

tacts and exchanges and that a cultural policy worthy of the name consisted in promoting the full development of the cultural values and aspirations of the community, in all their fruitful diversity, as a basis for State action in all spheres.

48. Her delegation would like to see the points she had mentioned fully reflected in any draft resolution adopted by the Committee on the item under consideration. It attached special importance to freedom of expression and of movement. She hoped that, after the illuminating introductory statement by the Director-General of UNESCO, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.1 might find it possible to improve the text. Her delegation noted with great interest, from part B of the report, that particular importance was attached to the free flow of knowledge and ideas and freedom of movement for individuals. The latter question had recently been considered by the Commission on Human Rights and by the Economic and Social Council, and the Committee would have an opportunity to discuss it when it considered the report of the Council.

49. Her delegation had been very favourably impressed by the considerations contained in para-

graphs 29 and 32 of part A of the report, concerning the new humanistic conception of development due to the introduction of culture. That conception largely—if not entirely—corresponded to what the Commission on Social Development called “the unified approach to development”, and she expressed gratification at the growing acceptance of that conception by the specialized agencies, which inevitably tended to consider development by sectors instead of viewing it as a global process affecting society as a whole. She therefore welcomed that propitious development in inter-agency co-operation.

50. With regard to the Brazilian amendments (A/C.3/L.2074) to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.1, her initial reaction was that, rather than improving the text, they would further emphasize the national approach which was typical of the draft resolution. Her delegation had no difficulty with the Moroccan amendments (A/C.3/L.2060 and Corr.1). She reserved her delegation’s right to comment on the second draft resolution after it had been circulated.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

2037th meeting

Friday, 23 November 1973, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

A/C.3/SR.2037

AGENDA ITEM 53

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (continued) (A/9003 and Corr.1, chaps. XXIII, sect. A.1 and A.2 and XXX, sect. B; A/9018, A/9094 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, A/9095 and Add.1, A/9139, A/9177, A/C.3/L.2055, A/C.3/L.2078):

(c) **Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (concluded)** (A/9018, A/C.3/L.2055, A/C.3/L.2078)

1. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078, said that the sponsors had intended to reflect the views of the delegations which had spoken during the discussion of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/9018), as well as the conclusions contained in that report. Operative paragraph 2 reflected the opinion that the establishment of the practice of inviting countries to send representatives to the Committee when it considered their reports had led to a very useful dialogue, which should be encouraged. In connexion with operative paragraph 3, which referred to decision 2 (VIII) of the Committee (*ibid.*, chap. X), she drew attention to paragraph 4 on page 83 of the Committee’s report, relating to its recommendations to the General Assembly concerning Namibia, and to the last paragraph 2 on page 85 of the report, relating to the petition concerning the inhuman treatment of prisoners in South African prisons. In addition, she pointed out that endorsement by the General Assembly of decision 5 (VII) of the

Committee (*ibid.*) concerning its meeting in Geneva in 1974, would not be contradictory to article 10 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Committee’s meetings in 1975 would be considered at a later date. Since draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078 was the outcome of extensive consultations among delegations, she felt that the Committee could adopt it without difficulty.

2. Mr. CARPENTER (Nigeria), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078, said that, in view of the excellent quality and the depth of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, his delegation was particularly concerned that the Committee should be equally painstaking in its consideration of that report. In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraph 13 of the report, which stated that the members of the Committee regretted that, in 1972, the Third Committee had not been in a position to pay as much attention to the Committee’s report as would have been desirable. The Third Committee should now therefore ensure that the efforts made by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and reflected in its report were not only justified and encouraged, but also that its recommendations were fully reflected in any draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee.

3. His delegation deplored the continued violation of the fundamental human rights of African peoples by minority and racist régimes in southern Africa. In defiance of world opinion, those régimes had made crimes against humanity part of their declared national

policies. In that connexion, he reminded all States parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of their obligation regarding the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof, which might strengthen or encourage those régimes in their determination to continue to commit inhuman, outrageous and atrocious acts. His Government's policy vis-à-vis those minority régimes had consistently been one of complete support for the oppressed African majority and of condemnation of the racists by all possible means, including total economic and trade boycott. It sincerely hoped that States parties to the Convention would take all the necessary steps to convince the world that they were, in fact and in practice, faithful to the cause which they had agreed to defend in the name of humanity.

4. In addition, the Third Committee should endorse the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination concerning colonial régimes which, by armed repression and mass killings, continued to violate the inalienable rights of subjugated peoples to independence and self-determination. It should also endorse the appeal to all other colonial Governments in the Pacific, Indian Ocean, the Caribbean and Atlantic Territories to expedite the preparation of their colonial peoples for full independence and democratic government.

5. With regard to the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.2055) on the administrative and financial implications of the adoption of decision 5 (VII) of the Committee, concerning its meetings in 1974, his delegation felt that every possible facility should be made available to that Committee for the accomplishment of its work.

6. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) said that the wording of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078 might be construed as meaning that the Committee was endorsing all the provisions of decision 5 (VII) of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. He had, however, understood from the representative of Yugoslavia that the Third Committee was being requested only to endorse the holding of one meeting of the Committee in Geneva, in 1974. In order to make it clear that the Third Committee was endorsing only one part of decision 5 (VII), he suggested that operative paragraph 5 should be amended to read: "Endorses the request of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination contained in decision 5 (VII) concerning one of its meetings in 1974 in Geneva".

7. Lord GAINFORD (United Kingdom) said that, in the four years in which it had been considering reports of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, it had been the Third Committee's practice to adopt the draft resolution on that item unanimously. It was of considerable importance to his delegation that the resolution adopted at the current session should receive the widest possible support and it shared the hope expressed by the representative of Egypt at the preceding meeting that the resolution could be adopted unanimously. Unfortunately, however, the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.2078) was not entirely straightforward. His delegation would have preferred a shorter and more general resolution noting with appreciation the comprehensive report of the Committee on the Elimination

of Racial Discrimination, requesting all States which had not yet ratified the Convention to do so as soon as possible, drawing attention to the decisions and recommendations of the Committee at its seventh and eighth sessions and expressing the hope that States parties would continue to co-operate fully with the Committee. It believed that no delegation could object to such a resolution; but the text before the Committee, which referred to specific decisions taken by the Committee at its seventh and eighth sessions, might cause difficulties for some delegations.

8. The United Kingdom had previously expressed reservations concerning the Committee's competence to take action with regard to the matter referred to in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Because of the element of controversy in decision 4 (IV) of the Committee,¹ his delegation believed that it would be preferable simply to note and draw attention to all the decisions of the Committee without singling out any one of them. It hoped that the sponsors would consider amending the draft resolution accordingly so that it could receive unanimous support. His delegation also believed that operative paragraph 5, which endorsed decision 5 (VII) of the Committee, requesting permission to meet once in 1974 in Geneva, was liable to be controversial. It was the task of the Fifth Committee to decide whether or not the financial implications of holding a meeting in Geneva in 1974 could justify the request. Every delegation in the Third Committee was, however, entitled to express its views on that point and those views should be taken into account by the Fifth Committee. His delegation did not, however, think that the Third Committee should try to make a decisive recommendation to the Fifth Committee on that matter because it was not convinced that the Committee's request to hold its summer session in Geneva in 1974 was justified.

9. Mrs. RAKOTOFIRINGA (Madagascar) said that her delegation supported the Brazilian proposal concerning the wording of operative paragraph 5.

10. Mr. GAHUNGU (Burundi) proposed that, in order to make the wording of operative paragraph 2 more polished, it should be amended to read: "Approves with satisfaction the joint action of States parties to the Convention in submitting their reports to the Committee and in participating in the consideration of these reports".

11. Mr. ABSOLUM (New Zealand), referring to operative paragraph 5, said that his delegation was not convinced that the holding of meetings in Geneva would help to publicize the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Moreover, the decision of the Committee represented a departure from the provisions of article 10 of the Convention.

12. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation would be prepared to accept the amendment to operative paragraph 5 proposed by the delegation of Brazil.

13. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) said that he did not clearly understand the meaning of the amendment to operative paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Burundi. According to that proposal, the General Assembly would approve the joint action of States parties to the Convention in submitting reports to the Commit-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 18*, chap. VII.

tee and in taking part in the consideration of those reports; but such joint action was incumbent upon them under the Convention. His delegation therefore preferred the text of operative paragraph 2 as it stood, whereby satisfaction was expressed at the increasing participation of States parties in submitting reports to the Committee and sending representatives to the Committee when it considered their reports. According to the proposal by the representative of Burundi the Third Committee would only express approval of action already required by the Convention.

14. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that his delegation agreed with the observations made by the representative of Iraq concerning the proposal of the representative of Burundi. It, too, preferred the text of operative paragraph 2 in the draft. Moreover, it had some difficulties with the words "joint action" in the proposal of Burundi, which were not as suitable as the words "increasing participation" in the draft resolution.

15. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that his delegation preferred the text of operative paragraph 2 in the draft, which reflected the actual situation of increasing participation of States parties in submitting their reports to the Committee and sending representatives to the Committee.

16. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) announced that the delegations of Algeria and the Philippines had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078.

17. Since her delegation had difficulty in accepting the words "joint action" proposed by the representative of Burundi, it appealed to the delegation of Burundi to withdraw its amendment to operative paragraph 2.

18. Mr. GAHUNGU (Burundi) said that his delegation could agree to withdraw its amendment to operative paragraph 2.

19. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) said his delegation considered it unnecessary to maintain the words "increasing" and "all" in operative paragraph 2 because those two words created some confusion.

20. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation could agree to delete the word "all" from operative paragraph 2, in order to eliminate any possibility of confusion.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it that the sponsors agreed to delete the word "all" in operative paragraph 2.

22. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that his delegation had some difficulties with operative paragraph 5. The arguments put forward thus far in favour of holding a session of the Committee in Geneva in 1974 had not been convincing and the request of the Committee was not justified. Moreover it was clear from operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution that the Committee would have to have further contact with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and with the Trusteeship Council, and such contact could best be established in New York. In addition, delegations in New York were larger than those in Geneva and it would therefore be easier for countries to send representatives to meetings of the Committee which were held in New York.

23. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said his delegation had some difficulty with operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution. With regard to paragraph 4, his delegation believed that the information supplied by the Syrian Arab Republic raised a number of questions about the scope of article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention which should be more thoroughly discussed and could not casually be settled in a draft resolution that was to be adopted on the day it had been tabled. The reporting system established in article 9, paragraph 1, was based on the concept of self-examination, as was customary for international conventions of that kind. States parties undertook to submit a report on measures they had themselves adopted. The Convention did not seem to make any provision for bringing complaints about other countries to the attention of the Committee outside the procedure among States parties set forth in article 11. Accordingly, his delegation doubted that, in the case referred to in paragraph 4 of the draft, the Convention had been correctly interpreted.

24. Although those objections were of a procedural nature, they were important because the Convention had entrusted the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination with a specific task. There were several forums in the United Nations where Member States were free to refer to situations in other countries where they believed human rights to be at stake. Referring to paragraph 15 of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, he said it would be unfortunate if a misapplication of article 9 of the Convention caused the Committee merely to echo pronouncements of other organs. In devoting a whole operative paragraph to that controversial matter, raised by the report of the Syrian Arab Republic, the sponsors of the draft resolution had impaired the balance that would seem to be required of the type of general resolution they had intended to draft.

25. Referring to operative paragraph 5, he noted that, unlike the original draft which had been circulated informally, it referred only to the year 1974. If that was meant to indicate that the General Assembly—if it adopted the draft resolution—had no objection to the Committee's having one meeting in Geneva during 1974, there did not seem to be any reason to refer to decision 5 (VII), which clearly spoke of holding one of its sessions every year in Geneva, a wording that was not acceptable to his delegation.

26. Since, however, there were other elements in the draft resolution, such as operative paragraph 2, which his delegation appreciated and endorsed, his delegation intended to vote in favour of the text as a whole.

27. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia), referring to the remarks made by the representative of Poland, said that in introducing the draft resolution she had not wished to go into great detail. She did wish to add, however, that in drafting operative paragraph 5 the sponsors had considered that allowing the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to meet once in Geneva would help to strengthen its relations with the ILO and other organizations that had European headquarters. They had also borne in mind the fact that the Division of Human Rights would be transferred to Geneva.

28. It did not seem fair that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which was per-

forming such excellent work, should be discriminated against while other bodies were allowed to meet either in Geneva or New York. Article 10 of the Convention only stated that the Committee should normally meet in New York; that statement did not preclude its meeting in other places.

29. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt), referring to the comments made by the representative of the Netherlands, said there was no reason why operative paragraph 4 should not refer to a situation which was being discussed in other United Nations bodies. He reminded members that General Assembly resolution 2784 (XXVI), which was referred to in paragraph 4, dealt with the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. It was not exclusively devoted to the situation in the Middle East, or any item that was before the Special Political Committee, or any other single topic. The draft resolution did not single out the situation mentioned in paragraph 4; otherwise, it would not have referred in paragraph 3 to the information to be supplied by the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee dealing with decolonization. All those matters related to the substantive work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Furthermore, the Committee would merely take note of the Committee's decision on the information supplied by the Syrian Arab Republic.

30. He did not agree with the representative of the Netherlands that the reporting system established in the Convention was based on the concept of self-examination. States parties had an obligation to submit reports, not to conduct an exercise in self-examination.

31. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said he wished to clarify that in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, decision 5 (VII) was referred to only in connexion with the holding of the Committee's summer 1974 session in Geneva. That had been confirmed by the representative of Yugoslavia.

32. Mrs. MANDARA (United Republic of Tanzania) said her delegation considered the elimination of racism and racial discrimination to be a duty of every self-respecting nation. That was not an easy task, and the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was therefore essential. The Committee's report was both useful and commendable.

33. She felt that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078 was very important. The information to be made available to the Committee in accordance with that paragraph would increase its efficiency.

34. If the draft resolution was put to the vote, her delegation would vote in favour of it. She hoped, however, that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

35. Mr. PETROPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation had some difficulties with the drafting of certain passages in the draft resolution. However, it appreciated the initiative taken by the sponsors in tabling the draft. The text seemed to have a tendency to give the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination certain specific powers. For example, in operative paragraph 6 the General Assembly would express the conviction that the Committee would "contribute to the implementation" of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVII). It was his delegation's understanding that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was a committee that dealt with reporting,

not implementation, which was the responsibility of the States parties.

36. The CHAIRMAN asked if any delegation wished draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078 to be put to the vote. If not, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt it unanimously.

37. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) requested a vote on the draft resolution.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited members to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

39. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote beforehand, said that the draft resolution was a very timely and important one. However, if a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 5, his delegation would abstain because it did not believe the cost of holding a session of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in Geneva was justified. Furthermore, since the costs of holding the session in Geneva would be borne by the States parties to the Convention, the decision would have to be taken by the signatories to the Convention.

40. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

41. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that, like the Soviet delegation, his delegation would have preferred it if operative paragraph 5 had not been included in the draft resolution. His delegation would, however, vote for the draft resolution as a whole. His Government had been one of the first to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and a Cypriot expert had served on the Committee during the first two years of its existence.

42. The holding of a session of the Committee in Geneva in 1974 would pose other problems in addition to the financial ones that had been mentioned. Several delegations did not have permanent missions or representatives in Geneva and would therefore be unable to participate in the deliberations when their country's reports were examined. If a separate vote was taken on paragraph 5, his delegation would abstain.

At the request of the representative of New Zealand, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 52 votes to 8, with 38 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

43. Mrs. RAKOTOFIRINGA (Madagascar), explaining her vote, said that her delegation understood paragraph 5 to be an exceptional provision. Under article 10, paragraph 4, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the meetings of the Committee were normally to be held at Headquarters. Even exceptional meetings away from Headquarters should be avoided because they deprived representatives of many States parties of the opportunity to participate in the consideration of their country's reports. Because of the expense involved in sending a representative to a meeting held away from Headquarters, such countries would be the victims of a discriminatory measure.

44. Her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

45. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel), explaining her vote, said that while her delegation supported measures designed to eliminate racial discrimination, it had not been able to support the draft resolution. It had certain reservations about the conduct of work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and its competence. The same reservations had guided its delegation in voting on the text adopted as General Assembly resolution 2784 (XXVI), which was referred to in draft resolution A/C.3/L.2078.

46. Her delegation's difficulty was mainly with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution just adopted. In accepting the Syrian complaint against Israel, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had acted *ultra vires*. The report itself had become distorted as a result of the Committee's refusal to permit the representative of Israel to refute the charges against Israel.

47. As for the accusations by the Syrian Government regarding the inhabitants of the Golan heights, that was but another example of the policy followed by the Arab countries, which had been applied in connexion with other items dealt with by the Third Committee. They dragged the element of the Israeli-Arab conflict into every field of activity of the United Nations and utilized United Nations bodies as platforms for propaganda against Israel. The problem of the inhabitants of the Golan heights had nothing whatsoever to do with racial or any other form of discrimination, nor had they been expelled by Israel. They had fled in the heat of battle; those who had chosen to remain continued living peacefully in their villages in the Golan heights. Theirs was another political problem arising out of the conflict in the Middle East.

48. Mr. BOURGOIN (France) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it attached great importance to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. However, he wished to make it clear that his Government's reservations in connexion with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) remained valid, and that it had made the same reservation when acceding to the Convention.

49. Also, he drew the attention of the Committee to the new situation with respect to the Comoro islands, which had been explained by the French representative to the Fourth Committee. Several delegations on that Committee had requested that the French statement should be reproduced *in extenso* in the record of the meeting at which it had been delivered. He would like to request that the statement should be made available also to the members of the Third Committee.

50. Mrs. DIALLO (Guinea) congratulated the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on its excellent report. She wished to draw the attention of the Committee to a recent news item in the press which showed once again what hatred and dangers were created by the practice of racial discrimination. Mrs. Verwoerd, the widow of the former South African Prime Minister, had warned her white compatriots that constant contact between white children and black servants could lead to the disappearance of racial barriers and open the way for integration and mixed marriages. The report of Mrs. Verwoerd's statement had elicited strong reactions from the opposition newspapers in

South Africa, which had accused her of encouraging racism. The matter required no further comment.

51. Her Government was seriously concerned about the need to eliminate racial discrimination and had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. LÖFGREN (Sweden) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, but had abstained on paragraph 5. It had cast its vote with some hesitation because it had not had time to study the item with the attention it deserved, nor had it had time to seek instructions from its Government. He did not, however, object to the fact that the vote had not been postponed, because he supported the Chairman in his efforts to expedite the work of the Committee.

53. Ms. WHITE (United States of America) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution not because it did not agree with the underlying principle of the text. Indeed, the United States supported that principle. The United States delegation had abstained because of two paragraphs. Operative paragraph 4 dealt with a matter that was being considered in the Security Council and on which the Committee should not pronounce itself. Operative paragraph 5 authorized the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to hold one of its two annual meetings at Geneva. The United States was opposed to that proposal because it entailed additional and unnecessary expense for an organization which was already heavily in the red.

54. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he was glad that the representative of Israel had explained her vote after the vote and had said that Israel had reservations regarding the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. That reservation would help everyone to understand Israel's reservations regarding the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had been set up under a Convention which had 74 States parties, and Israel's reservations should be understood in that context.

55. He was sure that the Committee would be pleased to allow the Israeli delegation to appear before it once Israel had acceded to or ratified the International Convention.

56. The Israeli representative's remark about "dragging in" matters with which United Nations bodies should not be concerned merely showed Israel's conception of the role the Organization should play. According to Israel, the United Nations should serve the interests of Israel, without regard for the Charter and other relevant international instruments.

57. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having accepted his delegation's suggestion for rewording paragraph 5, which had enabled Brazil to vote in favour of the paragraph.

58. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) said her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, but had abstained on paragraph 5. There had unfortunately not been time for her delegation to seek instructions from its Government.

59. Mrs. HEANEY (Ireland) said her delegation had been pleased to vote for the draft resolution as a whole, but had abstained on paragraph 5, because it had not had sufficient time to study its financial implications. Her delegation had some doubt as to whether operative paragraph 4 was justified under article 9 of the International Convention.

60. Like the delegations of Sweden and Italy, her delegation had had some difficulty in casting its vote, especially in view of some of the provisions of the draft resolution, which were controversial. She had not sought to postpone the vote by invoking the relevant rules of procedure because she wished to help the Chairman expedite the work of the Committee.

61. The CHAIRMAN assured the representatives of Sweden, Italy and Ireland that they would have an opportunity to rectify their votes, if necessary, when the draft resolution was considered at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

62. Mr. ROUX (Belgium) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, but had abstained in the vote on paragraph 5. It had not had time to seek instructions from its Government.

63. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) expressed appreciation to the fellow sponsors of the draft and to all those who had participated in consultations and made suggestions relating to the draft resolution that had been adopted.

64. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 53 (c).

AGENDA ITEM 63

Human rights and scientific and technological developments: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)
(A/9075, A/9227, A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.1, A/C.3/

L.2060 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.2074, A/C.3/L.2076, A/C.3/L.2077)

65. Mr. LOSHCHININ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076, said that the draft related to a very important aspect of the scientific and technological revolution. It was aimed at ensuring that States co-operated in making use of the achievements of science and technology to strengthen international peace and security and promote social development. He would not embark on a detailed discussion of the draft resolution at the current stage, but stressed his delegation's readiness to consider any proposal which was aimed at strengthening it.

66. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) warned against the technological phenomenon of "bugging", which invaded the privacy of the individual and could lead to the blackmail of political opponents; the loss of the human touch and the cohesiveness of the family unit—the corner-stone of society—which could lead to alienation and drug addiction; the invention of chemical products such as food additives, whose possible carcinogenic properties were greatly feared, and defoliants, by means of which certain countries brought democracy to other peoples; and, lastly, widespread brainwashing through the repetition of falsehoods in the mass media.

67. A return to the pastoral life was neither practicable nor desirable. Some happy medium would therefore have to be found between the total rejection of technology and the undoubted benefits it could provide, on the one hand, and uncritical acceptance of it, which had led to a belief in superiority based on technological achievements and, paradoxically, to misery: some of the most unhappy people he had ever known had been members of "highly civilized" societies.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

2038th meeting

Monday, 26 November 1973, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

AGENDA ITEM 67

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. XXIV, sect. C; A/9012 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2080)

1. Prince SADRUDDIN AGA KHAN (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) recalled that, 25 years earlier, the General Assembly had adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Paris—an event that would shortly be commemorated—and he wished to underline what the Third Committee, charged with humanitarian and social responsibilities, would be the first to recognize: it was not the words, but the continuing observance that counted. The functions entrusted to his Office were organically linked to the observance of the Declaration and to work that the

Committee had undertaken on such issues as racial equality, political and religious tolerance, and minority rights, to mention a few. To the extent that the international community made progress in those fields, the problem of refugees would be eclipsed. However, the facts as they were pointed to the existence of a fourth world peopled by millions: the displaced and often stateless and others in similar circumstances on whom he reported each year to the Third Committee. Looking back on the chain of resolutions on the question, the Committee would see in perspective some of the tensions that had divided nations and peoples in the preceding quarter century; it would also see the growing conviction among Governments that those tensions must be solved speedily and in civilized consensus. Through the resolutions adopted, his Office had been able to widen the range of Governments with which it

A/C.3/SR.2038