

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records**



THIRD COMMITTEE
53rd meeting
held on
Friday, 20 November 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RITTER (Panama)

later: Mr. DIRAR (Sudan)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 98: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 99: HUMAN RIGHTS AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 100: QUESTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 101: INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)**

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 790, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/42/SR.53
1 December 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/42/3, A/42/67, A/42/121; A/42/296-S/18873; A/42/391; A/42/402-S/18979; A/42/488, A/42/496, A/42/497, A/42/498 and Add.1, A/42/499, A/42/504, A/42/506, A/42/556 and Corr.1, A/42/568, A/42/612 and Add.1, A/42/641 and Corr.1, A/42/645, A/42/646, A/42/648, A/42/658, A/42/661, A/42/667 and Corr.1, A/42/677, A/42/685, A/42/690, A/42/725; A/42/734-S/19262; A/C.3/42/1; A/C.3/42/6; A/C.3/42/L.2, L.5, L.8)

1. Mr. VARKONYI (Hungary), referring specifically to racial discrimination in South Africa, which was so massive as to make the country virtually sui generis, said that the racist South African régime continued to pursue its policy of apartheid in open defiance of the international community and its efforts to bring about a change in South Africa. Certain States were continuing to provide direct and indirect assistance to South Africa and engaging in economic and military collaboration with it. As experience showed, the argument put forth to justify economic co-operation with the racist régime, to the effect that it improved the economic and social conditions of the oppressed majority and humanized the apartheid system, was a fallacy. The sanctions imposed by the United Nations should be strictly observed, and new and more effective measures should be taken to put an end to racial discrimination and apartheid in South Africa.

2. In some countries certain groups also made use of racism and theories of racial or national superiority to exploit specific population groups and migrant workers, keeping them in an inferior social, political and economic position and denying their fundamental human rights. Moreover, in some countries there were still anachronistic groups propagating fascist and racist ideologies. The fact that such groups could act freely made them even more dangerous. The price mankind had had to pay for underestimating or ignoring such political groups must not be forgotten.

3. Referring to the situation of human rights in Chile, which the United Nations had been examining since 1974, he said that for more than 13 years torture, violence, exile, lack of effective judicial remedies, frequent states of emergency and persecution of human rights organizations had formed part of the Chilean people's daily life.

4. Despite frequent statements by Government officials to the contrary, no progress had been made on the most prominent human rights cases and the military jurisdiction and the police forces were still committing abuses, as was apparent from the report of the Special Rapporteur (A/42/556).

5. Hungary was in favour of strengthening international co-operation in the field of human rights on the basis of international instruments designed to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. Greater international co-operation in the field of culture, the arts, education and science would also contribute substantially to the promotion of human rights. The recognition and implementation of cultural rights was an important element in strengthening the cultural dimension of

(Mr. Varkonyi, Hungary)

development. Likewise, the right of everyone to enjoy the moral and material benefits deriving from any scientific, technical or literary production of which he or she was the author must be respected.

6. His delegation was convinced that the concerted and persistent efforts of the United Nations to improve the situation in the various fields discussed in the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/42/3) would lead to positive results. In pursuit of that aim, use must be made of the proven and efficient method of consensus, which was based on mutual respect, tolerance and understanding.

7. Mr. LY (Senegal), speaking as representative of the United Nations Council for Namibia, recalled that in its annual reports to the General Assembly the Council had stated that despite the international condemnation of apartheid, South Africa continued to intensify its brutal repression of the Namibian people by, among other things, murdering innocent Namibians, detaining them without trial and holding them incommunicado indefinitely, as well as through abductions and disappearances of civilians and bannings and banishments, all in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, various General Assembly resolutions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

8. The results of that abhorrent policy of apartheid were the abject poverty in which the majority of the Namibian people lived, widespread malnutrition and a high incidence of disease, and high unemployment resulting from the inhuman labour system applied in the Territory, which separated workers from their families.

9. Indeed, there was no aspect of human life in Namibia which had not been seriously affected by South Africa's illegal presence. At the political level, the Pretoria régime continued to subject the Namibians to second-class citizenship. Laws were applied in a discriminatory manner across all aspects of life and, moreover, were used to crush the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative. It was not surprising, then, that many Namibians were forced to seek refuge in Angola, Zambia and Botswana. The number of Namibian refugees was currently calculated at some 75,000, with 70,000 in Angola and 4,300 in Zambia.

10. The economic interests of South Africa and other countries continued to subject the Namibian people to brutal exploitation in defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Those economic interests encouraged racial discrimination in the Territory by, for example, paying very different wages and salaries depending on the colour of the workers. About 75 per cent of professionals performing managerial, administrative and technical functions were white, while black workers were forced to accept second-rate, low paying jobs.

11. The education system, too, was highly discriminatory. Schools for white children received more funds than schools for black children. As a result, there was a high dropout rate in black schools, few black youngsters went on to higher

(Mr. Ly, Senegal)

education, and some sectors of the black population had no access to education services.

12. The Economic and Social Council, for its part, concerned at the violations of human rights in Namibia, had over the years called for the immediate and unconditional release of political prisoners and had strongly condemned the detention of striking African workers in Ovamboland and their forcible return to their rural homes.

13. As the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Human Rights in Southern Africa indicated in its most recent report, conditions in Namibia continued to deteriorate as a result of South Africa's violations of human rights in the Territory. In addition, the state of emergency imposed on South Africa in 1986 had also affected large sections of Namibia and had resulted in further violations of the human rights of Namibians. Likewise, the restrictive effects of South Africa's bantustanization policy should be noted.

14. Lastly, he said that all those abuses were taking place in a territory which had long been declared an international territory by the United Nations. In view of that harrowing situation, he appealed to the international community to take immediate action to dislodge South Africa from Namibia.

15. Mr. FAIRWEATHER (Canada) said that the work of the United Nations in the field of human rights had evolved in emphasis in the past decade from standard-setting to thematic studies and country situations. Some cases, such as that of South Africa, had been on the agenda of the United Nations for decades. Others, such as those of Afghanistan and Iran, were of more recent origin. The various situations had different sources. Some were the result of Government policies and practices, while others were the result of tragic circumstances in which the Government was but one actor among many. There were also differences in the approach that needed to be taken, and the possibilities of contributing constructively to change.

16. There were, however, unifying themes in the different situations. One of them was the importance of Government co-operation. After more than a decade of United Nations experience with fact-finding, only one State, Iran, refused to co-operate with the Commission on Human Rights. Such co-operation was critical, not only because impartial investigation required on-site visits and the examination of evidence, but also because the more egregious violations of human rights were usually committed with the direct or implicit involvement of Governments, as had occurred in places as diverse as Afghanistan, El Salvador, Chile and Iran.

17. A second unifying theme was the universal applicability of international standards to those various situations. There could be no partial adherence or selective acceptance of those standards, which formed part of international law and practice. Moreover, they were the standards which must be used by the special rapporteurs in preparing varied evaluations, and by which the success of efforts should be assessed.

(Mr. Fairweather, Canada)

18. A third important theme in relation to human rights was the right to practise one's religion, and the rights of minorities in general. The issues must be confronted objectively and fairly, whether they were based on differences of religion, race, culture or ethnic origin, and whether they concerned Bulgaria, Iran, the Soviet Union or any other place. It was useless to pretend that a declaration on the rights of minorities would solve the more intractable problems. However, such action would at least send a clear message that the subject deserved increased attention from the international community, within a framework designed to preserve the integrity of the State.
19. The issue of religious intolerance lay at the root of some of the most serious and enduring conflicts. In that connection, it was necessary to ensure that the principles contained in the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief were fully respected. Canada supported the work of the Special Rapporteur on that topic, which could serve as a foundation on which to construct an international instrument with a stronger implementation device than that of the Declaration.
20. The Secretary-General's report on international conditions and human rights (A/42/585) offered an ideal opportunity to carry out a thorough investigation of conditions favouring the fulfilment of international obligations and the variety of obstacles to that fulfilment. Regrettably, the report failed to link adequately the enjoyment of human rights with the various obstacles which frustrated attempts to exercise them in many countries and regions. His delegation felt that attention should be focused on those obstacles.
21. The situation in Central America was a case in point. Although human rights were at the core of concern in that region, the countries of the region were also suffering from other difficulties, namely, chronic underdevelopment, military conflict and a heritage of unpopular or unelected Governments. The Third Committee must also study the barriers to full enjoyment of human rights. Canada therefore fully supported the recent efforts by the Central American countries to bring peace and stability to the region and, in keeping with its commitment to helping the neediest, had recently resumed bilateral aid to Guatemala.
22. The United Nations played a vital role in bringing international public opinion to bear on Governments which failed to meet their international human rights obligations. At the same time, constructive action must be taken to assist the countries emerging from catastrophic situations and seeking to reverse years of institutional damage and human rights violations. The proposed United Nations voluntary fund for advisory services and technical assistance in the field of human rights could be of great use in that regard.
23. Amidst crisis and enduring conflict, it was often difficult to measure the results of the international community's human rights efforts. One hopeful sign, however, was that human rights were being incorporated as a fundamental principle

(Mr. Fairweather, Canada)

of domestic law. Canada believed that the gap between principle and practice would be narrowed if the necessary political will could be mobilized to that end.

24. Mr. Dirar (Sudan) took the Chair.

25. Mr. CARAZO (Venezuela) said that the work accomplished by the Commission on Human Rights at its forty-third session had been intense and difficult. Indeed, at times inappropriate political considerations had seemed to dominate. However, the importance of the Commission on Human Rights was evident in the increasing participation of Governments and the growing attention of the mass media and the public to its activities. That attention reflected the high priority which the contemporary world attached to the full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Such social control had a positive effect on the conduct of the government sectors responsible for ensuring respect for those rights.

26. Venezuela supported the practice of appointing special rapporteurs or representatives of the Commission on Human Rights to conduct studies and prepare reports on specific countries or themes. The role of the rapporteurs or representatives should not be seen by Governments as an affront or interference, but rather as a persuasive or monitoring factor which could help create conditions of domestic stability and peace.

27. Although some of the reports of the special rapporteurs or representatives indicated certain improvements in the human rights situation in the countries concerned, none of them gave reason for completely optimistic conclusions. Moreover, his delegation regretted that the treatment of human rights continued to be tarnished by a selective approach. Persistent and flagrant violations of those rights did not occur solely in the countries which had been the subject of denunciations, reports and resolutions.

28. An examination of the successive reports showed that, although results might not be seen from one year to the next, in many cases it was possible to observe substantial progress over time with regard to rights and fundamental freedoms in some of the countries studied. However, some Governments still refused to co-operate. Nevertheless, even in cases where progress could not be verified, the fact that the international community was on the alert was a positive development, because it led to public pressure.

29. Venezuela's performance in the field of human rights could be observed by any body concerned with respect for those rights. In isolated cases improvements could be made and it was the Government's aim to do just that. The country was characterized by democracy, freedom, respect for human rights, pluralism and equal opportunities in society. Venezuela therefore welcomed the process of free expansion and consolidation of democracy in Latin America. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that democracy was highly fragile and could be constantly undermined. Its achievement per se was not enough. It had to be monitored and strengthened continuously.

(Mr. Carazo, Venezuela)

30. The enjoyment of human rights provided the foundation for efforts made in the cause of peace, development and economic and social well being. In a stable society, there was greater potential for progress and development of the rule of law than in a country torn by internal conflict.

31. The debt problem experienced by many democratic countries was dangerous in that it had negative social effects. Debt could be a destabilizing element. Thus, it was not simply an economic or financial concept, but one with a significant political content that it was important to keep in mind.

32. He welcomed the fact that the Central American countries had been able to find their own ways to overcome their differences. If it proved possible to strengthen the hopes embodied in the Procedure for the Establishment of a Firm and Lasting Peace in Central America, signed on 7 August 1987 by the five Central American Presidents, there could undoubtedly be genuine progress towards the effective enjoyment of human rights in countries afflicted by internal problems.

33. It was also his delegation's fervent hope that the democratic process would succeed in Suriname and Haiti, countries with which Venezuela had many links. Only free elections, enabling the people to express their will and to decide upon their future, could legitimately clear the way to a society based on the rule of law and the scrupulous protection of human rights.

34. As part of its ongoing support for initiatives directed towards greater respect for human rights, Venezuela had taken an active part in the efforts of the Organization of American States to reach agreement on a protocol additional to the Inter-American Human Rights Convention, concerning economic, social and cultural rights. It also supported all efforts to increase international co-operation in the field of human rights with a view to achieving a greater commitment on the part of the international community in that fundamental area.

35. Mrs. MATVEEVA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that there was still much to be done as far as respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was concerned. She cited the situations in South Africa, Namibia, Chile and the occupied Arab territories, all of which called for concerted action by the international community. Regrettably, Third Committee discussions, particularly those devoted to item 12, had for the most part been used by Governments to air their political views, which contributed nothing to orderly debate or to efforts to find the most acceptable solution.

36. Confrontations, stereotyped behaviour typical of the cold war, campaigns of abuse and other manifestations of hostility constituted an obstacle to genuine co-operation, which must be based on respect for other countries and peoples. Rather than preaching or discrediting the socialist system, as the representatives of Denmark and Canada had done in their statements, they would do better to consider the human rights situation in their own countries.

(Mrs. Matveeva, Ukrainian SSR)

37. What was needed was action to strengthen and promote international co-operation, separate it from narrow, self-centred political interests and work out rules and principles by which it could be put into practice. It might be appropriate, therefore, to draft a declaration or some other instrument, enunciating those principles and establishing priorities for international co-operation.
38. As a number of delegations had indicated with regard to the principles set out in General Assembly resolution 41/155 and Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/42, co-operation increased confidence in relations between States and made it easier to have lasting peace and to achieve other United Nations objectives. While it might be difficult, for financial and other reasons, to agree with some of the proposals put forward, they all merited detailed study. In that connection, she recommended using the consultation procedure, particularly since many countries had not yet expressed their opinions.
39. Questions of procedure, the establishment of priorities for international co-operation, and legal and organizational matters were all basic features of the Third Committee's agenda. Nevertheless, the focus of its work should be the strengthening of international co-operation with a view to establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security.
40. With regard to Afghanistan, she said that the Special Rapporteur had indicated that human rights were not being respected in areas not under Government control or in the combat zones. It was evident, therefore, that in order to achieve greater respect for human rights in that country, the conflict must be brought to an end and a political settlement reached. The Government's policy of national reconciliation met those objectives. Lastly, greater progress could be made if the other side were to respond adequately to that gesture of good will and if a halt were called to foreign interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.
41. Mr. MARWAT (Pakistan) said that the Islamic countries were immensely concerned about the position of Muslims of Turkish origin living in Bulgaria. Accordingly, he hoped that the efforts of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to ameliorate their plight would succeed.
42. Turning to the report on the human rights situation in Afghanistan (A/42/667), he said that the Special Rapporteur's objectivity and mature judgement had enabled him to give an authentic, if incomplete, account of the tragedy of the Afghan people.
43. Referring to paragraph 118 of the report, he said that human rights violations persisted in Afghanistan mainly because of the continued military intervention. The presence of over 3 million refugees in Pakistan and some 2.2 million in Iran was clear evidence of the assault by a super-Power on the sovereignty and independence of a small, non-aligned Islamic country.

(Mr. Marwat, Pakistan)

44. As had been confirmed by the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, in order for the Afghan people to exercise the right to self-determination, the armed conflict must be brought to an end and the Soviet troops withdrawn from Afghan territory.
45. The Special Rapporteur had pointed out in paragraph 120 of his report that his mandate did not permit him to make recommendations of a political nature. As far as Pakistan was concerned, however, there was no reason for such a narrow interpretation.
46. The areas controlled by the Kabul régime did not constitute a large part of the country and their inhabitants represented only a small proportion of the population still living in Afghanistan (a third of that population had fled to Pakistan or Iran).
47. It was evident that the policy of "national reconciliation" proclaimed by Kabul as part of its endeavour to legitimize its position was in contradiction with the presence of foreign troops, the withdrawal of which was a pre-condition for the permanent neutrality of Afghanistan. Furthermore, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) had not been allowed to perform its humanitarian functions. According to ICRC Bulletin No. 142 of November 1987, ICRC activities were limited to Kabul and a visit to Pul-i-Charkhi Prison, begun in March, had had to be interrupted in the same month.
48. The areas of Afghanistan not under the control of the Kabul régime had been subjected to massive aerial and artillery attacks by the foreign forces and their accomplices. In recent months the conflict between the Soviet forces and the Afghan resistance had intensified, which was at variance with Kabul's declared policy of national reconciliation. The cease-fire offer had also not been implemented.
49. Afghanistan and Pakistan share a common geography and history, which had forged the religious, cultural and ethnic ties between the two nations. For that reason Pakistan too was suffering from the consequences of the events in Afghanistan. It was a painful situation to which there could be no military solution, and Pakistan was therefore playing a constructive part in the diplomatic process initiated by the Secretary-General. It was to be hoped that, despite the deterioration in the military situation, a just and honourable settlement could be found. The human rights situation in Afghanistan would improve only if the Soviet forces were withdrawn and if a comprehensive political settlement under United Nations auspices was concluded.
50. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in their statements, the Canadian and Pakistan representatives had referred to the human rights situation in Bulgaria. His delegation rejected any allegation of so-called human rights violations. Such allegations stemmed from well-known political prejudices and from ignorance of the true situation in Bulgaria.

AGENDA ITEM 98: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.52)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.52

51. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.52 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 99: HUMAN RIGHTS AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS;
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/42/L.53, 58 and 59)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.53

52. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.53 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.58

53. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.58.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

54. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.58 was adopted by 103 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.5955. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.59.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

56. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.59 was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 100: QUESTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.45)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.45

57. Ms. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Congo, Ecuador, Guatemala and Yemen had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. MARTENSON (Under-Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that, if the draft resolution was approved, an effort would be made to carry out the activities in question within available resources. If necessary, the general resources for conference services in Geneva would also be used.

59. At the request of the United States representative, a separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.45.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

60. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.45 was adopted by 126 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

61. At the request of the United States representative, a separate recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.45 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros,

Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

62. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.45 as a whole was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 101: INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.47 and 51)

Draft decision A/C.3/42/L.47

63. Mr. RAZZOOGI (Kuwait), supported by Miss AL-HAMMAMI (Yemen) and Mr. GALAL (Egypt), said that the main purpose of draft decision A/C.3/42/L.47 was the abolition of the death penalty, which was unacceptable to Kuwait, being contrary to the principles of Islamic tradition and religion. Accordingly, it would be unable to vote in favour of the draft decision.

64. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.3/42/L.47

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico,

Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Bahrain, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Grenada, India, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

65. Draft decision A/C.3/42/L.47 was adopted by 62 votes to 17, with 35 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.51

66. Mr. MITREV (Bulgaria), supported by Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), proposed that in paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.51, the words "the Commission on the Status of Women, the Commission for Social Development" should be added after the words "the Commission on Human Rights".

67. Mr. HOPPE (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that it had been agreed to replace the words "Recommends to State parties that they continually review", in paragraph 11, by "Appeals to States parties that they review".

68. Supported by Mr. FRIEDRICH (Federal Republic of Germany) and referring to the Bulgarian representative's proposal, he said he did not think that it would be advisable to include in the list set forth in paragraph 14 bodies which, notwithstanding their importance, had not been expressly entrusted with the task of ensuring compliance with international human rights instruments.

69. Ms. YOUNG (United Kingdom) pointed out that, in paragraph 11 as orally amended, the words "that they review" should read "to review".

70. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.51 to enable further consultations to be held.

71. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.