

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**



FORTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records**

THIRD COMMITTEE
44th meeting
held on
Thursday, 12 November 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RITTER (Panama)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 95: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN; STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 105: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TRAFFIC IN DRUGS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 100: QUESTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

*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.

87-56970 7389S (F)

12p.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/42/SR.44
24 November 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

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

AGENDA ITEM 95: ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN: STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (continued) (A/C.3/42/L.44)

1. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) pointed out two errors in the draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.44. Democratic Yemen should be removed from the list of sponsors and Denmark and El Salvador should be added to it. In addition, in paragraph 14 of the proposal, the word "Geneva" should be replaced by the word "Vienna".
2. After emphasizing that a large number of the paragraphs of the text were based on the provisions of resolutions 41/108 of the General Assembly and 1987/3 of the Economic and Social Council, he read out paragraphs 9 to 14 of the proposal. The draft resolution was the result of intensive consultations, and thus he hoped that the Committee would adopt it without a vote.
3. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary) noted that in paragraph 8 of its resolution 1987/3, the Economic and Social Council had recommended that the General Assembly, at its forty-second session, should consider the request of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women for additional meetings, on an exceptional basis, taking into account the views expressed by delegations, the financial situation of the United Nations and the priorities identified by the Secretary-General in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.
4. The revised cost estimates of the financial implications of resolution 1987/3 were contained in document A/C.5/42/16. The costs to hold additional meetings for the Committee would amount to \$44,100 for travel and subsistence and \$167,500 for conference services, estimated on a full-cost basis. Those costs would be absorbed by resources already included under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for 1988-1989. Document A/42/7/Add.4 contained the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

AGENDA ITEM 105: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued) (A/C.3/42/L.33, L.34, L.35, L.36, L.37 and L.38/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.33

5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.33 without a vote.
6. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/12/L.34

7. Mr. FRAMBACH (German Democratic Republic) stated that, at the request of certain delegations, he wished to make the following changes to the draft resolution: in the sixth preambular paragraph, following the word "self-determination", the phrase "by the peoples of economically less developed countries" should be replaced by the word "peoples". In addition, paragraph 4 should be eliminated and the paragraphs renumbered.
8. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) proposed to replace, in the ninth preambular paragraph, the phrase "man can achieve complete fulfilment of his aspirations" by the phrase "men and women can achieve complete fulfilment of their aspirations".
9. Mrs. AIQUAZE (Algeria), supported by Mr. KABORE (Burkina Faso) and Mr. LY (Senegal), said that she had no basic objection to that suggestion, but in French, the word "homme" was a general term which referred to all of humanity and thus included women.
10. Mr. FRAMBACH (German Democratic Republic) indicated that there would be no difficulty in accepting the proposed change but, in his opinion, the word "man" meant all human beings.
11. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) proposed that, in order to solve the difficulty, the word "humankind" should be adopted.
12. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that since the word "man" in the resolution was not capitalized, it was not general but specific and, consequently, it was appropriate to expressly mention women. She was amazed that certain delegations were balking at that idea.
13. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) recalled that the representative of Canada had expressed the wish, at a previous meeting, that henceforth in French texts, the phrase droits de l'homme should be eliminated and replaced by the phrase droits de la personne humaine. It was a matter of principle.
14. Mrs. LAFORTUNE (Canada) explained that Canada, after a lengthy controversy, had effectively solved that problem by opting for the expression droits de la personne. She hoped that the United Nations would follow the Canadian example. She proposed that in the present case, the Third Committee should choose a neutral formula of that type.
15. Mr. DIRAR (Sudan) said that the word used in the Arab version encompassed all of humanity and, consequently, it was unnecessary to introduce a specific reference to women. He requested that the current wording should be retained.
16. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France) said that she was ready to accept Egypt's amendment concerning the addition of an explicit reference to women; however, if that posed problems, perhaps the words "human being" could be substituted.

17. Mr. AL-HAKEEM (Oman) supported the Arab-speaking representative who had already spoken and confirmed that in Arabic, the word used encompassed women in its meaning.
18. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) observed to the representative of Sudan that Arabic had different words for "human being" and for "man". She subscribed to the solution, proposed by France, of choosing the phrase "human being".
19. Mr. GALAL (Egypt), said there was no valid reason not to mention men and women explicitly and maintained his proposal.
20. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands) emphasized that the discussion on that controversial question might last for years and proposed, to put an end to the debate, that the word "people" should be adopted in the English version.
21. Mr. QUINN (Australia), supported by Ms. YOUNG (United Kingdom), supported the compromise solutions proposed by the Netherlands and Canada. He emphasized that conference services were costly and that the question could be resolved more easily by informal consultations.
22. Mrs. AL-TURAIHI (Iraq) proposed that a vote should be held on the draft resolution.
23. Mr. KOUNKOU (Congo) said that, at the risk of being taken for a conservative, he proposed to retain the wording in the published text and to leave the resolution of that problem to the linguists.
24. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that, since it was a matter of changing attitudes and mentalities, Egypt's proposal to make a specific reference to women was perfectly justified. Her delegation would, however, be prepared to accept the compromise formula "human being".
25. Mr. FRAMBACH (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had had no intention of excluding women and that it was prepared to accept one of the compromises proposed, such as "human being" or "humanity". He proposed that no more time should be wasted on the question and that there should be a vote.
26. The CHAIRMAN said that, since all the delegations agreed that the draft resolution referred to women as well as men and that the discussion was only about how that idea could best be reflected in the text, he proposed that the Committee should vote on the entire draft and leave it to linguists to find a solution which, in the various languages, reflected its consensus as faithfully as possible.
27. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.34.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

/...

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Nepal, Singapore.

28. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.34 was adopted by 103 votes to 24, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.35

29. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

30. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.36

31. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Rwanda had become a sponsor of the draft resolution. The sponsors wished to omit from paragraph 5 the words "as a priority" and add at the end of the sentence the words "under the item entitled 'Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms: right to development'".

32. Mr. NAHAS (United States of America) said his delegation would not participate in the vote for the reasons it had already mentioned in February 1987 at the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva. He also recalled that his country had not voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 41/128 referred to in draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.36.

33. Mrs. COLL (Ireland) requested a clarification of the amendment to the draft resolution.

34. Mrs. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) said that it referred to the agenda of the General Assembly at its forty-third session. She also noted that in introducing the draft resolution she had stated that Morocco and Sudan had become sponsors.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as amended, without a vote.

36. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.37

37. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway and Samoa had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

38. Mr. QUINN (Australia) said that Costa Rica and Sweden had also become sponsors of the draft resolution, and that he had also received a proposal for an amendment which he had not had time to communicate to the other sponsors. In paragraph 1, the words "expresses concern" should be replaced by the word "notes".

39. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) and Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) said that their countries wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

40. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he sought clarification concerning paragraph 9 and 11, particularly concerning the words "teaching booklet" and "personalized version". The United Nations was not an educational institution and the States must bear responsibility for human rights education.

41. Mr. QUINN (Australia) said that the wording of the paragraphs was based on Commission on Human Rights resolution 1987/39, adopted at the request of many countries that wanted the United Nations to show them the way in that field and help them develop education responding to their own needs. As for the publication of the personalized version of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it was pursuant to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights that had it been decided to publish a reduced format version that would be easier to distribute to the public.

42. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) noted a technical error in the Spanish version of the draft resolution: in paragraph 4, the word "presentados" between the words "derechos" and "humanos" should be omitted.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.37, as amended, without a vote.

44. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.38/Rev.1

45. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali and Rwanda wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

46. Mrs. FERRIOL (Cuba) said that Cameroon had also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

47. Mr. HOPE (Denmark), speaking in explanation of the vote before the vote, said that the 12 countries of the European Economic Community would abstain as they had in previous years, because they doubted that the draft resolution and the other resolutions referred to in it contributed to the advancement of human rights. They regretted the emphasis on collective rights in a draft resolution devoted to the rights of the individual. They also regretted that the draft did not indicate anywhere that human rights violations were the concern of the United Nations or that they were being committed, whereas questions relating to the world economy and disarmament, which had nothing to do with the work of the Third Committee, were mentioned in it. Lastly, they rejected all provisions designed to establish pre-conditions for the enjoyment of human rights.

48. Mrs. CLARK (New Zealand) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. It had reservations, however, in respect of paragraph 16, which it felt was premature since the concept of the right to development still had to be defined. As for paragraph 22, she noted that if it had been a member of the Commission on Human Rights it would not have voted in favour of resolution 1987/19.

49. Mr. HYNES (Canada) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution for the reasons it had already indicated on several occasions. Specifically, it felt that it was inappropriate to mention the new international economic order and disarmament in a draft resolution relating to human rights. As for the specific case of paragraph 16, Canada did not feel that the draft resolution offered an appropriate framework for the future work of United Nations human rights bodies and it hoped that the Commission would prepare a more balanced text in the future.

50. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he fully supported the draft resolution but wanted the words "particularly in Namibia and Palestine" included after the words "for all" in paragraph 6, because of Egypt's interest in those two issues.

51. Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba) asked whether it was in order for an amendment to be put forward after the explanations of vote. She was surprised that she had not been consulted earlier by the representative of Egypt. In her view, and although she was not opposed a priori to such an amendment, it was not appropriate in the context. She called upon the representative of Egypt to withdraw the proposed amendment.

52. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he had indeed consulted Cuba before proposing the amendment in question. However, he would withdraw his proposal so as not to delay the Committee's work any further.

53. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.38/Rev.1.

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

Against: United States of America.

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

54. Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted by 112 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 104: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TRAFFIC IN DRUGS (continued)
(A/C.3/42/L.41, L.42 and L.43)

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.41

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the financial implications of the draft resolution appeared in document A/C.3/42/L.46.

56. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Rwanda had become a sponsor of the draft resolution. As to the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, she pointed out that document A/C.3/42/L.46 did not contain any request for an additional appropriation but merely explained the adjustments made under section 20 of the programme budget.

57. Mrs. PULIDO (Venezuela) pointed out that there was an error in the English text of the draft resolution. In paragraph 6, before the words "plenipotentiary conference" the word "the" should be replaced by "any agreed" in order to follow the conditional tense used in the original Spanish text. The holding of a conference did actually depend on the outcome of the work on the draft Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

59. It was so decided.

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

60. Mrs. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that Argentina and Samoa had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution and that the USSR and Poland had withdrawn from the list of sponsors.

61. Ms. YOUNG (United Kingdom), Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), Mrs. KABA (Côte d'Ivoire), Mr. NAWAZ (Pakistan), Mr. KRENKEL (Austria), Ms. MERCHANT (Norway), Mrs. ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic), Mr. REINBOTHE (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. RIETJENS (Belgium) and Mr. PANDEY (Nepal) said that they wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

62. Mr. YAKOVELEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had withdrawn from the list of sponsors because Democratic Kampuchea was a sponsor.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.42 without a vote.

64. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.43

65. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) informed the Committee that for technical reasons the English version of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.43 had been reissued; France, El Salvador, Indonesia, Angola, Turkey, Senegal, Guatemala, Côte d'Ivoire, Morocco, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Yugoslavia, Egypt and Fiji had become sponsors of the draft resolution. She drew attention to some minor changes in the text of the draft resolution.

66. In the eighth preambular paragraph, the first two lines should read as follows: "Considering the importance of the role of catalyst of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in the ...".

67. In operative paragraph 5, fourth line, after "Caribbean Region", the words "and the Interregional Meeting of Heads of National Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East region" should be added. In operative paragraph 12, the word "Urges" should be replaced by "Calls upon". In the third line, the word "drastically"

(Mrs. Ashton, Bolivia)

should be replaced by "significantly". She regretted that she had not had time to consult all the sponsors on the changes and hoped that they would be understanding.

68. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) said that he was not fully satisfied with the wording of the text and in particular felt that the first preambular paragraph did not refer to consequences which were even more serious than those indicated. He also feared that the reference made in the fourth preambular paragraph to the traditions of certain communities could serve as an excuse for drug abuse, particularly among young people. Lastly, he did not feel that it was desirable to combine two very different aspects of the question, as in operative paragraph 3. He hoped that the wording of the draft resolution would be reviewed because, in his view, it could not be adopted as it stood.

69. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) said that as far as her delegation was concerned the decision on the draft resolution could be postponed; it was possible that the English version was not in line with the Spanish text.

70. The CHAIRMAN suggested that delegations should resume consultations on the draft resolution so as to be able to adopt it without a vote. If there was no objection, he suggested that a decision on the draft resolution should be postponed.

71. It was so decided.

72. Mr. REINBOTHE (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, while his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.36 in an effort to be constructive, its previously stated position remained unchanged.

73. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.38/Rev.1 as a whole, with the exception of certain elements which did not, in his view, fall within the purview of the Third Committee's mandate. His delegation had abstained in the vote because the wording of certain phrases appeared to set pre-conditions for the development of the human person.

74. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Soviet Republic) said that the fact that his delegation had supported all the resolutions on which the Committee had taken action did not mean that it had no comments to make, nor that it agreed with all the provisions of the drafts. It was out of a desire to co-operate and to save time that it had refrained from asking questions about the texts. Nevertheless, he wished to make an exception in the case of paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.37. The fact that only three categories of individuals (members of armed forces, medical professionals and diplomats) were mentioned in connection with educational curricula might give the impression that those groups were the most vulnerable to human rights violations, which was far from being the case.

75. Mr. QUINN (Australia) replied that those individuals had been mentioned because they had an important role to play in promoting and protecting human rights, since they had direct contact with the public. While paragraph 9 of the draft resolution approached the education of young people from a community

(Mr. Quinn, Australia)

perspective, paragraph 10 stressed the need for special training for those involved in law enforcement. It was important that police officers should understand what was meant by human rights when carrying out their functions. He welcomed the Byelorussian delegation's interest in the draft resolution and hoped that that delegation would one day join in sponsoring a draft resolution on the same topic.

76. Mrs. ITO (Japan), explaining her delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/42/L.36 and L.38/Rev.1, recalled the reservations which her delegation had expressed in 1986 when the Declaration on the Right to Development had been adopted. Her country, being well acquainted with the legitimate aspirations of peoples and countries for development, particularly of the developing countries, was active in international efforts to provide those countries with economic assistance. However, her delegation did not believe that individuals or States had any legitimate rights to development other than those set out in the International Covenants on Human Rights, which had been recognized internationally. Moreover, the co-operation to which Article 56 of the Charter of the United Nations specifically referred must be encouraged by sovereign States on a voluntary basis; it did not constitute an inalienable human right.

77. Her delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.36, but hoped that the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development would continue to take the various views expressed by Member States on the new concept of the right to development duly into account. Until the complex question of the nature, scope and legal effect of that right had been determined, there should be no rush to begin codifying it.

78. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/42/38/Rev.1 because it had reservations about several paragraphs which emphasized the right to development.

79. Mr. LINDHOLM (Sweden) spoke on behalf of the Nordic countries in explanation of their votes on draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.38/Rev.1. It had often been suggested that the concept of human rights should be broadened to include various categories of rights having nothing to do with relations between individuals and States. The term "human rights" would then apply not only to the rights of individuals or groups of individuals, but also to the rights of States, nations or peoples. Furthermore, it had been said that human rights should also cover the rights of individuals in their relations with other individuals. Care must be taken not to dilute the concept of human rights by extending it to include those two categories of rights, though they were surely important. The rights and duties of States in their mutual relations had always been a major area of interest in international law; nevertheless, they should not be considered in the context of human rights.

80. In its resolution 32/130, the General Assembly had in fact stipulated that all human rights and fundamental freedoms were indivisible and interdependent, and that equal attention must be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of civil and political rights as well as of economic, social and cultural rights, a

(Mr. Lindholm, Sweden)

position which the Nordic countries fully endorsed. However, since the adoption of that resolution, that concept had gradually been eroded. The Nordic countries could not accept the phrase "human rights of peoples", nor could they accept the setting of a specific level of development or the establishment of a new international economic order as pre-conditions for the protection and promotion of the human rights of individuals. The Nordic countries also regretted the tendency to emphasize the rights of States rather than those of individuals and the apparent emphasis on economic and social rights over civil and political rights, even though the two categories of rights merited equal attention.

81. Ms. POC (Democratic Kampuchea) said that all sovereign States Members of the United Nations had the right to sponsor any resolution. The reservation expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning Democratic Kampuchea's appearance among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.42 attested to the fact that that country supported the aggressors and invaders of Democratic Kampuchea.

82. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/42/L.43 wished to be given a little time to confer with the Swedish delegation on the wording of the text.

AGENDA ITEM 100: QUESTION OF A CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD (continued)

83. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that the draft convention in question had been considered by the Commission on Human Rights since 1979. She believed that the Commission should have done more to achieve a consensus on a text which should simply confirm and expand the principles already set out in the Declaration on the Rights of the Child adopted unanimously in 1959.

84. There ought to be world-wide agreement on the need to protect children, to whom the contemporary world frequently offered unacceptable living conditions, assuming that, if unwanted, they had not fallen victim to the modern form of infanticide that was the order of the day in many developing societies. Those that survived were exposed to everything - famine, poverty, disease, pollution, exploitative labour, prostitution, pornography. Sometimes they even became a form of currency or were the focus of unspeakable types of trafficking. Some of them died on battlefields, others were tortured or beaten simply because they had been born under a racist régime.

85. It was with those "wretched of the earth" in mind that her delegation hoped that the Commission on Human Rights would complete work on the draft convention on children's rights so that the General Assembly might adopt it and make a concrete contribution to the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Rights of the Child, which proclaimed in its preamble that "mankind owes to the child the best it has to give",

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.