



**Economic and Social Council**

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1986/SR.19

29 May 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

First regular session of 1986

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 23 May 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique)

CONTENTS

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS (continued)

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN

HUMAN RIGHTS

---

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

ALLOCATION OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS (continued) (E/1986/45)

Mr. HANTKE (Federal Republic of Germany) proposed that paragraph 3 of the annex to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies relating to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (E/1986/45, p. 4) should be deleted and that consideration of the remaining paragraphs should be deferred to the Council's second regular session of 1986.

It was so decided.

Miss AYORINDE (Nigeria), supported by Mr. TANASA (Romania), Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) and Mr. ZIADA (Iraq), proposed that explanations of vote should be heard only after the Council had considered and voted on all the draft resolutions and decisions under agenda items 11 and 9.

It was so decided.

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (E/1986/94)

Consideration of the report of the Second (Social) Committee

Draft resolutions I to IV

Draft resolutions I to IV were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution V

The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution had been adopted in the Second (Social) Committee by 43 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution V.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 of draft resolution V was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution had been adopted in the Second Committee by 41 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 4 of draft resolution V.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 4 of draft resolution V was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT said that the draft resolution as a whole had been adopted in the Second Committee by 44 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution V as a whole.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 44 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI

The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution had been adopted in the Second Committee by 43 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution VI.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Japan.

Paragraph 6 of draft resolution VI was adopted by 43 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT said that the draft resolution as a whole had been adopted by 44 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VI as a whole.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan.

Draft resolution VI as a whole was adopted by 44 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII

The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution VII had been adopted in the Second Committee by 44 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VII.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 44 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII

The PRESIDENT said that the draft resolution had been adopted in the Second Committee by 42 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VIII.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX

The PRESIDENT said that the draft resolution had been adopted in the Second Committee by 43 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution IX.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolutions X to XVI

Draft resolutions X to XVI were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution entitled "Updating of the world survey on the role of women in development"

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to paragraph 23 of document E/1986/94 regarding the decision taken by the Second Committee on the draft resolution. He suggested that the Council should defer consideration of the draft resolution to the second regular session of 1986.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution entitled "System-wide medium-term plan for women and development and system-wide co-ordination of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women"

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to paragraph 31 of document E/1986/94 regarding the decision taken by the Second Committee on the draft resolution. He suggested that the Council should defer consideration of the draft resolution to the second regular session of 1986.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that the Russian and Arabic versions of the document needed for the next agenda item were not yet ready to be distributed, but would be shortly.

Miss BARKER-HARLAND (United Kingdom) suggested that the Council might wish to hear explanations of vote on item 11 while waiting for the documents to be distributed.

It was so decided.

Miss BARKER-HARLAND (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation would like to stress the concern which it had expressed at the adoption by the Commission on the Status of Women of resolutions V to IX, which did not have direct implications specific to women and should more appropriately be dealt with elsewhere. Such resolutions increased the politicization of the Commission, diminished its role as a focal organ of the United Nations for issues specific to women and jeopardized its ability to tackle the important work which it was mandated to carry out.

Mr. STIRLING (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against paragraphs 2 and 4 of resolution V and against the resolution as a whole because it was one-sided and did not help to solve the serious problems existing in the Middle East. Only a comprehensive settlement respecting the right of all men and women - including the right of Israeli men and women - to live in

(Mr. Stirling, United States)

safety would bring peace to that troubled area. With regard to resolution VI, he said that the United States firmly opposed the odious régime of apartheid. However, it must be dismantled in a manner which did not cause additional suffering to the people of South Africa and their neighbours, who depended to a considerable extent on the South African economy for their well-being. His delegation deeply regretted that the extreme and strident wording of the resolution had forced the United States to vote against it.

Mr. QUINN (Australia) said that his delegation had supported resolution VI; it had abstained, however, on paragraph 6 because, while Australia was in favour of mandatory economic sanctions, support for comprehensive sanctions went beyond current Australian policy. He expressed the hope that the Commission on the Status of Women would give priority the following year to the programme planning and budgeting issues listed in paragraphs 2 (a) to 2 (d) of resolution XIV.

Mr. LEE (Canada) said, with regard to the resolutions dealing with southern Africa, that his country's strong views on the subject of apartheid and its support for the efforts of countries and peoples in that part of the world were well known. Some of the specific wording and the tone of the resolutions, however, went further than seemed appropriate. Canada had therefore abstained in the voting on the resolutions in question.

Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on resolutions V to IX. The views of his delegation on apartheid, South Africa and Palestine were well known. However, the resolutions in question presented a somewhat distorted picture of the issues and contributed to further politicization of the Commission on the Status of Women.

The PRESIDENT said that any other delegations wishing to explain their votes on the resolutions under agenda item 11 would have an opportunity to do so later, in accordance with the decision taken earlier by the Council.

HUMAN RIGHTS (E/1986/95)

Consideration of the report of the Second (Social) Committee

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee on item 9 of the agenda, entitled "Human rights" (E/1986/95). He drew attention to the 11 draft resolutions recommended for adoption in paragraph 52 of that report.



Draft resolutions I to VIII

Draft resolutions I to VIII were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution IX

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution IX.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, United States of America.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution X

Draft resolution X was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution XI

Miss AYORINDE (Nigeria) proposed that, in the second preambular paragraph, the word "national" should be inserted before the words "liberation movements".

It was so decided.

A recorded was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph.

In favour: Bangladesh, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, Iceland, Jamaica, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, Turkey, Venezuela.

The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted by 31 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Colombia, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Panama, Philippines, Turkey.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 34 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Jamaica, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 38 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the 16 draft decisions contained in paragraph 53 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee.

Draft decision I

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision I.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Japan, Papua New Guinea, Sweden.

Draft decision I was adopted by 42 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Draft decision II

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision II.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zaire.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Draft decision II was adopted by 30 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

Draft decision III

Draft decision III was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision IV

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Observer for Afghanistan) said that his delegation continued to hold the view that no valid reason existed to justify an investigation of the human rights situation in Afghanistan. The so-called reports prepared by an individual about whose competence his delegation had not changed its views revealed the political motives of the enemies of the people and revolutionary Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The document which had unfortunately been placed before the Council again was part of a campaign of lies and insinuations against Afghanistan and was merely an echo of the psychological war being waged against his country by imperialism. He offered several examples to show the partial, unfair and tendentious nature of the so-called report, noting that the author had accused the representatives of Afghanistan of lying about the number of Afghan refugees. His delegation rejected such groundless judgments. With regard to Afghans living abroad, his Government's policy remained unchanged. A report submitted by Babrak Karmal to the extraordinary plenary session of the Revolutionary Council on 9 November 1985 had stated that the doors of the homeland were open to all compatriots living abroad and that they would be given every opportunity, with full guarantee of security, without any discrimination and with due respect for human dignity, to join the efforts to build a prosperous and independent Afghanistan.

The so-called Rapporteur had attempted to downplay the importance of the Loya Jirgah, or Supreme Council, and the local jirgahs, and had remained silent on the free and democratic local elections which had been held and which constituted the basis for the direct participation of the entire Afghan people in the conduct of public affairs.

The author of the so-called report had called into question the sincerity of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in acceding to a number of international human rights instruments. His delegation rejected such accusations and declared that Afghanistan had implemented those instruments by incorporating their relevant provisions into national legislation and by respecting them in its actions.

The so-called Rapporteur had ignored the achievements of the Afghan people in various social and economic fields, and had included lies and fabrications in his so-called report in order to satisfy imperialist circles and their local reactionary allies.

Mr. GONDJOUT (Gabon), speaking on a point of order, said that he understood that the Council had taken a decision that speakers should make their statements after the voting.

The PRESIDENT said that it had been the practice of the Council to give a delegation, in particular an observer delegation, an opportunity to speak before a vote which directly concerned the country which it represented.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Observer for Afghanistan), continuing his statement, expressed indignation at the manner in which the report discussed medical services and the right to health in his country. Medical schools in Afghanistan were in fact quite active, as demonstrated by the fact that the number of doctors and medical personnel graduating in 1985 alone was nearly a third of all graduates during the 50 years preceding the April Revolution. The report had also attempted to downplay the importance of the Red Crescent in Afghanistan and had accused the Afghan Government of using Red Crescent supplies for its own purposes. However, a delegation from the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies which had visited Afghanistan in April 1986 had disproved those lies.

It was thus clear that the people of Afghanistan had opted for independence, progress, economic and social development and scrupulous respect for human rights. The Council must consider the real violations of human rights: the barbarous acts of gangs of mercenaries trained, financed and armed chiefly by United States imperialism. His delegation had consistently brought such crimes to the international community's attention, and he now wished to state that, during 1985, mercenaries and terrorists, under direct orders from the CIA, had destroyed an Afghan civilian aircraft with American ground-to-air missiles, killing 52 persons, including children, women and old people.

Mr. WAKE (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the observer for Afghanistan was truly exercising the right normally given to observers to speak in connection with a proposal; he in fact appeared to be reopening the general debate on human rights which had been concluded several days earlier in the Second Committee, a debate which the Committee had decided not to pursue in plenary meetings of the Council. While his delegation had gone along with the extraordinary decision to depart from the rules of procedure and defer all explanations of vote until action had been taken on all draft proposals (a decision

(Mr. Wake, United States)

which, it was to be hoped, would not set a precedent), the Council ought to act consistently and ask observers, too, to wait until voting was completed before speaking.

The PRESIDENT explained that, as the observer for Afghanistan was not a member of the Council, and thus unable to vote, he was not speaking in explanation of vote; consequently, the Council's decision did not apply in the present case.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Observer for Afghanistan) concluded by saying that, since the self-styled defenders of human rights and opponents of terrorism had in fact committed unpardonable crimes in violation of all international norms and principles, his delegation categorically rejected the draft decision before the Council, which it considered devoid of any validity whatsoever.

The PRESIDENT said that the Second Committee had adopted the draft decision by a recorded vote of 36 to 7, with 5 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision IV.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic, India, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Finland, Iraq, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Draft decision IV was adopted by 37 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

Draft decision V

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision had been adopted in the Second Committee by a recorded vote of 24 to 7, with 13 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision V.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Against: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Gabon, Guyana, Haiti, India, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Draft decision V was adopted by 21 votes to 7, with 19 abstentions.

#### Draft decisions VI to XII

Draft decisions VI to XII were adopted without a vote.

#### Draft decision XIII

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision had been adopted in the Second Committee by a recorded vote of 32 to 7, with 6 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XIII.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Spain, Sweden.

Draft decision XIII was adopted by 41 votes to 7, with 6 abstentions.

#### Draft decision XIV

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision had been adopted by the Second Committee by 39 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. BUI XUAN NHAT (Observer for Viet Nam) said that the draft decision before the Council had no bearing on the actual situation in the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Rather, it presented a stark picture by grossly distorting facts for political reasons. If adopted, the draft decision would only subject the Kampuchean people once again to the same violations of human rights they had suffered under the genocidal régime.

(Mr. Bui Kuan Nhat, Observer, Viet Nam)

The draft decision failed to take the views of all the parties concerned into account and constituted a stumbling block to the incipient dialogue in South-East Asia and to a negotiated settlement of the problems of the region. Adoption of the draft decision would thus constitute interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and be contrary to the aims of the United Nations in the field of human rights. His delegation considered the draft decision to be devoid of any validity whatsoever and urged the Council to vote against it.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XIV.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic, India, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Finland, Iraq, Uganda, Zimbabwe.

Draft decision XIV was adopted by 41 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

Draft decision XV

The PRESIDENT announced that Uruguay had become a sponsor of the draft decision.

Draft decision XV was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision XVI

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision had been adopted by the Second Committee by a recorded vote of 31 to 1, with 17 abstentions.



A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XVI.

In favour: Bangladesh, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela.

Draft decision XVI was adopted by 35 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.

Explanations of vote

The PRESIDENT invited Council members to explain their votes.

Ms. UMAÑA (Colombia) said that if she had been present at the time of voting, she would have voted in favour of decisions IV and V.

Mr. ODOCH-JATO (Uganda) said he had abstained in the vote on decision II even though his delegation had sponsored all the resolutions leading to the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. The decision to appoint a special rapporteur was inappropriate, since the duties the special rapporteur would be asked to perform were already being carried out by other bodies, including the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

He had voted in favour of decisions IV and V for purely procedural reasons. However, he would not have supported them had their texts been identical to those of the resolutions adopted on the same topics by the Commission on Human Rights at its forty-second session, since his delegation considered those texts to be unbalanced.

Mrs. MIGNOTT (Jamaica) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on resolution XI because, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, it preferred to await the outcome of that Committee's deliberations

(Mrs. Mignott, Jamaica)

before according recognition to the concepts set out in the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution. Furthermore, while the appointment of special rapporteurs had been a successful procedure in other instances, she could not support the request to appoint one for the purpose specified in paragraph 6. Her delegation did, however, associate itself fully with all other paragraphs of the resolution.

Mr. TELLE (France) said that his delegation had consistently condemned the activities of mercenaries. Unfortunately, the consensus which the international community had reached on that subject had been abandoned at the forty-second session of the Commission on Human Rights when the Commission had adopted its resolution 1986/26. Resolution XI not only retained the exaggerated wording of that resolution, particularly in the fourth preambular paragraph, but also called for a misuse of the resources of the United Nations and overburdened the Commission on Human Rights by requesting the appointment of a special rapporteur. His delegation had consequently voted against the resolution.

His delegation had voted in favour of decision IX because it believed that the Commission on Human Rights should be entitled to hold additional meetings if necessary to discharge its onerous task. Given the budgetary difficulties facing the Organization, the Commission's effectiveness must be enhanced, particularly since more and more items bearing only the most tenuous connection to the promotion of human rights were being added to the Commission's agenda each year. His delegation therefore wished to propose a number of measures that might enable the Commission to continue to abide by the principles that had guided it for 40 years: the length of statements on political subjects not directly related to the Commission's mandate should be limited, as should the time allotted for rights of reply; the time given to observer delegations and non-governmental organizations should likewise be limited; the President should be given the power to invite delegations, after consultations with the other officers of the Commission, to withdraw any proposals not directly related to the Commission's mandate; and certain items on the Commission's agenda could be considered every other year rather than annually.

His delegation had voted in favour of decision X, but believed that the General Assembly's decision to postpone the 1986 session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities would prevent the working

(Mr. Telle, France)

group specified in the decision from considering new communications. The working group might, however, continue to consider information currently before the Sub-Commission in accordance with the provisions of Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII).

Mr. LEE (Canada) said that Canada strongly condemned everything associated with mercenaries; however, resolution XI, on that subject, contained at least two elements which his delegation was unable to support. The fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution recognized mercenarism as constituting a crime against humanity, a legal determination which he doubted the Council was empowered to make. Furthermore, mercenarism and genocide were two different concepts which should not be equated, as was done in the paragraph in question. The wording of the resolution actually appeared to diminish the horror the world felt at genocide. Finally, the decision in paragraph 6 to appoint a special rapporteur was inappropriate because it would interfere with the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, particularly as the Committee had yet to define the term "mercenary". Thus, having opposed those two paragraphs when they had been put to a vote, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole.

With regard to decision I, his delegation had, in meetings of the Second Committee, questioned the value any meeting of the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to development might have when the General Assembly had not yet reached a decision on that question. His delegation had abstained in the vote as an indication of its support for the text on that subject which had been proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia at the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

Finally, his delegation had voted in favour of decision IX, but wished to emphasize that the additional meetings of the Commission on Human Rights which had been authorized should not be used unless it was absolutely necessary to do so. He also urged the President of the Commission to do everything possible to ensure that that body adhered to its timetable in 1987 and voiced support for the measures to organize the Commission's work more efficiently just proposed by the representative of France.

Mr. ABOU HADID (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, although his delegation had wished to vote against decision II, its vote had erroneously been recorded as an abstention. He requested that the error should be corrected.

Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that, although his delegation had not objected to the adoption without a vote of resolution XII, that did not mean that it accepted Commission on Human Rights resolution 1986/21 on the question of Western Sahara. His country's position, which had been expressed in General Assembly resolution 40/50, continued to be one of support for self-determination and for democratic consultation under United Nations auspices with a view to achieving a just and definitive solution of the question of Western Sahara.

Mrs. KIMATA (Japan) said that her delegation had voted against resolution XI because it felt that any new element should be thoroughly discussed before it was incorporated in a resolution. The mandate of the special rapporteur referred to in paragraph 6 appeared to be very broad and ambiguous, and the financial implications of such an appointment needed consideration. The question of mercenaries was before the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, and it appeared unwise that any other report should be undertaken before that Committee completed its work. Her delegation had abstained in the voting on decision I because it believed that it would be premature to take a decision on a meeting of the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development before the results of consideration of the draft declaration on the right to development were known. It was to be hoped that a full range of views would be expressed on that subject at the forty-first session of the General Assembly so that a text acceptable to all States might be drawn up. She also endorsed the statements made by the representative of France concerning rationalization of the work of the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. SCHWANDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on decision I for the same reasons for which it had abstained in the vote on resolution 1986/15 of the Commission on Human Rights. A decision to convene a meeting of the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development before the adoption by the General Assembly of a declaration on that subject was premature, and it also seemed unlikely that the Working Group could do any useful work if it were to be convened as early as January 1987. His

(Mr. Schwandt, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on decision X since it attached great importance to action taken in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII). Such action was severely impaired by the deferment to 1987 of the thirty-ninth session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which constituted a severe blow to United Nations activities in the field of human rights. It was important that the adverse consequences of that deferment should be overcome rapidly so that the United Nations would be able to fulfil legitimate expectations relating to the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Mr. QUINN (Australia) said that his country had taken a vigorous stand against the activities of mercenaries, by, inter alia, enacting national legislation on the subject. However, it was his delegation's view that a resolution on such an important subject should have been introduced earlier in order to attract consensus, and he also expressed his country's reservations with respect to the unduly flexible definition of the term "crime against humanity" as used in resolution XI. His delegation fully supported decision X, as a reflection of its commitment to the confidential procedures established by Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII). However, it was regrettable that the cancellation of the 1986 session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities would prevent the consideration of many human rights communications until 1988. His delegation supported resolution II and regretted the likely cancellation of the 1986 session of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations. With regard to decision IX, his delegation shared the view that the organization of the work of the Commission on Human Rights should be given careful and critical consideration.

Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that particular attention had been devoted during the Council's first regular session of 1986 to efforts to attain the goals of the International Year of Peace. His delegation had supported the resolution adopted by the Council on that subject. In connection with the Council's decision to step up the struggle against apartheid and racism, his delegation strongly condemned the recent attack by South African racists on

(Mr. Yakovlev, USSR)

Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia and called for an immediate halt to the criminal policy of terrorism and violence pursued by the South African authorities. The call for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the Charter must be heeded and the criminal apartheid régime ended once and for all. The Council's resolution on the training and use of mercenaries was of particular significance in the world of today.

His delegation supported resolutions adopted by the Council which were designed to strengthen international co-operation in the field of human rights and had proposed the adoption of a resolution marking the twentieth anniversary of certain international instruments in that field. Universal accession to and compliance with such international instruments represented a major factor in international action to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter. The Council's decision to step up efforts against genocide and Fascist dictatorial régimes was of current importance, and the Soviet delegation also supported the Council's measures to safeguard the rights to life and development and to realize the right to adequate housing.

His delegation accorded particular significance to the Council's resolutions and decisions concerning the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women. His country called for the total elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and the establishment of full equality for them in all areas of life. His country had also supported the activities of the United Nations to mark the occasion of the International Youth Year, as well as efforts to oppose the criminal activities of "big business" in the field of narcotic drugs, and supported the convening of an international conference on that subject in 1987.

The first regular session of 1986 had, unfortunately, been the arena of continued attempts by the imperialists to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States. The decisions on Afghanistan and the People's Republic of Kampuchea bore no relation to the defence of human rights, and the politically tendentious statements contained in the report of Mr. Ermacora clearly served the purposes of the imperialist policy of mercenary-aided aggression against Afghanistan. The peoples of both Afghanistan and the People's Republic of Kampuchea had embarked on the path of independent development and of radical

(Mr. Yakovlev, USSR)

socio-economic change with a view to achieving social justice and securing the human rights of the broadest masses of the population. Imperialist intervention in the affairs of those two countries must be halted.

Some decisions had, unfortunately, been taken by the Council without due regard for the financial situation of the United Nations and the recent decisions of the General Assembly on that subject. The Council should not permit duplication of work by different bodies in the preparation of studies.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation expressed its support for decisions adopted by the Council concerning United Nations activities to combat apartheid, racism, militarism and gross violations of human rights, as well as action to strengthen international co-operation for the achievement of equality for women and the solution of international social problems.

The meeting was suspended at 1.05 p.m.