

# 18th meeting

Friday, 29 May 1987, at 11.10 a.m.

President Mr Eugeniusz NOWORYTA (Poland)

E/1987/SR 18

## Statement relating to item 18

1 Mr DIRAR (Sudan), referring to agenda item 18, consideration of which had been concluded at the 17th meeting of the Council, said that if his delegation had been present during the voting it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A entitled "Efforts and measures for securing the implementation and the enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to life, to education and to work", the text of which was contained in the report of the Commission for Social Development on its thirtieth session (E/1987/20, chap. I, sect. A)

## AGENDA ITEM 17

### Human rights (E/1987/18 and Corr.1, E/1987/97)

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1987/97)

2 The PRESIDENT said that the Council had before it the report of its Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 17 (E/1987/97). On page 10 of the report, the Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of six draft resolutions, namely I, "Question of a convention on the rights of the child", II, "Question of a draft declaration on the right and responsibility of individuals, groups and organs of society to promote and protect universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms", III, "Summary or arbitrary executions", IV, "Use of mercenaries as a means to violate human rights and to impede the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination", V, "Realization of the right to adequate housing", VI, "Infringements of trade union rights in South Africa". For the texts of draft resolutions II and III, members should refer to the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1987/18 and Corr.1, chap. I, sect. A), in which the draft resolutions were originally recommended to the Council for adoption. For the texts of draft resolutions I, IV, V and VI, members should refer to the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1987/97, pp. 10-16).

3 On page 16 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee, 17 draft decisions were recommended to the Council for adoption, namely I, "Situation of human rights in Haiti", II, "General decision concerning the establishment of a working group of the Commission on Human Rights to examine situations referred to the Commission under Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII) and those situations of which the Commission is seized", III, "Situation of human rights in South Africa", IV, "Implementation of

the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief", V, "Use of mercenaries as a means of impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination", VI, "The right to development", VII, "Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment", VIII, "Voluntary fund for advisory services and technical assistance in the field of human rights", IX, "Situation of human rights in El Salvador", X, "Situation of human rights in Guatemala", XI, "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran", XII, "Question of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Afghanistan", XIII, "Question of human rights in Chile", XIV, "Report of the Commission on Human Rights", XV, "Organization of the work of the Commission on Human Rights", XVI, "Right of peoples to self-determination and its application to peoples under colonial or alien domination or foreign occupation", XVII, "National institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights". For the texts of draft decisions I to XI and XIII to XV, members should refer to the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1987/18 and Corr.1, chap. I, sect. B), in which the draft decisions, with arabic numerals, were originally recommended to the Council for adoption. For the texts of draft decisions XII, XVI and XVII, members should refer to the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1987/97, pp. 16-18).

4 He invited the Council to take action on the 6 draft resolutions and the 17 draft decisions recommended by the Second (Social) Committee for adoption.

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION I

*Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 1987/58)*

#### DRAFT RESOLUTIONS II AND III

*Draft resolutions II and III were adopted (resolutions 1987/59 and 1987/60).*

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION IV

5 The PRESIDENT noted that draft resolution IV had been adopted by the Second (Social) Committee by a recorded vote of 38 to 11, with 3 abstentions.

*A vote on the draft resolution was taken by roll-call*

*Sri Lanka, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zimbabwe

*Against* Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining* Australia, Norway, Oman

*Draft resolution IV was adopted by 37 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions (resolution 1987/61)*

6. Mr. POPOLIZIO (Peru) said that his delegation had wished to explain its vote before the vote. Since it had been unable to do so, it had not voted. He requested that Peru's vote in favour should be taken into consideration in the final count.

7. Miss EMARA (Egypt) said that the representative of Peru had formally requested to speak before the results of the voting had been announced and therefore should be allowed to cast its vote.

8. The PRESIDENT suggested that the vote of Peru should be taken into account. The results of the voting would therefore be 38 votes in favour, 11 against and 7 abstentions.

*It was so decided.*

9. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) said that if his delegation had been present during the voting it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. KAM (Panama) wished it to be noted that if his delegation had been present during the voting on draft resolution IV, "The use of mercenaries as a means to violate human rights and to impede the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination", it would have voted in favour.

11. Mr. AL-HAGRI (Oman) said that his delegation had made statements in the Second (Social) Committee in explanation of its vote on the draft resolution, expressing Oman's opposition to the use of mercenaries in any circumstances. Nevertheless, his abstention on the present occasion was in accordance with the position it had adopted concerning the work of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION V

12. The PRESIDENT said that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution V by a recorded vote of 49 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

13. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) asked whether, since the draft resolution could not be put to a recorded vote because the electronic mechanism was out of order, it would be possible to proceed to a vote by a show of hands, in which case the United States would abstain.

*A vote was taken on draft resolution V*

*Draft resolution V was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 1987/62)*

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION VI

*Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 1987/63)*

#### DRAFT DECISIONS I, II, III AND IV

*Draft decisions I, II, III and IV were adopted (decisions 1987/140, 1987/141, 1987/142 and 1987/143)*

#### DRAFT DECISION V

14. The PRESIDENT said that the Second Committee had adopted draft decision V by a recorded vote of 39 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions.

15. Miss ACHKAR (Guinea) said that in the French text of document E/1987/18 four paragraphs on page 15 and the text of the draft resolution on Afghanistan were missing.

16. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there were no omissions in the English text and that the complete text in French would be reproduced as soon as possible.

*A vote was taken by roll-call on draft decision V*

*China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first*

*In favour* Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zimbabwe

*Against* Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining* Australia, Oman

*Draft decision V was adopted by 40 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (decision 1987/144)*

#### DRAFT DECISION VI

*Draft decision VI was adopted (decision 1987/145)*

17. Miss BYRNE (United States of America) said that her delegation had not participated in the adoption of draft decision VI, concerning the right to development, on which it had already fully expressed its opinions at the forty-first session of the General Assembly and forty-third session of the Commission on Human Rights.

#### DRAFT DECISIONS VII, VIII, IX AND X

*Draft decisions VII, VIII, IX and X were adopted (decisions 1987/146, 1987/147, 1987/148 and 1987/149)*

#### DRAFT DECISION XI

18. The PRESIDENT said that the Second Committee had adopted draft decision XI by 23 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.

*A vote was taken by roll-call on draft decision XI*

*Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first*

*In favour* Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic

of, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela

*Against* Iran (Islamic Republic of), Oman, Pakistan, Romania, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic

*Abstaining* Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, India, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Turkey, Zaire, Zimbabwe

*Draft decision XI was adopted by 22 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions (decision 1987/150)*

19 Mr AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that his country wished to vote in favour of the draft resolution just adopted

20 Mr LINDGREN (Brazil) said that the international community should explore all possibilities of co-operation before passing judgement on any given situation. It therefore believed that the Council should accept the offer made by the Iranian Government to receive a special representative of the Secretary-General, taking into account that country's request that any expert sent to evaluate its internal situation must be an expert in Islamic law. Furthermore, the work of the special rapporteurs and representatives should not be used for political ends. Brazil's abstention should not be interpreted as a criticism of Mr Galindo Pohl, whose work was held in high esteem by the Government of Brazil

21 Mr ZARIF (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the decision just adopted was based on a series of resolutions that had been rejected by the Government of Iran because of their political nature and because they prejudged the situation of human rights in his country. He reiterated that Iran was not prepared to co-operate with any political measure passed off as a defence of "human rights"

#### DRAFT DECISION XII

*Draft decision XII was adopted (decision 1987/151)*

22 Mr DOST (Observer for the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan) informed the Council that, at the invitation of his Government, fruitful discussions had recently been held in New York with Mr Felix Ermacora, the Special Rapporteur, concerning his forthcoming visit to Afghanistan. He hoped that the Special Rapporteur would have the opportunity to prepare a factual, correct and unbiased report of the situation of human rights in Afghanistan. His Government had also invited two delegations of States members of the Commission on Human Rights and also the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit Afghanistan

#### DRAFT DECISION XIII

*Draft decision XIII was adopted (decision 1987/152)*

#### DRAFT DECISION XIV

*Draft decision XIV was adopted (decision 1987/153)*

23 Mr LOULICHKI (Morocco), referring to resolution 1987/3, contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1987/18 and Corr.1) which had just been adopted, said that, as stated in document

A/41/723, his country had decided not to participate in the debate on the question of Western Sahara so as to avoid becoming involved in a sterile polemic or jeopardizing the likelihood of success of the good-offices initiative. The progress made by the Secretary-General in the search for a just and definitive solution to that question led his Government to reaffirm the position taken during the forty-first session of the General Assembly

24 Mrs BARUTÇU (Turkey), referring to Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/50, said that her country believed that a fair, comprehensive and lasting resolution of the problem of Cyprus could only come about through agreement between the two parties involved, namely, the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. Turkey supported the Secretary-General's mission of good offices to that end. The attempts to single out certain issues and seek solutions for them in bodies where one of the parties was not represented were incompatible with the basic principles of justice, and their only motivation was to undermine the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and perpetuate the problem of Cyprus. Political calculations lay behind the resolution in question. The absence of any reference to the work of the Committee on Missing Persons, on the other hand, proved how flawed the resolution was and amounted to an admission by the Greek Cypriot side of its reluctance to participate in the Committee's work with a constructive attitude

25 Two years of strenuous efforts by the Secretary-General had resulted in the draft framework agreement on Cyprus<sup>25</sup> he had presented to the two parties on 29 March 1986, which provided the framework for negotiating a just and lasting solution. Unfortunately, the party which had yet to accept that document had redoubled its efforts to frustrate the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. It was deplorable that the same party had used the Commission on Human Rights to attain its purely political objective

26 Her delegation wished to state that it could not support resolution 1987/50 and noted with satisfaction that 18 members of the Commission itself had expressed opposition to that resolution

27 Mr GVIR (Observer for Israel) said that Commission on Human Rights resolutions 1987/1, 1987/2 A and B, 1987/4 and 1987/49 represented a new wave of arbitrary and baseless accusations against Israel. Once again, the United Nations was letting itself be used as an instrument of the demented forces waging a political campaign against his country

28 Israel was being condemned for virtually every conceivable human rights violation. Furthermore, no serious critical review was made of human rights abuses by the dictatorial régimes of certain Arab and other countries. That illustrated how political and tendentious were the human rights measures adopted in the United Nations. Israel appealed to the Council to restore balance and fairness to its investigations of human rights abuses, and explicitly rejected the resolutions mentioned, which unjustly condemned Israel

29 As for Commission resolution 1987/49 on the situation in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon,

<sup>25</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Forty-first Year Supplement for April, May and June 1986*, document S/18102 Add.1 annex II

although it once again exemplified the selective approach of the United Nations, it did also strongly condemn the siege that had prevented the delivery of food and medicine to the refugees for 155 days, which offered a ray of hope. In any case, it failed to mention that the siege was carried out by the Amal militia, an omission that was hard to justify. When Arabs themselves committed aggression against their own brethren, the condemnation was worded in a vague and impersonal manner. That malicious practice only contributed to the further erosion of the integrity and credibility of the United Nations.

30. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Observer for Cyprus) said that Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/50 contained all the elements needed to put the Cyprus problem in the proper perspective, taking into account the deterioration of the human rights situation in that country. Nearly 40 per cent of Cyprus continued to be occupied. The Turkish occupation forces, instead of withdrawing as called for in numerous United Nations resolutions, were being steadily reinforced. Turkish settlers now numbered more than 65,000, and the obvious aim of the settlement policy was to change the country's demographic structure. For the last 13 years the refugees had been denied their inalienable right to return to their homes and lands. The process of destroying the local culture and imposing Turkish culture in the occupied areas continued unabated.

31. The people of Cyprus had, during the 13 years of Turkish occupation, placed their hopes in international law. Commission resolution 1987/50 was a landmark document for the vindication of human rights in Cyprus. The validity of that resolution, which had been sponsored by 13 non-aligned countries and supported by the overwhelming majority of the members of the Commission, did not depend upon the attitude taken towards it by the aggressor, Turkey, in violation of its commitments under the Charter of the United Nations, not only refused to implement United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council, but also violated them flagrantly, thus undermining all effort towards a just and lasting solution that would allow the people of Cyprus to live in peace and prosperity.

32. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) indicated that, although draft decision XIV had been adopted without a vote, his delegation wished to go on record as having been in favour of it. Even though at the forty-third session of the Commission on Human Rights Rwanda had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on the question of human rights violations in the northern part of Cyprus, adopted as Commission resolution 1987/50, since then it had had occasion to become convinced that such violations were directly related to the secession of any part of a sovereign State and believed that it would be best to work towards restoring the integrity of Cyprus as soon as possible.

#### DRAFT DECISION XV

*Draft decision XV was adopted (decision 1987/154)*

#### DRAFT DECISION XVI

33. The PRESIDENT said that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted the draft decision by 41 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

34. Mr. RESHETOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would vote against draft decision XVI because it contradicted reality, was based on interference in the internal affairs of the people of Kampuchea and sought to have Kampuchea revert to the era of the cruel Pol Pot dictatorship. The delegations mentioned strongly opposed using United Nations organizations to support the Pol Pot criminals who had committed genocide against the Kampuchean people. They therefore rejected the draft decision under consideration and invited all who respected human rights and wished to re-establish normalcy in South-East Asia to vote against it.

*A roll-call vote was taken on draft decision XVI*

*In favour:* Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, China, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

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

*Abstaining:* Iraq, Zimbabwe.

*Draft decision XVI was adopted by 32 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions (decision 1987/155)*

35. Mr. PRASITH (Observer for Democratic Kampuchea) said that the decision taken by the Council for the eighth time was an expression of the indomitable desire of the international community to prevent any country, under any pretext, from interfering in the internal affairs of another country or imposing its will on it. The decision showed a firm resolve to defend the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the international norms governing relations between States in the interest of maintaining international peace and security. It also showed that eight years of lies, slander and manoeuvring had not enabled Kampuchea's invaders and occupiers to win acceptance for their actions in the international community.

36. Thanks to international support combined with military pressure on the spot by the national resistance forces, the struggle by the Kampuchean people was now entering a strategic phase which would lead it irreversibly to national liberation. The road that the Kampuchean people must still travel in order to exercise their right to self-determination was not, however, free of obstacles and dangers because the enemy was not yet prepared to renounce its ambition of establishing an "Indo-China Federation", or the regional expansionism which it had fostered for more than half a century. It also received immense amounts of support from its well-known protector, which it provided with important military bases to serve as platforms for its global expansion. Both patron and protégé were seeking to wear down the patience and resolution of all those who supported the struggle of the Kampuchean people. What they had been unable to win by force of arms they tried to obtain by means of propaganda,

diversion, beating about the bush and other such manoeuvres.

37. His delegation, on behalf of the Kampuchean people and their Coalition Government, therefore urged all peace- and justice-loving countries to keep up their guard and continue their noble support for the resolutions of the General Assembly on Kampuchea and the eight-point peace plan put forward by His Royal Highness Norodom Sihanouk on behalf of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. Only when the resolutions and peace plan were put into effect would the Kampuchean people be able freely to exercise their right to self-determination with no invasion or occupation forces present, and then Kampuchea would once again become an independent, pacific, neutral and non-aligned country, and peace, security and stability would once again reign in the South-East Asian region.

#### DRAFT DECISION XVII

*Draft decision XVII was adopted (decision 1987/156).*

38. Mr AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply and referring to the earlier statement by the representative of Rwanda (para. 32 above), said that his delegation wished to point out that the decision on Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/50 had been passed in the absence of one of the parties vitally concerned—the Turkish Cypriot community. The slightest regard for fairness would prevent any value from being attached to a resolution issuing from a discussion from which one party, not only the principal party concerned but the victim of flagrant human rights violations, had been excluded. The political exploitation of the Commission's work redounded to the grave detriment of the human rights cause. If a solution was to be found to the Cyprus problem which dealt with all aspects of the matter, the consent of both parties must be obtained, resolutions stemming from unilateral initiatives would contribute nothing towards such a solution.

39. The framework agreement on Cyprus," presented to the two parties on 19 March 1986 by the Secretary-General after numerous contacts, contained some elements of a balanced solution, taking the political equality of the two communities in Cyprus as a starting-point. The distinguished representative of Rwanda could hardly object to such a principle. The Turkish community had accepted the Secretary-General's proposal, not because that proposal entirely satisfied its requirements but because it was prompted by a spirit of compromise and the hope of reaching a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem as soon as possible. The basic agreement had not been accepted by the Greek side, probably because it provided for equal rights for the two communities. That was the heart of the problem.

40. Mr KABANDA (Rwanda) said his delegation was aware that the difficult situation in northern Cyprus had been the subject of exchanges between the Governments concerned, with the Secretary-General acting as intermediary. It would have been preferable if the attempt to resolve the problem of the Greek and Turkish communities in northern Cyprus had continued, but his Government did not believe that secession could represent the culmination of such negotiations or the answer

to the problem. The best thing would be for discussions between the two communities to resolve the problem to continue, and for all the territory of Cyprus to be reunited as a sovereign State.

41. Mrs MARCOULLIS (Observer for Cyprus) said that the representative of Turkey had spoken of calumny, but had actually been referring to United Nations resolutions and to Member States which had supported them. The Turkish delegation might equally well accuse of calumny the eminent jurists of the European Commission of Human Rights, who had adopted a report of fundamental importance on the situation of human rights in Cyprus.

42. Regarding the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, mentioned by the representative of Turkey, the President of Cyprus had made the following statement clearly explaining the position of Cyprus:

"In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 10 June 1986, I explained to him our position with regard to his latest initiative, and I suggested to him how we might proceed forward. Progress cannot be made by demanding more and more concessions from one side to the point that an arrangement will be both totally unjust and unworkable. In fact, all the concessions we made in the past, which, I repeat, no other Government in our position, in my humble view, would have made, were contingent upon acceptance of the position that the subject-matter of the resolutions of the United Nations relating to the withdrawal of the occupation troops and settlers, the question of the effective international guarantees with no spurious claims of rights of unilateral interventions, and the application of the fundamental freedoms and human rights for all Cypriots, were priority questions to be discussed and settled urgently. If agreement on these three fundamental issues is not possible, there is no point in discussing further the constitutional aspect of the problem, if, on the other hand, agreement on the three vital issues proves possible, that will facilitate an overall agreement as provided for in the resolutions of the United Nations. The way out, therefore, would be, without further delay and as a matter of priority, to tackle the important issues of the Cyprus problem."

43. Mr AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation agreed with the essence of Rwanda's position to the effect that negotiation was the most appropriate way. He also accepted the plan prepared by the Secretary-General regarding the creation of a bi-communal federal State based on the political equality of both communities.

44. Mr HERNDL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that since its inception the United Nations had worked to define and strengthen human rights and fundamental freedoms on the basis of a specific mandate set forth in Article 1 of the Charter. The Organization's work to promote human rights was directly linked to its work to maintain international peace and security, which was its foremost purpose. Respect for human rights was an essential condition for preserving peace.

45. In the modern world there were hardly any international issues which did not have a human rights dimension. Such issues needed to be studied from the angle of human rights so that policies and strategies were adopted that were grounded in respect for the

dignity of the human person. The United Nations had created a system of universally applicable norms, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,<sup>9</sup> which had become instruments of international law, and the two Covenants,<sup>12</sup> which had been supplemented by further treaties and other instruments, including most recently the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.<sup>20</sup> The process of supplementing and refining that international legal normative system would have to continue, through the implementation of human rights norms and a tightening of the international procedures designed to ensure compliance with them. To that end, organs had been set up to probe into specific country situations or into phenomena such as disappearance, summary or arbitrary executions, torture and the issue of mercenarism.

46. In general terms, the United Nations had advanced to the stage where it was monitoring implementation of human rights norms world wide. It was also attempting to consolidate and expand its activities in the area of advisory services, with the establishment of a voluntary fund for advisory services and technical assistance in the field of human rights, referred to in Commission resolution 1987/38, which had been endorsed by the Council when it adopted draft decision VIII.

47. The effects of the international human rights programme would henceforth have to reach the national level. The United Nations must make use of the experience of the international community to induce States to fulfil their duties, facilitate the discharge of those duties and help satisfy the needs at the national level

for international co-operation, for exchanges of information, and for advice and assistance. Action should be taken to support the evolution of a national human rights infrastructure, so that each country could demonstrate its commitment through specific action, with the advice and active support of the United Nations.

48. On the question of budgetary and financial resources, none of the activities currently carried out could be regarded as being in its final phase, since the normative system had to be refined and adapted to new developments. Increased emphasis would have to be placed on the evolution of economic, social and cultural rights and the monitoring procedures must be maintained, as must the capacity of the Organization to assist States effectively in the implementation process. That was why organs and new approaches had been developed. What was needed was further consolidation of the system. It would not be possible, therefore, to eliminate or reduce the activities of the existing organs. It would seem imperative that the level of resources to be provided for the human rights programme should be commensurate with the activities outlined and the organizational approach taken. Any long-term view must take into account the totality of the programme and the need to keep the United Nations actively involved in the promotion of human rights on a world-wide scale. With the resolutions and decisions just adopted by the Council, a number of important programmes and priorities had been determined which showed the road to be followed in the future.

49. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 17.

<sup>20</sup> General Assembly resolution 39/46, annex.