

22. Mr. KLOSSON (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2163 because of the inadequacies of definition in the language of operative paragraph 1 and lack of clarity in the text. The United States was opposed to giving military assistance to the colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa, and did not provide such assistance itself. Like many other countries, however, it did trade with those countries. Moreover, nations in all regional groups engaged in such trade. In particular, as the latest reports on the subject by the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund indicated, the level of total trade between South Africa and independent black African nations was over \$1,020 million a year. His delegation therefore considered that the term "assistance" used in paragraph 1 could not be applied to such trading relationships.

23. Mr. STÅHL (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting because its instructions had not yet arrived when the vote had taken place. However, it had just been instructed to place on record that it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

24. Ms. FINBORUD (Norway) said that her delegation too had abstained in voting because it had not yet received instructions at the time the draft had been put to the vote. However, it had just been instructed to place on record that it would have voted for the draft resolution.

25. Mr. von KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting because of the imprecise wording and prejudgements in operative paragraph 1. Moreover, paragraph 3, which would involve recommendations of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, raised further difficulties for his delegation, since it understood that the normal United Nations procedure was for recommendations by a subsidiary body to be cleared by its parent body, which in the present instance was the Commission on Human Rights.

26. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that no explanations were required for the fact that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. It only wished to inform the Committee that the USSR had ratified the International Convention on the Suppression

and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex).

27. Mr. NYIMI-NYIMI (Zaire) said that his delegation had been absent when the vote had taken place but that, had it been present, it would have voted for the draft resolution.

28. Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting because of the lack of clarity in operative paragraph 1 and its implied prejudgements. Its abstention did not, however, relate to the study to be submitted by the Special Rapporteur, which he hoped would be completed by the thirty-first session of the Assembly.

29. Miss GUERRA (Madagascar) said that her delegation had voted for the draft resolution because the continued survival of the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa depended largely on the political, military, economic and other forms of assistance which they received from other countries, and because it was imperative for the United Nations to take action to ensure a transfer of power from those régimes to its rightful claimants, namely the indigenous populations subjected to their domination.

30. Mr. DABO (Guinea) expressed surprise at the way some delegations consistently raised objections to the adoption of decisions designed to put an end to the colonial and racist régimes of southern Africa. They always had an excuse suited to the occasion, ranging from their opposition to violence to textual obscurities. Such an attitude seemed to justify the suspicion that they were the accomplices of the colonial and racist régimes.

31. His delegation had voted for the draft resolution, which represented a notable contribution to the cause of the freedom of the peoples under the domination of the white minority régimes in southern Africa and provided moral encouragement for the oppressed peoples of Africa to assume their responsibilities and free themselves with the support of all progressive mankind.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 78.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

2141st meeting

Monday, 27 October 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2141

AGENDA ITEM 69

Human rights and scientific and technological developments: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)
(A/10146, A/10162, A/10226 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1, 2146-2148, 2160-2162)

1. Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing the revised draft declaration on the use of scientific and technological progress in the interests of peace and for the benefit of mankind (A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1) on behalf of the sponsors, said that the document before the Committee was the product of painstaking work

by the sponsors and other delegations. The sponsors had endeavoured to take into account as much as possible the comments and opinions expressed with a view to improving the draft, including those expressed at the preceding session of the General Assembly. The revised draft declaration was a carefully prepared and balanced document covering a series of important issues involving the enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms in the context of scientific and technological progress.

2. The sponsors had accepted in their entirety the amendments submitted by Morocco (A/C.3/L.2146), by Cuba, Mexico and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.2161), and by Cuba, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.2147). They believed that the reference to the International Covenants on Human Rights which had been added to the last-named amendment was necessary because those instruments complemented the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by adding, *inter alia*, the right of peoples to self-determination and because they specified more clearly the human rights which were proclaimed only in general terms in the Universal Declaration. The sponsors had also accepted the first, second and fifth amendments submitted by Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.2160). The sponsors were still unable to accept the other two amendments submitted by those countries, because to do so would be tantamount to eliminating fundamental principles of international relations, such as the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for State sovereignty, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, which had been recognized and approved and were embodied in many international legal documents.

3. The sponsors had taken into account almost all the amendments submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.2148); they contended, with regard to those that they had not incorporated, that sufficient reference had been made to individual rights in the second and seventh preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 2 and 8 of the revised text before the Committee and considered further reference to them unnecessary. They consequently asked the United States delegation not to press those amendments. The oral amendment of Mexico to the effect that the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States should be mentioned in the eighth preambular paragraph had been accepted and, at the suggestion of several delegations, a reference to the territorial integrity of other States had been added to operative paragraph 4.

4. It was the sponsors' hope that the Committee would appreciate the goodwill with which they had worked and they urged that the draft declaration should be approved by consensus since it expressed the concerns of all delegations on the matters dealt with in it.

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mongolia had joined the sponsors of the revised draft declaration in document A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1.

6. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been motivated by two concerns in submitting, together with other countries, its amendments at the 2139th meeting (A/C.3/L.2147 and A/C.3/L.2160): first, the draft declaration seemed to be weighted against

individual rights and, secondly, the concept of State sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, embodied in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, was proclaimed in absolute terms without being balanced by a concern for human rights, which Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter required States to defend.

7. The first and second amendments in document A/C.3/L.2160 and the new operative paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.2147 related to the first concern. He was grateful for the effort the sponsors had made to accommodate the content of those amendments and regretted that they had been unable to accept the new paragraph as it stood. His delegation failed to understand the reasons for adding a reference to the International Covenants on Human Rights after the mention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, since every second paragraph of the Covenants curtailed individual rights to some extent, apart from the fact that relatively few countries had ratified them. The decision not to refer solely to the Universal Declaration, the specific purpose of which was to proclaim human rights comprehensively, had weakened the draft declaration. His delegation would not, however, press the point.

8. The proclamation of the principle of non-interference in internal affairs was the subject of the third and fourth amendments in document A/C.3/L.2160. This issue was undoubtedly of great importance, as the sponsors had pointed out, but there was good reason for stressing also the obligation to promote human rights laid down in Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter. If, every time a human rights question arose, the country concerned confined itself to invoking the principle of non-interference in internal affairs in order to prevent any action on individual rights, there would be no need for a Third Committee at all. What his delegation was asking was that there should be a balance between that principle and human rights obligations.

9. The issue was not a purely technical or philosophical one. One specific example involving the rights of an individual was the concern expressed in the United Kingdom and elsewhere over the various human rights issues arising in connexion with Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov, the winners of Nobel prizes. There were those who rejected that concern as interference in the domestic affairs of States and as being calculated to inspire distrust between peoples, and to accept its draft declaration as it stood was tantamount to accepting that sort of rejection. At the collective level, it should be remembered that in the near future the Committee was to consider the question of respect of human rights in Chile, which had aroused considerable concern. In that instance the Government of Chile might argue—as it had never done—that the matter was a domestic one in which nobody was entitled to interfere. There could be no double standards: if the Committee was to use its influence to promote respect for human rights in all countries, it could not at the same time erect the barrier of unqualified State sovereignty. One could not simultaneously express concern for the situation of human rights in another country and refuse to accept that same concern every time it affected one's own. His delegation hoped that the sponsors of the draft declaration would once again show a spirit of compromise and accept the third and fourth amendments in document A/C.3/L.2160, which would otherwise have to be put to the vote.

10. Miss MELČICKÁ (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that her delegation had been omitted from the list of sponsors of the revised draft declaration (A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1) of which it was still a sponsor.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the error would be corrected.

12. Mr. HUME (United States of America) commended the spirit of compromise exhibited by the sponsors of the draft declaration. He said that, although some of the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.3/L.2148) had been accepted, the idea behind the fifth amendment had not been adequately reflected in the revised text before the Committee. His delegation believed that a more specific reference should be made to the protection of individual rights in order to give the draft declaration the balance that it still lacked. In order to preserve the original purport of that amendment, he proposed that the following words should be added at the end of operative paragraph 6: "including their misuse to infringe upon the rights of the individual or of the group, particularly with regard to respect for privacy and protection of the human personality and its physical and intellectual integrity". He believed that that amendment would be well received by the Committee.

13. Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation attached particular importance to the third and fourth amendments in document A/C.3/L.2160. It was regrettable that they had not been accepted by the sponsors of the draft declaration, since operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of the revised text seemed to be aiming at a negative change in the existing balance in the Charter between the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, on the principle of non-intervention, and Article 1, paragraph 3, Article 55 and Article 56, on the obligation of the United Nations to promote human rights. If paragraphs 1 and 4 were adopted as they stood, that would be tantamount to saying that human rights could be promoted only on the basis of the principle of non-intervention and national sovereignty. Such a decision would affect the balance between those sometimes contradictory principles, while the amendments submitted were aimed at maintaining it. Reference was simply made to the Charter, to the *status quo*, and there was no proposal for changes. The question under discussion went to the heart of the problems facing the Committee, and if the narrow concept contained in operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of the draft declaration was accepted, that would limit, undermine and even negate to some extent the task which the Charter had entrusted to the Committee in the field of human rights.

14. Subsequently, when agenda item 12 was considered, most of the sponsors of the draft declaration would deliver long and passionate speeches on the human rights situation in Chile, while maintaining, in order to protect the situation in their own countries, the principle of non-interference and absolute national sovereignty. It would be harmful for the promotion of human rights if double standards were used in such an open manner. His delegation believed that the Committee was faced with a fundamental problem on which each delegation would have to take a responsible decision, and therefore it felt compelled to ask for a roll-call vote on the third amendment in document A/C.3/L.2160, concerning operative paragraph 1 of the revised

draft declaration. Everyone's position must be on record on the question of the relationship between national sovereignty and the promotion of respect for human rights.

15. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft declaration (A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1) for the understanding they had shown in accepting almost all the amendments submitted and said that his country wished to join them. He then asked if it would be possible to add the following words at the end of operative paragraph 2: "and other relevant international instruments".

16. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that the Spanish version of document A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1 contained some faulty renderings which should be corrected. In the third preambular paragraph, she would like to see the words "*a los fines de*" replaced by the word "*para*". In the sixth preambular paragraph, she would prefer to see the word "*transmisión*" replaced by "*transferencia*". The drafting of the final operative paragraph should also be improved. She also noted that the word "shall" was used in all the operative paragraphs despite the fact that at the preceding session the sponsors had accepted the United States amendment calling for a less preemptory wording.

17. With reference to the fourth amendment in document A/C.3/L.2160, she pointed out that the most striking difference between the wording proposed in that amendment and the wording of operative paragraph 4 of the revised draft lay in the fact that the amendment called for omitting any reference to interference in internal affairs and aggressive wars. Her delegation could not agree to that, since it felt that the human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals would be hard to defend if their countries were the victims of aggressive wars.

18. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had nothing to add to what had been said on behalf of the sponsors by the Byelorussian SSR, but that the statements by the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany prompted him to reply in order to clarify certain points. He recalled that the sponsors had made every effort to accept the proposed amendments which, in some instances, had considerably improved the original text. None the less, he wished to point out that concern for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the individual was expressed throughout the text of the draft declaration, particularly in the second and seventh preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 7 and 8. He therefore thought that the amendments submitted by the United States were unnecessary, because the balance that they sought to introduce was already present in the draft. For example, in operative paragraph 7 it was stated that all States should take the necessary measures, including legislative measures, to ensure that the utilization of scientific and technological achievements promoted the fullest realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms without any discrimination whatsoever on grounds of race, sex, language or religious beliefs. That was a much broader and more general protection than that proposed by the United States, which referred only to the physical and intellectual inviolability of the human personality and respect for privacy. The concepts embodied in the draft declaration not only included the proposed amendments but went even further.

19. With reference to the amendments submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.2160), he said that several of the proposed changes had been taken into account but that the sponsors could not accept the third or fourth amendments. The main argument for changing operative paragraph 1 of the original draft had been that if the Charter of the United Nations was not mentioned there, an imbalance would be caused to the detriment of individual rights and freedoms. In fact, references to the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for State sovereignty, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, which under the third amendment would be deleted, were in no way in opposition to the principles of the Charter. An attempt had been made to present the issue as if the sponsors cared nothing about respect for human rights but that their only concern was for State sovereignty. It should not be forgotten that the aim in view was to promote international co-operation in order that scientific and technological progress should be used to strengthen peace, accelerate economic development and promote respect for human rights; it was not possible to speak of true international co-operation unless it conformed to the principle of the sovereign equality of all States and was based on respect for the right to self-determination and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. With reference to the fourth amendment, he endorsed the comments of the representative of Argentina. His delegation regarded both amendments as unacceptable and felt that if they were introduced they would weaken the text of the declaration. He would accordingly vote against them.

20. Mr. THOMAS (Liberia) said that scientific and technological progress should always be directed towards promoting the progress of mankind and respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the individual. His delegation would therefore support most of the proposed amendments, which in his opinion would not weaken the text of the draft declaration.

21. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) said that she would vote for the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1) but wished to point out that, as her delegation understood it, the reference made in operative paragraph 4 to national liberation movements included only movements in those countries which were still under the colonial yoke and not terrorist groups which operated in countries that enjoyed sovereignty and freedom and which had arbitrarily chosen that label to serve their own ends.

22. Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait) said that she would not repeat her delegation's views on the draft under consideration, since they appeared in document A/10226. As to the amendments proposed in document A/C.3/L.2160, she would abstain in the vote on the third amendment because she found the original text of operative paragraph 1 satisfactory, and she would vote against the fourth amendment because she believed that the omission of the reference to non-interference in internal affairs and to aggressive wars in operative paragraph 4 would create an imbalance in the general tenor of the draft declaration. However, she would support the draft decision contained in document A/C.3/L.2162.

23. Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the sponsors of the revised draft declara-

tion (A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1) accepted the amendment to operative paragraph 2 submitted orally by the representative of Cuba. They also welcomed Cuba as a sponsor of the draft declaration.

24. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation would vote against the third amendment in document A/C.3/L.2160 because the balance which its sponsors sought to achieve already existed in the draft declaration. It was pointless to replace the last part of operative paragraph 1 after the words "human rights and freedoms" by the words "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", since that paragraph stated that "All States shall promote international co-operation . . . in the interests of strengthening international peace and security, freedom and independence, and also for the purpose of the economic and social development of peoples and the realization of human rights and freedoms on the basis of the principles of the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination", concepts which were all embodied in Article 1 of the Charter and which therefore contained nothing that was unusual or inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Moreover, paragraph 1 referred to "respect for State sovereignty, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of States", and those were also concepts and terms which were virtually identical with those contained in Article 2 of the Charter. Paragraph 7 of that Article specifically established the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. That was perfectly clear to all delegations, but the same could not be said of what the sponsors of the amendment sought to accomplish by trying to change the very essence of the draft declaration.

25. Mr. HSING Sung-yi (China) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote on draft declaration A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1 for the reasons which it had already given at the 2136th meeting.

26. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba), referring to the amendments contained in document A/C.3/L.2160, said that his delegation could not support and would vote against the third one. The sponsors of the revised text preferred to have the declaration include a full and specific enumeration like that contained in operative paragraph 1. The principles it was proposed to delete were very important, especially for small developing countries. They should be mentioned one by one in clear-cut terms and not covered by a general reference as proposed in the amendment.

27. With regard to the fourth amendment, Cuba would vote against it for three reasons. In the first place, it thought it inappropriate to say that States should ensure that scientific and technological achievements were "not abused" for the purpose of violating the sovereignty of States, because that would suggest that they could be used to violate the sovereignty of States if such use was not deemed to be an "abuse". In the second place, he wondered what reason there was to delete the words "interfering in their internal affairs, waging aggressive wars, suppressing national liberation movements"—an enumeration which was of special interest to countries like Cuba. Finally, he could not understand why the concept had been introduced that some policies or practices of racial discrimination were contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Could it be that some policies of racial discrimination were in keeping with the Charter?

28. With reference to the United States oral amendment calling for an addition to operative paragraph 6, Cuba felt that there could be no contradiction between the desire of the international community to protect individual rights, on the one hand, and cultural, economic and social rights, on the other. Normally, Cuba would welcome such an amendment, which would seem to be a laudable attempt to eliminate illegal wiretapping, violation of the secrecy of correspondence, etc., offences which had occurred in various countries, including that of the delegation which had proposed the amendment. However, it would not support the amendment because paragraph 2 and, to a certain extent, paragraphs 6 and 8 already seemed to reflect that concern of the United States.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that votes would be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1 and on the amendments thereto, with separate votes on the paragraphs to which amendments had been proposed.

The first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2148 was adopted by 36 votes to 15, with 57 abstentions.

The third preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 57 abstentions.

The second amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2148 was adopted by 40 votes to 13, with 59 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a vote was taken by roll-call on the third amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2160.

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

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Mexico, Mongolia, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon,

United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

The amendment was adopted by 28 votes to 21, with 70 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 75 abstentions.

The fourth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2160 was rejected by 38 votes to 23, with 50 abstentions.

The oral amendment of the United States of America to operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 51 votes to 12, with 61 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2144/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that Jordan had become a sponsor of the draft decision contained in document A/C.3/L.2162.

31. Mrs. KALLIGA (Greece) said that her delegation also wished to become a sponsor of the draft decision.

32. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the 2139th meeting the delegation of the USSR had suggested that the sponsors of the draft decision should insert the words "recalling its resolution 3268 (XXIX) and" after the words "the General Assembly".

33. Mr. GROS (France) accepted on behalf of the sponsors of the draft decision the suggestion of the Soviet Union.

34. The CHAIRMAN put the draft decision, as revised, to the vote.

The draft decision, as revised, was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

35. Mr. HUME (United States of America), explaining his delegation's vote on the inclusion, in the last preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution, of a reference to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, said that the position of the United States on that Charter had been clearly stated at the preceding session of the General Assembly. His delegation had been opposed, for a number of reasons, to its adoption and it maintained its objections.

36. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of his delegation and those of Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that the Nordic countries endorsed the main provisions of the amended draft declaration, but had abstained in the vote because they had considered that it would be premature to adopt them without having had sufficient time to make a careful evaluation of their consequences. They would have preferred the deliberations to be deferred until the following session, as a number of delegations had proposed. The text which had been adopted was, even in its amended form, still an unbalanced document which did not accurately reflect the provisions of the 1968 Proclamation

of Teheran¹ on the protection of individual rights and freedoms, which had subsequently found expression in several United Nations resolutions in favour of which the Nordic countries had voted.

37. Mr. SIBLESZ (Netherlands) said, in explanation of his delegation's vote, that paragraph 18 of the Proclamation of Teheran had laid the foundations for a series of activities within the United Nations system related to the problem of the protection of the human rights of the individual. Consequently, the Secretariat, the specialized agencies, States and other entities were defining the problem and identifying those aspects which called for exhaustive study, with a view to formulating practical rules and guidelines to prevent the misuse of science and technology. The General Assembly had entrusted the Commission on Human Rights with the co-ordination of those activities and had reaffirmed that decision in resolution 3268 (XXIX).

38. The draft resolution which had just been adopted was far from perfect. As many delegations had pointed out, the terminology used upset the balance which had been maintained so far by focusing on one aspect which was not at the heart of the problem. It would be unfortunate if the adoption of the declaration adversely affected the activities of such bodies as the Commission on Human Rights and the specialized agencies which were dealing with the question. The implementation of the declaration should not be regarded as ending the Committee's responsibilities with regard to the item. The hazards of scientific and technological progress, far from disappearing, were becoming more serious. Bodies better qualified than the Third Committee should continue their work as a matter of priority. His delegation hoped that those activities would soon lead to specific standards which could be applied in areas in which scientific and technological progress threatened the human rights and freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He would have preferred a declaration to be approved only after careful study and drafting by the competent United Nations bodies.

39. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that, although it had objections to the third amendment in document A/C.3/L.2160 regarding paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, his delegation had voted in favour of the declaration as a whole, since the Charter of the United Nations proclaimed that international co-operation in the field of human rights should be based on the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for the sovereignty of States, equality among them and non-interference in their internal affairs.

40. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that her delegation had taken into account the objectives of the International Conference on Human Rights held in 1968 at Teheran, which had emphasized the protection of human rights. Accordingly, it had voted in favour of those amendments which stressed the protection of human rights of individuals and groups. A declaration of such importance should maintain a balance between respect for those rights and the principle of State sovereignty. Her delegation had preferred the original version of operative paragraph 4 and had

abstained in the vote on the new formulation proposed in document A/C.3/L.2160.

41. Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed his delegation's gratitude for the support which its amendments had received. However, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the document as a whole because the new version proposed for operative paragraph 4 had not secured the approval of the majority. His delegation considered the adoption of the declaration to be premature in existing circumstances and maintained the objections it had expressed with respect to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, to which reference was made in the preamble.

42. Ms. WENSLEY (Australia) said that her delegation regretted that it had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution; despite the efforts made to reconcile positions, a balanced text which took due account of the protection of individual rights had not been achieved. Her delegation did not believe that the adoption of the declaration was a matter of urgency, and in view of the work being carried out in other United Nations bodies on the same subject and of the fact that the comments made had not been taken into consideration or a balanced text achieved, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote.

43. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) said that her delegation had supported the draft resolution because it considered it to be a constructive document. She wished to make it clear, however, that her delegation, in supporting the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4, which referred to national liberation movements, made a very clear distinction between countries subjected to colonialism which were struggling for their self-determination and independence and those other liberation movements which were merely centres of subversion and sedition dedicated to destroying the legal order of States.

44. Mr. GROS (France) expressed gratitude for the support which had been given to draft decision A/C.3/L.2162, of which his country was a sponsor. He was gratified that the work on the item relating to human rights and scientific and technological developments could go forward unimpeded.

45. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said that he was appreciative of the support given to some of his amendments. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole for the reasons adduced by the Federal Republic of Germany.

46. Mr. INFANTE (Chile) said that his delegation had voted for operative paragraph 4, in which mention was made of national liberation movements, for the reasons stated by the delegations of Bolivia and Uruguay.

47. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq) said that his delegation had been under the impression that a vote was being taken on operative paragraph 6 as amended, and had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. He wished his vote to be changed and recorded in favour of the revised draft resolution.

48. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because, in its

¹ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.XIV.2), p. 3.

opinion, the principles established at the International Conference on Human Rights had been designed basically for the protection and respect of the rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals, whereas the draft resolution showed a marked concern with respect for the sovereignty of States in the face of any kind of interference in their internal affairs, even in the sphere of human rights. That idea was not consistent with the position of her delegation on the protection of human rights. For those

reasons, the text of the draft, although improved by the adoption of some of the proposed amendments, still lacked the balance necessary between the two aspects, and consequently her delegation had been unable to support it. She regretted that a more balanced text, which would be generally acceptable and could have been approved by consensus, had not been achieved.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

2142nd meeting

Tuesday, 28 October 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

A/C.3/SR.2142

In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Shahani (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections F, G, I, L and M), IV (sections A and C) and V] (continued)* (A/10003, A/10284, A/10285, A/10295, A/10303, A/C.3/637, A/C.3/639, A/C.3/L.2164-2168)

NARCOTIC DRUGS

(A/10003, chap. V, sect. C; A/C.3/L.2164-2167)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to the consideration of agenda item 12 on the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/10003). The question of narcotic drugs dealt with in chapter V, section C, would be considered first.

2. Mr. DE BEUS (Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control) said that the Economic and Social Council, after consideration of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its twenty-sixth session in February 1975,¹ had adopted at its fifty-eighth session several draft resolutions recommended by the Commission. Council resolution 1932 (LVIII) recommended in particular that States should co-operate closely to facilitate the detection and suppression of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.

3. In its resolution 1935 (LVIII) the Council emphasized the need for co-ordination in that field. Close co-operation already existed, of course, among the units of the United Nations Secretariat which dealt with drug problems, the World Health Organization and other specialized agencies, and INTERPOL and similar organizations, all of which had their headquarters in Geneva.

4. Council resolution 1934 (LVIII) dealt with measures to reduce the illicit demand for drugs and resolution

1933 (LVIII) dealt with cannabis. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs had also indicated that it would be necessary to convene a special session in 1976; the Council had endorsed that recommendation during its consideration of the calendar of conferences and meetings.

5. Finally, the Commission had emphasized the importance of giving adequate priority to narcotics control in the allotment of resources to the various United Nations bodies. He hoped that a resolution along those lines would be adopted at the current session.

6. The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control had a worldwide structure of 74 projects within the integrated programme for drug abuse control. In many parts of the world drug abuse was a new phenomenon and very often too little was known about the subject, especially about the aspect of demand, without which the illicit supply and illegal traffic would not exist. It was known that drug abuse was increasing and posed a danger to civilization as a whole and to the younger generation in particular.

7. With regard to supply, illicit or uncontrolled production of natural narcotics might be the result of poverty or greed. It appeared most often where the resources available to Governments were not sufficient to provide the infrastructure and development needed to lead the people away from the production of coca, opium or cannabis. The Fund had supported two programmes concerned primarily with the problem of supply, one in Thailand and the other in Lebanon. They had apparently been successful in proving that farmers could earn a living without relying on illicit crops and it was to be hoped that the Governments concerned would act on such findings to bring about a permanent change in the way of life of those farmers.

8. The Fund had also provided the means for a more concentrated attack on the international illicit traffic in drugs. With the assistance of the Fund, the Government of Afghanistan had made great strides towards attaining its goal of stopping the drug traffic through and from its territory.

9. The problems of demand were much more intractable, since the traffickers were veritable criminals with tremen-

* Resumed from the 2117th meeting.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 5*.