (Mexico) withdrew his motion.
64. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) introduced his draft amendment, which was to add the following words to the end of operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37: "under the item entitled 'Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories'". The draft amendment had two objectives, the first of which was to stress that the human rights situation in Chile was not comparable to that in South Africa, contrary to what the Commission had been told, and the second was to allow a rapprochement with the Chilean Government so that it could give further evidence of co-operation, as it had done in accepting something to which no other country had agreed - the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile, which had visited the country and had submitted several reports. He emphasized that his draft amendment was not a substantive one.

65. Mr. SALAH-BEY (Algeria), explaining his vote, said that the introduction of the amendment clearly showed that it was substantive. Its intention was to downgrade the question of human rights in Chile from the important place it currently occupied. His delegation opposed that initiative because it would create a dangerous precedent for other situations which also had a predominant place in the work of the Commission, such as those in Israel and South Africa. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft amendment.

66. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it emerged very clearly from the Special Rapporteur's report that the human rights situation in Chile, far from improving, had deteriorated and draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37 had been drafted with that state of affairs in mind. The situation of human rights in Chile required increased attention from the international community and the Commission had received instructions in that regard from the General Assembly. To eliminate the separate agenda item on the situation of human rights in Chile would be to encourage the Chilean Government to continue to violate human rights with impunity. His delegation would vote against the Uruguayan draft amendment.

67. Mr. BENDIX (Denmark) said that he would vote against the draft amendment because the picture of the situation given by the Special Rapporteur was grimmer than ever and because the Chilean authorities had not given any evidence of co-operation, unlike other countries whose situations were the subject of special reviews by the Commission.

68. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that his delegation would vote against the draft amendment since it considered that the elimination of the separate agenda item on the situation of human rights in Chile was a major substantive measure which could not be justified in the current state of affairs. There would have to be an improvement in the situation and the Chilean Government would have to give evidence of co-operation, which was not the case. It should be stressed that measures aimed at reverting to normal procedures for the study of the case of Chile had been taken, such as, for example, the replacement of the United Nations Trust Fund for Chile by the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, anywhere in the world, but the Chilean Government had nevertheless not shown any spirit of co-operation. The amendment would constitute an encouragement to the Chilean Government.

69. Mr. SOLÁ VILA (Cuba) said that his delegation would vote against the draft amendment since the report before the Commission showed a deterioration of the situation and the Chilean Government had never given any evidence of co-operation, even in respect of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

70. Mr. JESS JANI (Zimbabwe) said that, in view of the flagrant violations of human rights set out in the report, his delegation would vote against the draft amendment.

71. Mr. LANG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, while his delegation did not endorse all the statements made by the Uruguayan delegation in introducing its draft amendment and continued to be concerned by the violations of human rights in Chile and to condemn them, it nevertheless considered that it was unfair to select a particular country for special consideration of its case year after year. It would therefore vote in favour of the draft amendment.

72. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada) said he had noted with regret that according to the Special Rapporteur the situation of human rights in Chile had deteriorated in some respects, but he was convinced that in order to obtain positive results it was necessary to avoid politicization of the debate, whatever country was involved. In that regard, the main task was to restore the dialogue with the Chilean Government, and he would therefore vote in favour of the draft amendment.

73. At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a vote was taken by roll-call on the amendment submitted by the Uruguayan delegation.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Jordan, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, India, Italy, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

74. The amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

75. At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution E/CN.4/1982/L.37.

76. Zaire, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, India, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Pakistan, Philippines, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, Fiji, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Peru, Zaire.

77. The draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.