

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1297th  
MEETING**

Friday, 8 October 1965,  
at 10.40 a.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 60:</i>	
<i>Measures to accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued) . . . . .</i>	47

**Chairman:** Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO  
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 60

Measures to accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (A/5923, A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1204-1207, E/3743, para. 88) (continued)

1. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) said that as far as the revised amendments submitted by the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1) were concerned, he approved the new version of the first amendment, which took account of the changes proposed by the delegation of Saudi Arabia, but he would like to see the second amendment deleted.

2. With regard to the amendment submitted by Brazil (A/C.3/L.1204), the Mauritanian delegation was in favour of sub-paragraph (a) but feared that sub-paragraph (b) might cause some delay because of the legal studies it would entail.

3. His delegation would vote in favour of the amendments submitted by the Ivory Coast (A/C.3/L.1205) and the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206).

4. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said he feared that sub-paragraph (b) of the Brazilian amendment, which in fact simply stated the terms of reference of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, would lengthen, to no purpose, the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 958 D (XXXVI) and set out in paragraph 4 of the note by the Secretary-General (A/5923).

5. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) observed that sub-paragraph (a) of the amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1204 seemed to regard disarmament as a foregone conclusion. If the Economic and Social Council were recommended to study the "possibility" of transferring the resources "which might be released" as a result of disarmament, that would be closer to reality, since it was impossible to use resources which did not yet exist.

6. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that it was primarily the General Assembly and not the

Economic and Social Council which dealt with questions of disarmament. The Assembly had on its agenda four or five items relating to disarmament, including one on the Question of convening a World Disarmament Conference (agenda item 95), and the First Committee was continuing its study of those problems. Therefore, in the opinion of the Uruguayan delegation, the task referred to in the draft resolution fell within the competence of the General Assembly, rather than that of the Economic and Social Council. His delegation believed that the General Assembly was the only body competent to deal with universal problems involving the destiny of all mankind.

7. Furthermore, the Committee should bear in mind the remarks of the representative of Venezuela regarding the as yet problematical nature of the resources which might be released as a result of disarmament and the remarks of the United Kingdom representative regarding the pointlessness of restating, in sub-paragraph (b) of the Brazilian amendment, the terms of reference of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

8. Mr. TSAO (China) said that the principal merit of the draft resolution before the Committee was that it was conceived in sufficiently general terms to cover all the rights stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That general nature should therefore be maintained by avoiding any mention of specific rights or specific countries. Consequently, he welcomed the amendment submitted by the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206), which would delete the reference to developing countries.

9. For the same reason, he could not support either the Ukrainian amendments, which took away something of the general character of the draft resolution by bringing up the colonial problem, or the Brazilian amendment, which drew attention to certain rights at the expense of others. In any case, the right to work, to education and to security in old age or disablement belonged just as much to the field of economic and social development as to that of human rights.

10. Mr. SIRI (El Salvador) said that as representative of a country which had always supported measures to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms he would vote in favour of the draft resolution and any amendments likely to improve and strengthen it.

11. Among such amendments he particularly approved that submitted by Brazil, although it might be better to delete from sub-paragraph (a) of that amendment, for the reasons already stated by the representative of China, the reference to the right to work, to

education and to security in old age or disablement. If, however, the delegation of Brazil preferred to retain its original text, he could still support it.

12. His delegation would abstain from voting on the amendments submitted by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Jamaica, but would vote in favour of the amendment submitted by the Ivory Coast and Nigeria.

13. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that under the terms of sub-paragraph (a) of the amendment proposed by Brazil, the General Assembly would recommend the Economic and Social Council to study the question of transferring the resources released as a result of disarmament. The implementation of that recommendation would not involve any extra costs, similar decisions having already been taken by the General Assembly in its resolution 1837 (XVII) and by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1026 (XXXVII).

14. In sub-paragraph (b), the Economic and Social Council was recommended to instruct the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to study current legislation, treaties and other documents containing discriminatory provisions. If the intention was only that the Sub-Commission should be asked to place the question on its agenda for consideration, that would involve no extra costs. If, however, the intention was that the Sub-Commission should carry out a general study which would form part of the series of studies on discrimination in various fields, prepared by Special Rapporteurs, then extra costs would arise.

15. The regular budget of the United Nations provided for studies to be undertaken by two Special Rapporteurs at a time for the Sub-Commission. A study of discrimination against persons born out of wedlock and a study of equality in the administration of justice were at present under way. In addition, the Sub-Commission had decided to undertake a study of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres, which could be carried out without additional expenditure when the study of discrimination against persons born out of wedlock was completed in 1967 or 1968; if the Sub-Commission decided to begin the study before then, additional costs amounting to \$27,500 would be incurred as reported to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly at the present session.

16. Only in 1969 or 1970, after the study of equality in the administration of justice had been completed, could an additional study of the type envisaged in document A/C.3/L.1204 be carried out without incurring additional expenditure. If, however, a new Special Rapporteur was to be appointed before that date, and if the same procedure was adopted as for the other studies, additional funds would be required to cover the Rapporteur's round trip travel, his subsistence allowance and the remuneration of the staff which would assist him. The extra costs in the first year would be of the order of \$27,500 (\$2,500 for the Special Rapporteur and \$25,000 for his assistants). Provision for the continuing costs for completion of

the study would be made in the Secretary-General's budget estimates as required.

17. Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil) thanked the delegations which had supported his text. Taking into account the various opinions which had been expressed, however, he would replace sub-paragraph (a) of his original amendment with the following text:

"Recommends that the Economic and Social Council, in studying the question of transferring the resources released as a result of disarmament, should bear in mind the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the less developed countries".

18. In addition, sub-paragraph (b) would be deleted.

19. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) feared that the direct reference to less developed countries in the new text might give the impression that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was not so well guaranteed in those countries as in others. It would be better to emphasize the need to ensure respect for such rights and freedoms wherever they were not guaranteed.

20. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) welcomed the Brazilian delegation's deletion of sub-paragraph (b) of its amendment (A/C.3/L.1204) and took note of the remarks made by the representative of Uruguay. If those remarks were taken into account, he would be able to vote in favour of the draft.

21. Miss ADDISON (Ghana) said that, unfortunately, she could not accept the Brazilian text, as it discriminated against the less developed countries. She questioned the utility of making such a change in the body of the draft resolution, and hoped at all events that a text more likely to secure wide support would be substituted for it.

22. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) also felt that the amendment might be misunderstood. It added nothing to the original text and did not clarify its meaning; furthermore, it could not readily be reconciled with a universal conception of human rights. Although the right to work, the right to education and the right to security in old age or disablement were certainly matters deserving consideration, the Tanzanian delegation could not support the Brazilian amendment, as it did not seem to reflect the right spirit.

23. Mr. SAKSENA (India) supported the objections voiced by the representatives of Uruguay, Ghana and Tanzania to the Brazilian proposal (A/C.3/L.1204). He was not sure that effective disarmament could soon be achieved. It was therefore too hypothetical a suggestion to make that funds released from disarmament should be utilized towards promotion of human rights. It involved the study of the use of resources which did not yet exist. Undoubtedly the Brazilian proposal contained an important matter of substance. It should be made the subject of a separate resolution or a different agenda item, which could be discussed at a more opportune time.

24. Mr. CASTRO (Chile) said that he supported whole-heartedly the spirit of the Brazilian proposal; the Committee should look beyond nuances of drafting

and see the noble intention behind the proposal; for that reason, he could not agree with the criticisms which had been levelled at sub-paragraph (a). Surely the essential point was to seek to promote fundamental human rights. The arms race was not solely confined to the developed countries. It was still more harmful in the case of less developed countries, because it often served as a pretext for economic interference. Disarmament had, therefore, to apply also to the small countries.

25. Believing firmly that the resources released as a result of disarmament should be used for economic advancement, the Chilean delegation had submitted a draft Convention on Human Rights to the Inter-American Conference.

26. The defence of human rights was one of the most ennobling aspects of the work of the United Nations. It had certainly given rise to some flights of eloquence, but it was regrettable that twenty years of effort had not produced more in the way of practical results. One needed only to recall that, only recently, men had died in Santo Domingo for their opinions. The Committee must avoid delegating its responsibilities to other organizations, must not allow the impetus of its work to slacken and, inspired by the words of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, must help peoples of the world to live in dignity.

27. The text of the Brazilian draft might perhaps be rephrased or it could be made a separate declaration. In any event, it was necessary to state, in concise terms, that peace and development were among the major concerns of the United Nations, and that disarmament was the indispensable prerequisite for them.

28. The CHAIRMAN warned the Committee against the temptation of engaging in a general debate on a question which, strictly speaking, did not appear on its agenda. The First and Second Committees had before them similar questions relating to the allocation of the resources released as a result of disarmament.

29. Miss TABBARA (Lebanon) supported the draft resolution and the Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1), the Ivory Coast amendment (A/C.3/L.1205) and the Ivory Coast and Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1206).

30. With regard to the Jamaican amendment (A/C.3/L.1207), she saw no need to replace the reference to two very important declarations by a much more general wording. If need be, the words "and other United Nations instruments" could be added after the words "the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

31. The Lebanese delegation fully shared the point of view of the representative of Chile. Peace and disarmament were the topics which dominated the twentieth session of the General Assembly. It was true that other Committees were dealing with the same question, but it was desirable that the Third Committee too should make its contribution. She was therefore prepared to vote in favour of the Brazilian amendment, as amended by the proposal of the Venezuelan representative. However, she preferred the original draft. As the representative of a developing country, she wished to emphasize that it was the

least developed countries which had the most urgent need of assistance and that, in their interests, a reference to less developed countries should be retained in the text.

32. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) supported the amendment proposed by the Brazilian representative and paid tribute to the latter's spirit of compromise. In order to meet the objections which had been raised by various delegations, he suggested that the term "the less developed countries" should be replaced by "all countries".

33. Mr. RIOS (Panama) recalled that one of his eminent countrymen had participated in the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948. His delegation was fully prepared to support a text which aimed to accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. He was not sure that effective disarmament could soon be achieved but he would nevertheless support the Brazilian amendment. Some of the other amendments which had been submitted were subject to possible misinterpretation. The Third Committee had already done much work on the question at the seventeenth session and he hoped that definite draft recommendations could be adopted at the present session.

34. Mr. BECK (Hungary) supported the amendments submitted by the Ivory Coast (A/C.3/L.1205) and by the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206). With regard to the Jamaican amendment, he shared the point of view of the Lebanese representative.

35. Like the representative of Chile, he regarded the right to work, the right to education and the right to security in old age or disablement as fundamental. Under the original Brazilian amendment, the majority of resources released by disarmament would be used in developing countries in order to ensure greater respect for human rights. Although it felt that those rights and freedoms could be strengthened only if there was economic development as well, the Hungarian delegation was prepared to support the Brazilian amendment, but not the amendments submitted later, which had the effect of distorting it and completely changing its meaning.

36. He regretted that one delegation should have proposed the deletion of the end of the third Ukrainian amendment. The discussion had served to emphasize the vital importance of social and economic rights, which could be greatly extended by use of the sources released as a result of disarmament.

37. Mr. ABDEL-RAHIM (Sudan) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution on measures to accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the amendments submitted by the delegations of Jamaica (A/C.3/L.1207), the Ivory Coast (A/C.3/L.1205) and the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206).

38. With regard to the amendment submitted by the Brazilian delegation (A/C.3/L.1204), he was in full agreement with the observations made, among others, by the representatives of Tanzania, Ghana and Uruguay, and he wondered whether the representative of Brazil would accept a revised wording which

would be more in accordance with the spirit of his original suggestion and which would have a greater chance of meeting with the Committee's approval. Sub-paragraph (b) would be deleted, as the Brazilian representative had himself proposed, and sub-paragraph (a) would be replaced by a new text, stating that the General Assembly requests the Economic and Social Council to study the question of the conversion of the resources released as a result of disarmament, and their utilization for the purpose of strengthening the national resources of the less developed countries, and in order to enable the appropriate national and international authorities to work more effectively for the purpose of ensuring international peace and promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in all countries of the world.

39. Mr. MACDONALD (Rapporteur), speaking as the Canadian representative, said that his delegation thought it advisable to depart as little as possible from the original draft resolution so as to retain its full impact, while envisaging only reasonable objectives. His delegation had examined the amendments before the Committee with that in mind and was glad to be able to support those proposed by the Ivory Coast (A/C.3/L.1205), by the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206) and by Jamaica (A/C.3/L.1207).

40. His delegation respected the convictions which underlay the Brazilian amendment. He, too, was fully aware of the relationship between human rights and economic and social development and recognized the extreme importance of the question of disarmament. However, he agreed with the delegation of Tanzania that such a delicate problem should not be dealt with in a text of that kind. He hoped that the Brazilian delegation would find it possible to withdraw its entire amendment.

41. With regard to the Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1), his delegation was interested to note the proposed changes, which testified to the Ukrainian delegation's great concern with the question of human rights; there, too, however, his delegation thought it advisable to keep as close as possible to the wording of General Assembly resolution 1776 (XVII).

42. In the opinion of his delegation, the third Ukrainian amendment, which was perhaps more broadly worded than the original text and tended to widen the terms of reference of the Commission on Human Rights, should end with the words "and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms". His delegation was requesting the deletion of the last part of the paragraph because of the possible financial implications of the proposed further studies.

43. Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) said he thought that the constructive idea underlying the Brazilian amendment was worth retaining. Bearing in mind the reservations expressed by a number of delegations, he would suggest that sub-paragraph (a) should be replaced by a text recommending the Economic and Social Council to call upon the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission to accelerate their work on Disarmament, since any part of the resources devoted to armaments that could be released as a result of disarmament would make it possible to

contribute more substantially to the development of many countries where the low standard of living resulting from economic conditions aggravated problems in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

44. Mr. INCE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation was in favour of any measure which would accelerate the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It would support the Ivory Coast-Nigerian amendment (A/C.3/L.1206), which, in its opinion, strengthened the text under consideration.

45. He agreed with the suggestion by the representatives of Uruguay, Ghana and Tanzania that the Brazilian amendment should not refer to the less developed countries but to all countries where human rights and fundamental freedoms were not guaranteed.

46. He had also listened with great interest to the statements of the Chinese representative.

47. Miss KING (Jamaica) said that she supported the amendments submitted by the Ivory Coast (A/C.3/L.1205) and by the Ivory Coast and Nigeria (A/C.3/L.1206), which improved the original text.

48. With regard to the Brazilian amendment (A/C.3/L.1204), her delegation thought it useful to raise the question of the transfer of resources released as a result of disarmament, even though there might be some overlapping with the work of other committees. She shared the view that there should be no specific reference to the less developed countries. She was also glad that the Brazilian delegation had withdrawn sub-paragraph (b) of its amendment.

49. With regard to the Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1), more specifically the third one, Jamaica, as a member of the Commission on Human Rights, questioned the advisability of instructing the Commission to carry out further studies in the human rights field. Hence, she would be unable to support that amendment unless it ended with the words "and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms".

50. Regarding her delegation's amendment to the amendments submitted by the Ukrainian SSR, she regretted to say that she could not accept the Lebanese proposal. In her opinion, instruments other than the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should either not be mentioned at all or all be mentioned.

51. She hoped that the members of the Committee would recognize that she had submitted the amendment out of a concern for universality and not in order to limit the scope of the text. The amendment could leave no doubt as to her delegation's position on the question of colonialism and racial discrimination.

52. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) again requested the Ukrainian delegation to consider the possibility of withdrawing the second of its amendments, since it was in substance repeated at the beginning of the third amendment.

53. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that, in order to reconcile the various points of view expressed

on the Brazilian amendment, sub-paragraph (a) should be replaced by the following text:

"(a) To bear in mind, when studying the question of transferring the resources released as a result of disarmament, the necessity of aiding countries, particularly the developing countries, to attain the goals they have set themselves in order to ensure respect for human rights and freedoms."

54. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he agreed to withdraw his second amendment. However, he could not yield to the arguments of the Jamaican representative, for there were other documents of fundamental importance, besides the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which should be mentioned.

55. With regard to the third amendment, his delegation could not agree to the Canadian delegation's suggestion.

56. Mr. SAKSENA (India) referring to the third Ukrainian amendment, proposed that the word "request" should be substituted for the word "instruct".

57. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, while he felt that the Economic and Social Council had the right to instruct the Commission on Human Rights to undertake a given task, he agreed to the Indian proposal.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would regard the Indian proposal as adopted.

*It was so decided.*

59. Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil) said that his delegation would retain the present wording of its amendment. Any further change would only distort the meaning of the text.

60. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) thanked the Ukrainian representative for the spirit of co-operation he had just shown. His delegation would support document A/C.3/L.1201/Rev.1.

61. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) observed that while the Brazilian representative of course had the right to reject any change in its text, it would be unfortunate if agreement could not be reached on an amendment whose purpose was most laudable. Since the amendment had given rise to so many objections, he feared that it would be rejected if put to the vote in its present form. He therefore suggested that the Committee should postpone consideration of the amendment until the next meeting in order to give the Brazilian delegation an opportunity to study its text with other members of the Committee.

62. Mrs. DELLA GHERARDESCA (Italy) supported the suggestion.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.