

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
FORTY-SECOND SESSION



*Official Records**

THIRD COMMITTEE
58th meeting
held at
Tuesday, 24 November 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RITTER (Panama)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 106: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (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 750, 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.58
30 November 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 106: NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2)

1. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had consulted further with other delegations on draft resolution A/C.3/42/Rev.2. It had had no difficulty in accommodating the request made by the representative of Sweden regarding operative paragraph 3 and had decided to insert the words "and regularly" after the word "substantially" in that paragraph. The representatives of Jordan and Colombia, among others, had drawn attention to possible difficulties with operative paragraph 6. His delegation had decided to accommodate their concerns by deleting the entire paragraph. He hoped that no delegation would find further problems with the text, since it was the result of lengthy consultations and embraced all the considerations voiced by the various delegations.
2. Ms. UMAÑA (Colombia) thanked the Soviet delegation for its willingness to accommodate her country's concerns. The Third Committee had adopted many resolutions dealing with the same issues, an approach which was inconsistent with the need to rationalize the work of the Committee and the United Nations. The draft resolution under consideration was quite similar to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.57, which also dealt with the new international humanitarian order. Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89 introduced in the First Committee also dealt with the same issue, particularly in its operative paragraphs 7, 8 and 12. Her delegation felt that draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2 represented a duplication of effort, and therefore proposed that the Committee postpone its consideration until the next session of the General Assembly, by which time she hoped that it would be possible to draft a single, unified resolution on the new international humanitarian order.
3. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) said that it was encouraging that the Soviet representative had agreed to amend operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2.
4. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the consultations, which had been open to all delegations, a common language had been found and agreement had been reached on a general resolution concerned with international humanitarian co-operation. The Soviet Union claimed no monopoly of humanitarian questions. It was inappropriate to start making economies by reconsidering the draft resolution; much time had been spent on consultations in which a serious, constructive and non-political approach had prevailed. Analogies with the work done in other committees could go a long way. The questions of humanitarian co-operation and human rights, and of social and cultural development, were clearly on the Committee's agenda; references to the work of the First Committee did not provide sufficient justification for the proposal made by the representative of Colombia. Some delegations, including the Colombian delegation, had introduced two or three draft resolutions on the same subject. Any delegation, including the Colombian delegation, was free to make procedural proposals. Since extensive consultations had been conducted on the draft resolution, he called on the representative of Colombia to withdraw her proposal.

5. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands) said that his delegation was fully aware of the constructive approach taken by the Soviet delegation to the draft resolution. However, further time was needed to consider the draft resolution proposed in the First Committee and to compare draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2 with draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.89. The Committee must look at similar paragraphs in other resolutions in order to see whether it could rationalize the draft resolution and avoid duplications and even contradictions. He fully supported the Colombian proposal.
6. Miss ZINDO (Zimbabwe) said that her delegation needed more time to consult on the draft resolution.
7. Ms. UMANA (Colombia) said that it was clear to her delegation that the Committee needed more time, not because it questioned the content of the draft resolution but because all the views of delegations must be reflected in the resolution. Her delegation was concerned about the multiplicity of texts all calling for similar action and the lack of a clear message from the United Nations.
8. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) said that negotiations had been under way on the draft resolution for some time; moreover, it was not the first time that there had been two resolutions on a similar subject.
9. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France) said that the representative of Colombia had made a courageous and highly relevant statement. Her delegation was deeply concerned at the proliferation of draft resolutions submitted to the Committee at the current session. It had great difficulty in analysing texts in depth and comparing and amending them. The Third Committee was the only Committee which had not heeded the Secretary-General's request to limit its documentation. Her delegation deplored such methods of work.
10. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation was ready to take action on the draft resolution since the subject-matter was very straightforward and there was a broad measure of understanding and agreement. Many countries criticized the Soviet Union for violating human rights at home, yet when that country submitted a draft resolution calling for international humanitarian co-operation, the same delegations resisted the idea of co-operating in alleviating human rights violations around the world.
11. Ms. AIOUAZE (Algeria) agreed that the Committee needed more time to consider the draft resolution and compare it with the draft resolution submitted to the First Committee.
12. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he had already raised concerns in the Committee about rationalization; his delegation had co-operated in producing a single resolution on the subject of youth. It fully supported the idea of postponing a decision on the draft resolution. There should not be more than one draft resolution on the same item; repetition must be avoided.

13. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said that his delegation noted the concern expressed about the multiplicity of texts and hoped that that concern would be borne in mind in future deliberations.
14. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.63/Rev.2 until the end of the week.
15. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/42/3, 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, L.50, L.61, L.62, L.64, L.65, L.70-72, L.73/Rev.1, L.74-76, L.79, L.82-89.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, as agreed at the 57th meeting, he would begin by giving the floor to those countries which had asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.
17. Ms. AL-TURAIHI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in his statement the representative of Sweden had mentioned the detention of Kurdish children in Iraq. Her delegation wanted to make it clear that hostile forces in Iraq had made allegations regarding such detentions in order to cast Iraq in a negative light internationally. She hoped that the Swedish representative would obtain correct information from reliable sources. She referred representatives to Iraq's eighth periodic report to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which gave a clear idea of the situation in the Kurdistan region in Iraq.
18. Mr. AMSELEM (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that one of the lesser delegations that comprised the troika of delegations representing the Soviet Union had criticized his country. His delegation did not object, because it believed that everyone should have the right to freedom of speech, even political fictions such as the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. When the United States representative had referred in his statement to human rights violations in the Soviet Union, he had referred to violations by the Government of that country. The Byelorussian representative, in speaking of human rights violations in the United States, had referred to the Ku Klux Klan. His delegation could not argue with the Byelorussian representative if he saw a moral equivalency between the Byelorussian Government and the Ku Klux Klan. Both were organizations consisting of individuals who did not believe in freedom and they therefore shared the same human rights policy.
19. With regard to Cuba, the Cuban prisoners currently staging a revolt in United States prisons were rioting because they did not want to be sent back to Cuba. He wondered what kind of a system existed in Cuba if such people preferred to remain in prison in the United States rather than be free in Cuba, or if Fidel Castro's

(Mr. Amaelem, United States)

sister preferred to live in the United States as an ordinary citizen rather than be part of the ruling élite in Cuba, or if black Cubans preferred to live in the United States.

20. The Cuban representative had claimed that civil and political rights were considerably less important than other rights, a statement which was contradicted by the fact that those countries which showed the most respect for civil and political rights also did best in the economic and social spheres. The Cuban representative had launched an assault on the concept of civil and political rights and had essentially admitted that Cuba opposed the exercise of fundamental freedoms. He had claimed that underdevelopment and poverty were excuses for not honouring civil and political rights, while criticizing alleged violations of those rights in El Salvador and Guatemala, both of which were developing countries. Those two countries sought to follow a socio-economic path that would lead to freedom and democracy, something which constituted an imardonable crime for the Castro régime. The Cuban dictatorship dated back to 1959. Since then, democracy had flourished in the majority of Latin American countries, thereby isolating Cuba as one of the few undemocratic countries in Latin America.

21. At the 57th meeting, he had spoken on a point of order, objecting to references by the Cuban representative to members of the United States delegation. The Cuban delegation had persisted in making those references. He in turn wished to ask why the son of the Permanent Representative of Cuba was in prison and whether it was true, as the Cuban Government alleged, that he had been imprisoned for homosexual activities.

22. He wished to conclude with an anecdote according to which Cuba was in fact the largest country in the world, since its leaders were supposedly in Havana, its real Government was in Moscow, its army was in Africa and its people were in Florida.

23. Mr. DAZA (Chile), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he would have preferred not to respond to the assertions of the Cuban representative regarding his country. However, for the sake of clarity, it was necessary to refute certain of those assertions. It was ironic that Cuba, with more than a million exiles, thousands of political prisoners and a catastrophic economic situation, should dare to participate in a debate on human rights. In March 1987, Cuba had narrowly escaped being the subject of a resolution of the Commission on Human Rights criticizing its human rights record. The fact that the situation in Cuba had not been taken up detracted from the seriousness and objectivity of the work of that Commission, which had the duty to examine that case.

24. With regard to the burning of Rodrigo Rojas and Carmen Quintana, to which the Cuban representative had referred, that incident had been repudiated by all Chileans. Moreover, it had already been investigated fully and responsibility for it had been determined. Ms. Mireya Baltra, who had also been mentioned by the Cuban representative, was living in her home at Santiago, Chile. Mr. Clodomira Almeyda had accepted the jurisdiction of Chilean courts, which were currently considering his situation. His delegation did not know of a single Cuban exile who had done likewise with Castro's courts.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

25. With regard to the harsh language used by the Cuban representative against the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Fernando Volio, his delegation understood that, for many countries, any attempt at objectivity was an unpardonable sin. It was obvious that some delegations refused to accept the Special Rapporteur's objective consideration of certain situations, since that would prevent them from making political use of the report.

26. Chile had never denied its problems in the area of human rights, which was why it was co-operating with the Special Rapporteur and the United Nations. Chile was in a period of transition. Its present system of government would end the following year and it was in the process of re-establishing democratic institutions. The transition would, however, take place in accordance with the sovereign will of the Chilean people and its Constitution and not according to the political wishes of other countries or international organizations.

27. Mr. CANETE (Paraguay), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Cuban representative had called the Government of his country a tyranny. The Paraguayan Government was the result of free elections, rather than a military coup or a guerrilla movement supported from outside, and its mandate had been conferred on it by the Paraguayan people. The Government in Paraguay was democratic because it was supported by a majority party which was not the only party in the country. The Paraguayan Constitution had been drafted by a constituent assembly comprising representatives of the people belonging to the four existing political parties. In Paraguay, there had never been any special courts or special laws, still less executions by firing squad. There was no rationing in Paraguay, nor had Paraguayans gone into exile in large numbers.

28. The dictionary definition of "tyranny", as those who lived under tyranny could attest, was the unlawful seizure of power or the illegitimate exercise of government. That definition did not apply to the Paraguayan Government.

29. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the human rights situation in the United States described by other delegations was a reality, whereas what the United States representative had said was a fiction. He quoted from an article on the significance of human rights for United States foreign policy, which had appeared in a 1986 issue of the journal Foreign Policy. In that article, former United States Secretary of State Cyrus Vance had said that the concept and definition of human rights had been distorted in foreign policy to the point where they were often virtually unrecognizable; the time might come, however, when Americans would be able to discard the illusions and myths that were often intentionally used to obscure human rights disputes. Unfortunately, judging from the comments of the United States representative, that time had not yet come. His delegation had time, however, and was willing to wait.

30. Ms. FLOREZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States representative had been highly unoriginal in his reply and had simply repeated what the United States delegation had said on many other occasions. With respect to his personal reference to the son of the Cuban Permanent Representative,

(Ms. Florez, Cuba)

her delegation considered the United States representative's remarks to be in extremely bad taste and indicative of a total lack of respect for Committee members. If the representative's son was in jail, it was because justice in Cuba was applied equally to all, regardless of who their parents were.

31. United States Administrations had always used certain rhetorical devices, which in the past had included references to good-neighbourliness and the Alliance for Progress. Human rights was the slogan of the current United States Administration. However, the true essence of United States imperialist policy was big-stick diplomacy, the law of the dollar, and the doctrine of survival of the fittest. The reason why the United States pursued a policy of hostility and aggression towards Cuba was because Cuba had exercised its right of self-determination and had chosen the path of socialism.

32. It was ironic that the United States representative should speak of human rights at the United Nations and condemn Cuba, when he represented a Government which was the most brutal, cynical and merciless violator of human rights, not only at home but throughout the world. She wondered how that representative could talk of human rights when he represented a system which had almost completely exterminated Indians living in the United States, and had enslaved blacks, who were still the victims of ill-treatment, were paid less than whites, were abused by the police and racist groups and had a much higher infant mortality rate than whites. What justification did the United States have for speaking of human rights when it was responsible for the assassination of millions of Vietnamese, supported the South African Government, was responsible for the death of thousands of Nicaraguans killed in the dirty war being waged in that country, and had dropped atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

33. The United States considered its own system to be the only democratic one in the world. However, she wondered what sort of democracy was based on gross inequality among its citizens. The United States failed to see the value in Cuba's having eliminated gambling, prostitution and illiteracy and having achieved one of the lowest infant mortality rates in the world thanks to a health care system that was accessible to all. She wondered what was the human and democratic value of a system in which one person or a small oligarchic group could decide to restrict social programmes designed to benefit the poor, the infirm, blacks and minorities.

34. Mr. AMSELEM (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he was sure that the Byelorussian SSR was a paradise and that there were long lines of people applying for visas to visit the country at Byelorussian consulates around the world. He wondered, however, where those consulates were, with whom Byelorussia maintained diplomatic relations and, indeed, what Byelorussia was. The representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had quoted a prominent American and he in turn wished to quote a prominent Soviet citizen, Anatoly Shcharansky, whose most famous words had perhaps been "Get me out of here".

(Mr. Amselem, United States)

35. With regard to the Cuban representative, he was sure she knew all about dollars and probably should not be too critical since the ruling élite in Cuba had special dollar stores at which they were able to obtain all the goods not generally available to ordinary Cubans. In response to her questions, he asked how many black Americans, Indian Americans and Cuban Americans fled to Cuba and how many homeless people wanted to live in Cuba. He wished to conclude with a story about two Cubans, Juan and Pedro, who were walking down a street. Juan asked Pedro to tell him exactly what he thought of Fidel Castro. Pedro replied that he thought exactly the same thing as Juan thought of Fidel Castro. Juan replied that, in that case, it was his duty to put Pedro under arrest.

36. Ms. FLOREZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, asked whether what was taking place was a meeting of the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly or a session devoted to telling jokes and trying to entertain others.

37. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Byelorussia was far from being a paradise, if only for reasons of climate. He was not surprised that the United States representative knew nothing about the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic because, according to official UNESCO data, the United States ranked third in the world in illiteracy. With regard to the consulates mentioned by the United States representative, he said that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic welcomed all those who cared to visit it. Anyone who did would see many memorials to the victims of the Second World War, which bore witness to the fact that Byelorussia had earned its place in the United Nations at great cost. One out of every four of its inhabitants had been killed in the Second World War. However, Byelorussians had also killed more of Hitler's soldiers than all of the other Allied countries put together.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.70

38. Mr. RALEBITSO (Lesotho), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.70, said that the first preambular paragraph should refer to resolution 41/136 of 4 December 1986. Brazil, Cameroon, Cuba, Indonesia, the Philippines and Sierra Leone had become sponsors. The question of student refugees in southern Africa remained on the Committee's agenda because of the discrimination and repression perpetrated by the South African apartheid régime, which continued to deny full citizenship rights to the majority of its black inhabitants and subjected them to inferior education and to torture and inhuman treatment. The draft resolution had been updated to reflect recent developments described in the report of the High Commissioner for Refugees (A/42/496). It was encouraging that an increasing number of independent African States and other States which were not traditionally countries of asylum for South African refugees had offered to admit such refugees into their countries, thereby alleviating the burden on the host countries of southern Africa. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71

39. Mr. DAZA (Chile), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71, said that the purpose of the draft resolution was for the international community to express concern about the human rights situation in Mexico. Nearly all delegations recognized that the international human rights instruments provided protection for human rights everywhere. There was reliable information that basic rights were being violated in various parts of Mexico and that individuals had disappeared. The draft resolution neither condemned the Government of Mexico nor made value judgements on matters which fell within the sovereignty of that Government. It expressed concern and made recommendations to the Government of Mexico, as well as to the Commission on Human Rights in the area of competence of the entire international community. It was important for the Committee to affirm the view that human rights must be given practical implementation. The draft resolution was being submitted to the Committee on the basis of the many precedents which had made the submission of such draft resolutions almost an established practice.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.74

40. Mr. CONLEY (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.74, said that Costa Rica, Ecuador, Lebanon, Norway and the Philippines had become sponsors. The celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights offered an ideal opportunity to gain a perspective on the ultimate objective of reaffirming and ensuring that each human being was entitled to full respect for his fundamental rights. That objective transcended all differences. Adopted in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had special significance in human affairs and had become an essential point of reference for the entire international community.

41. Every five years, the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was celebrated and States Members of the United Nations were encouraged to take appropriate measures at the national level to heighten awareness of human rights and promote respect for them. Since the fortieth anniversary of the Declaration was to be celebrated in 1988, a new paragraph - operative paragraph 8 - had been added to the traditional resolution, which encouraged Governments to include in their delegations participating in the commemorative meeting of the General Assembly persons from their respective countries who were associated with the drafting of the Universal Declaration. That suggestion should help underscore the lasting and basic nature of the Declaration. It was hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus, thereby demonstrating the commitment of all delegations to the Universal Declaration and its fundamental principles.

42. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), supported by Mr. GALAL (Egypt), suggested that action should be taken forthwith on the draft resolution.

43. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.74 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.73/Rev.1

44. Mrs. UMAÑA (Colombia), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.73/Rev.1, said that the sponsors hoped that, since the draft resolution was procedural, was based on earlier similar resolutions and took account of the observations made by various delegations, it could be adopted immediately by consensus.

45. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) recalled that at its second regular session in 1987, the Economic and Social Council had not supported a motion by his delegation to increase the membership of the UNHCR Executive Committee by more than two seats. Despite the Council's decision, his delegation still believed that increasing the Executive Committee's membership by only two seats was not commensurate with actual needs, particularly in his country's region. Nevertheless, his delegation would join in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.73/Rev.1.

46. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.73/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.76

47. Mr. MOYA-FALENCIA (Mexico), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.76, said that it was modelled on earlier resolutions on the same subject. As could be seen from paragraph 12 of document A/C.3/42/L.81, adoption of the draft resolution would incur no additional costs under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. The sponsors, which included the Philippines, hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.79

48. Mr. ORGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.79, said that the sponsors, all of them countries which had experienced the horror of genocide, wished to stress the need for measures to prevent its recurrence. The text was straightforward and taken broadly from that of the relevant Convention. He hoped that it would be adopted immediately by consensus.

49. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.79 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.82

50. Mr. VENTEGOOT (Denmark), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.82, said that the text conformed broadly to Assembly resolution 41/144. The few changes made merely served to bring it up to date. The sponsors drew particular attention to operative paragraph 2, which called for an end to the practice of summary or arbitrary executions, and to paragraphs 5, 7 and 8, which endorsed the Special Rapporteur's recommendations and urged co-operation with him. They hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

51. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India), referring to a question raised by Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) on a point of order, said that some delegations had not had time to study the texts of all the draft resolutions being introduced and found it difficult to agree to their immediate adoption.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that no action should be taken at the current meeting on the remaining draft resolutions to be introduced at the meeting.

53. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.83

54. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.83, said that its purpose was to reiterate the Assembly's deep concern at the persistence of the practice of enforced or involuntary disappearances. The sponsors hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.84

55. Mr. STROHAL (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.84, said that its purpose was to improve co-ordination and co-operation among the various United Nations bodies dealing with questions relating to human rights in the administration of justice, and to enhance assistance in that field. The preamble had been amended to reflect decisions taken at the 1987 sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. A further paragraph was to be added at the end of the preamble, as follows: "Convinced of the need for further co-ordinated and concerted action in promoting respect for human rights in the administration of justice,". The sponsors, which included the Netherlands, hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

56. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) pointed out that the preamble to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.84 contained additional paragraphs which had not appeared in earlier resolutions. One such paragraph was the fifth preambular paragraph, which caused some difficulty for her delegation and made the resolution unacceptable to it.

57. Mr. STROHAL (Austria) said that the paragraph in question reproduced exactly the relevant part of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/33, which had been adopted without a vote.

58. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) pointed out that her delegation was not a member of the Commission.

59. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of its agreement simply to hear introductions of draft resolutions during the remainder of the meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.85

60. Mr. CONLEY (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.85, said that, despite the abatement of refugee flows from the massive levels of the late 1970s and early 1980s, it was essential for the international community to maintain its vigilance in addressing the root causes of refugee flows, particularly the violation of human rights. The purpose of the draft resolution was to help in that task, not by creating new institutions but rather by developing ways to make existing institutions more effective. The Australian delegation deserved special

(Mr. Conley, Canada)

thanks for its active participation in the drafting of the text. Honduras had also become a sponsor. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.86

61. Ms. FERRIOL (Cuba), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.86, said that it reflected the substance of General Assembly resolution 41/152 and contained some new elements which it was hoped would put needs relating to improved social conditions into better perspective. The sponsors, which included Viet Nam, hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, and were ready to hold further consultations to that end.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.87

62. Mr. BOLD (Mongolia), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.87, said that its purpose was to place on record the General Assembly's profound concern at the plight of the estimated 100 million people throughout the world who lacked adequate housing. The preamble was based on General Assembly resolution 41/146. Kenya had become a sponsor. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would receive the Committee's full support.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.89

63. Mr. MATSOUKA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.89, said that its purpose was to promote not only respect for international legal norms and State sovereignty but also recognition of the economic, social and cultural realities, differences in levels of development and variety of problems existing in different societies. It reflected the need to strengthen intergovernmental co-operation for the benefit of all, and the value of studying the concept of global measures to promote co-operation in the field of human rights. The delegations of Czechoslovakia, Laos and Viet Nam had become sponsors. The sponsors were ready to continue consultations with a view to ensuring the consensus adoption of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.62

64. Mr. MEZA (El Salvador), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.62, said that it accorded fully with his country's position on the "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America" and its desire to comply with that instrument in order to achieve peace and stability in the region. The delegation of Belize had become a sponsor.

Draft resolutions A/C.3/42/L.64, L.50, L.61, L.65, L.72 and L.75

65. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire), introducing the draft resolutions, said that it was clear from the reports of the Secretary-General and UNHCR that, despite the measures taken by African host Governments, in close co-operation with the Office, and the financial, material and humanitarian assistance provided by donor States, non-governmental organizations and the competent specialized agencies for refugees and displaced persons, additional resources were still needed to finance integration, resettlement, shelter and reclassification projects. The precarious economic situation of the host countries which were mostly in the Sahel region, with continued drought and natural disasters, called for greater humanitarian assistance from the international community.

66. Regarding draft resolution L.64 on emergency assistance to voluntary returnees and displaced persons in Chad, he drew attention to operative paragraph 2. The situation of Chadians displaced by the 1983-1984 drought had not changed since 1986.

67. In connection with draft resolution L.50 on humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti, whose sponsors had been joined by China, Equatorial Guinea, Honduras, Japan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Zimbabwe, he drew attention to operative paragraph 5. Although 3,223 refugees had returned to Ethiopia on 30 June 1987 under the voluntary repatriation programme, an increase of funds from \$1,357,000 to \$1,400,000 would be needed to improve the refugees' living and nutritional conditions.

68. Concerning draft resolution L.61 on assistance to refugees in Somalia, he drew attention to the following changes: in operative paragraph 6 a full stop had been inserted after "covered" in the third line and the rest of the paragraph deleted; and in operative paragraph 7 the words "the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees" inserted after "with" in the last line. He also drew attention to operative paragraph 3. Brazil, India, Peru and Romania had joined the sponsors.

69. The following additional countries had become sponsors of draft resolution L.65 on the situation of refugees in the Sudan: Bangladesh, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Jamaica, Liberia, Philippines, Romania, Tunisia and Uganda. He drew attention to operative paragraphs 2 and 4.

70. The main object of draft resolution L.72 on assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia was stated in operative paragraph 2. Refugees in Ethiopia had now reached a record figure of 136,719 in the Utang region alone and the Government had appealed to the Office of the High Commissioner for new refugees to be transferred to a reasonable distance from the frontiers of their countries of origin.

71. Lastly, on draft resolution L.75 concerning assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Malawi, whose sponsors had been joined by Guinea, Jamaica, Philippines, Sudan and Uganda, he drew attention to operative paragraphs 3 and 4. Malawi had received 250,000 refugees or displaced persons by the end of September and the figure was likely to approach 500,000 by the end of the year.

(Mr. Nzengeya, Zaire)

72. On behalf of the sponsors, he urged that, for humanitarian reasons, the six draft resolutions should be approved without a vote.
73. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation supported the proposal by Zaire to adopt the six proposed draft resolutions without a vote in the current meeting.
74. Mrs. HELKE (United Kingdom), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.64, said that it was her impression that General Assembly resolution 41/198, recalled in the first preambular paragraph of L.64, had been adopted by the Second Committee and concerned special economic assistance. The resolution adopted by the Third Committee in 1986, and bearing the same title as draft resolution L.64, was resolution 41/140. She wished to know which resolution had been intended by the representative of Zaire.
75. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire) said that the reference to General Assembly resolution 41/140 should replace the reference to General Assembly resolution 41/198 in preambular paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.64, and that the error would be corrected by the Secretariat.
76. Ms. UMANA (Colombia) requested the addition of her country to the list of co-sponsors of A/C.3/42/L.65.
77. Mrs. ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago) said that her country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.61.
78. Miss EFFANGE (Cameroon) said that her country should be added as a co-sponsor to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.72.
79. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that his country supported the proposal by Zaire, also supported by Byelorussia, to adopt all six draft resolutions without a vote.
80. Mrs. ITO (Japan) said that her country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.72.
81. Miss ZINDOGA (Zimbabwe) said that her country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.61.
82. Mr. ABOU-HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had joined the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.72.
83. Mr. NAHAS (United States of America) requested postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.72 in order to permit further consultations.
84. The CHAIRMAN, referring to draft resolutions A/C.3/42/L.50, L.61, L.64, L.65 and L.75, said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt all those draft

(The Chairman)

resolutions without a vote. To avoid any confusion, he planned to adopt each one separately.

85. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.50 was adopted.

86. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.61 was adopted.

87. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.64 was adopted.

88. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.65 was adopted.

89. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.75 was adopted.

90. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.72, added the following countries to the list of co-sponsors: Japan, Cameroon, Syria, Austria, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, and Zimbabwe.

91. With respect to postponing a decision on draft resolution L.72, his delegation had done all that was possible to accommodate the concerns of other delegations in the existing text. Consequently, the need for further consultations seemed rather limited.

92. Ms. UMANA (Colombia) said that her delegation should be added to the list of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.75.

93. Mr. JAMALUD-DIN (Malaysia) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus in adopting draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.78 because he supported the general substance of that resolution. However, he questioned the use in preambular paragraph 6 of the term "asylum-seekers", since, in that context, the term appeared to include all those who were rescued at sea. A growing number of people leaving their countries of origin were not refugees but were seeking a better life abroad. His delegation hoped that the term would be appropriately clarified in a similar resolution in 1988.

94. Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) said that draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71 was an act of extraordinary cynicism, based on the false idea that the international community knew nothing about history or politics or international law and that it was very gullible. General Pinochet's Fascist Government believed that it could distract attention from the systematic violations of human rights committed daily against the heroic Chilean people. The Chilean régime entertained the ridiculous illusion that its slander of others would disguise the horrendous reality of life in Chile for more than 14 years and might spare it the universal opprobrium of the international community ever since democracy had been crushed in Chile in 1973. That régime, which flouted all appeals and demands of the United Nations and unhesitatingly violated international law and commitments, relying on force, torture and repression, was suddenly claiming to defend democracy and human rights by sponsoring draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71. How could the Chilean military junta, impervious to the current democratic trends in Latin America suddenly show

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

such concern or respect for human rights? How could they sully Mexico's reputation for constitutional democracy? How could those who had not held a single election in 14 years dare to criticize Mexico's democratic elections, in which nine political parties participated at the state, national and municipal level?

95. The history of violations of human rights in Chile was eloquent. Since 1980, when the current Constitution had been adopted, some 117,850 cases of violations of human rights had been reported. The violation of the most basic human right, the right to life, was particularly serious. Since 1985 there had been 694 cases of death or attempted murder, with untold suffering of the friends and relations of the victims.

96. General Pinochet recently said that he was the victim of an international campaign, oblivious of the fact that no democratic country could fail to condemn the flagrant violations of international law and the United Nations Charter in Chile. The Chilean anti-Government had therefore decided to attack democratic countries in the Third Committee and other international forums and had chosen Mexico as a target for its first indiscriminate attack because it had been one of the first countries to condemn the military coup of September 1973, which had overthrown the democratic Government of President Salvador Allende. Mexico had immediately granted diplomatic and territorial asylum to thousands of Chilean refugees and exiles and their families and had saved the lives of many Chileans who otherwise would have been murdered. It had then broken off relations with the Pinochet dictatorship and would not resume them until the Chilean people had regained its right to self-determination. Mexico was one of the countries which consistently supported, in both the Commission on Human Rights and the Third Committee the yearly resolution expressing concern at the situation of human rights in Chile. Mexico was very proud to have been chosen as a target by the Chilean dictatorship because it showed that its foreign policy had never given in to threats or pressure because Mexico was an independent country.

97. The lamentable episode of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71, which would go down in history as a clear example of international libel, demonstrated the truth of a remark made at the beginning of the current session that questions of human rights were being used by some countries as instruments of political blackmail instead of as a means of implementing the United Nations Charter and preserving basic human rights. The tactical intention of the attack to which his country was subjected was clear, but it was also clear which country was a dictatorship and which a democracy, in which human rights were violated and which respected constitutional precepts and international law. Mexico was unaffected by calumny and knew well that when at last the Chilean people was able to express itself, it would recognize Mexico's resolute opposition to Pinochet's dictatorship.

98. His country did not seek to give lessons to anyone. He did, however, wish to draw attention to the strange concept of human rights being promulgated by Chile. There was no objection to the idea that all countries had to respect human rights. However, it was unacceptable for one of the greatest violators of human rights to attempt to cast blame on the rest of the international community. It was Chile's

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

dangerous and absurd interpretation of human rights that his country was repudiating, not only to defend itself, but all those countries - the vast majority - where human rights were, in fact, not violated. According to draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71, there were serious human rights violations in Mexico, in addition to violations of electoral rights and freedom of the press. His Government neither practised nor condoned any human rights violation and if any violations were brought to its attention, it took action. In that connection, it had always been prompt in responding to concerns of non-governmental organizations and, in most cases, his Government had been cleared of any blame. While recognizing that there were isolated cases of human rights violations, his Government had spared no efforts to prosecute and punish those responsible.

99. Apart from constitutional guarantees, his country had a system of judicial remedies to provide compensation and reparations to any person whose fundamental rights had been violated. That system, moreover, was famed throughout the world as a Mexican initiative. His country's entire set of rules and laws were designed to work in favour of the most disadvantaged sectors of the population. In fact, his country had great respect for its cultural origins and indigenous populations. The State of Chiapas, besides containing a large indigenous and peasant population, had provided asylum for many Guatemalan and Central American refugees, a fact which had been applauded in a resolution before the Third Committee. There had been no complaints of violation of human rights in the case of any refugee, Mexican or foreigner, living in the State of Chiapas.

100. Given the wretched state of affairs in Chile, that country was in a poor position to level criticism at Mexico's electoral system. That system was based on tripartite vigilance over the electoral process. In addition, there were nine political parties, whose activities were protected by law. Those parties participated in a new consultative assembly which had been elected by direct suffrage. Freedom of the press existed in his country, as evidenced by the many newspapers which circulated unrestricted and the numerous radio and television stations, all free to criticize the Government. Mexican society was an open one, where democracy was not only a system of government but a system of life, a fact. A recent meeting in Chile of a non-governmental press society had condemned that country itself for lack of freedom of the press.

101. Aware that its system was not a perfect one, his country had vigorous constitutional institutions to enable it to overcome any shortcomings. When deciding on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71, he urged the Third Committee to be aware of the importance of that decision. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.71 was frivolous and inadmissible because it did not have foundation in fact or in law. To support that draft resolution would be tantamount to supporting a manoeuvre designed to strip the United Nations of its prestige in the area of human rights. The Pinochet Government lacked any authority based on law to put itself forward as a champion of human rights. The Third Committee should clearly state its energetic opposition to the deplorable attempt to undermine the principles and distort the purposes of the United Nations Charter.

102. Mr. DAZA (Chile) said that he had presented a draft resolution which was serious and respectful in nature and not intended as an insult. The gist of the draft resolution was simply that the human rights situation in Mexico should be studied. To that, the Mexican delegate had responded with rage, and he wondered what were the reasons for such a reaction. One reason was that Mexico's oligarchical mentality was not accustomed to such an initiative; but Chile, as a sovereign State, had the right to produce that resolution.

103. Despite many allegations to the contrary, his country had made many advances in the field of human rights. The battery of criticism directed at Chile told an exaggerated story and was, a crude distortion of what was actually happening. Yet, truth and justice would win in the end: his country was engaged in a successful political, economic and social process.

104. Violations of human rights were universal. Thus, all countries should be more modest and keep in mind that if complete freedom from human rights violations were required to submit draft resolutions in that area, such resolutions would not exist. Yet, countries did submit draft resolutions and Mexico, while censuring Chile and all of Latin America, reacted with annoyance when it received similar treatment.

105. He recognized the advances made in Mexico and had deep respect for the Mexican people. But everything in that country was a fiction - from its democracy to its basic compliance with human rights. According to the views of Octavio Paz, there was only one dominant political party in Mexico, although the appearance of pluralism and democracy was promoted. That party ruled the country with the usual totalitarian methods - violence, corruption and intimidation - and by manipulating public opinion. Furthermore, the leader of the Mexican Government had unmatched secret personal power which, at the end of his six-year term, was passed on to his successor, enabling the régime to perpetuate itself. That same fiction was also applicable to the human rights situation in Mexico. Cases of human rights violations in that country were well documented; there was sufficient material for the Commission on Human Rights to be concerned. Among the many violations were murders of rural workers, unlawful detention without trial, disappearances and torture.

106. With respect to freedom of the press, that same meeting in Chile to which the Mexican delegate had referred also reported that there was no freedom of the press in Mexico. The Mexican Government provided paper only to newspapers which supported it. That same report went on to cite numerous attacks in Mexico against journalists.

107. In Mexico every election was a flagrant violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Political campaigns were marked by fraud and vote purchasing. In the States in the Federal District, the elections had for many years been won by the dominant political party. Although an attempt was made in 1983 to open up the political process, the governing party had reacted the following year with repressive measures.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

108. Other reasons to examine the human rights situation in Mexico were the massive migrations of Mexican people due to massive unemployment. Mexico, a country which in recent years had received the greatest inflow of resources, had an elevated infant mortality rate. In contrast, his own country had one of the lowest infant mortality rates in Latin America, with active programmes to ensure the survival of its children. In Mexico, no one was addressing the human rights of children.

109. He regretted making that type of statement, but was obliged by the representative of Mexico to do so. He urged all the members of the Third Committee to consider what justice really meant and to take a stand on Mexico. That country was caught up in a moral marsh, bogged down in the impossibility of granting human rights to its citizens. He thus appealed to his fellow delegates to launch a process which would benefit future generations in Mexico.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.