



CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 62:</i>	Page
<i>International Year for Human Rights (con- tinued):</i>	
<i>(a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary- General;</i>	
<i>(b) International Conference on Human Rights General debate and consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1 (con- cluded)</i>	1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 62

International Year for Human Rights (continued) (A/7194, A/7195, A/7195/Add.1 and Add.3-7, A/CONF.32/41, A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1633 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1635, A/C.3/L.1636, A/C.3/L.1637 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1638-1641, A/C.3/L.1642/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1643):

- (a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights: report of the Secretary-General;
- (b) International Conference on Human Rights

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.3/L.1623/REV.1 (concluded)

1. Mrs. CONDE (Guinea) said that the International Year for Human Rights should be a year for reflection and for action against any kind of denial of individual rights. The twentieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was a time to assess what Member States, particularly the colonial Powers, had done to emancipate those nations which they had deprived of their liberties. Although Guinea had not taken part in the International Conference on Human Rights, it fully recognized the importance of the decisions adopted at Teheran and was convinced that the Conference would prove a landmark in the history of the emancipation of the countries of the Third World.

2. In Guinea, class conflict had been eliminated and ethnic and tribal strife had been replaced by national action; men and women were now completely equal, and Guinean women held responsible posts and played a full part in political, administrative and trade union affairs; the Guinean Civil Code and people's courts recognized all human rights; women, young people and workers organized conferences, symposia and seminars on the promotion of human rights; Guinea had organized a

comprehensive welfare system and provided safeguards for working women and children; social security had been developed, and under the marriage code injustices and irregular practices were abolished and women were guaranteed a peaceful home. President Sékou Touré had proclaimed that human dignity and freedom were indivisible and absolute and had condemned all violations of human rights. The people of Guinea enjoyed freedom of expression and information, and the progress made in mass education, the eradication of illiteracy and training was evidence of the Government's concern for the well-being of its citizens.

3. The principles contained in international agreements relating to human rights should be fully implemented. Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, equality of rights had ceased to be an abstract concept. What had given it force above all had been the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which had been adopted by the General Assembly in 1960. Those two Declarations represented both the manifesto of the Third World and a proclamation of the abolition of the superiority of some nations over others. At a time when man had mastered science and technology, it was intolerable that only certain countries should continue to benefit from them, and human rights, like human knowledge, should be universal; in the twentieth century, the achievement of freedom and equality was the best guarantee of the coexistence of nations.

4. Nations were now attempting to eliminate the after-effects of colonialism, but there was a danger of a new form of colonialism emerging, if it was not checked; she referred in that connexion to the occupation of Arab territory by Israel forces. The Teheran Conference had opposed that situation, and the Organization of African Unity had demanded the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops. Her delegation had become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1 as an indication of its desire to guarantee each nation and each individual the inalienable right to enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms. The sponsors of the draft thought that a committee should be established to investigate the usurpation of which the inhabitants of the occupied territories had been victims; the committee should be as small as possible so that it could accomplish its task effectively. She expressed the hope that the Israel authorities would apply the principles of the Charter of the United Nations resolution 242 (1967) adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967.

5. In spite of the efforts made by the United Nations over a period of nearly twenty-five years, in spite of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, there was still a long way to go before equality of rights and social justice were achieved. Some parts of the world still suffered from usurpation and from violation of fundamental freedoms; the representatives of certain colonial Powers condemned violations of human rights and racial discrimination in the United Nations, but their Governments, pursuing a policy of duplicity, were oppressing the peoples of Africa and Asia. The Teheran Conference had drawn attention to all those violations and had, *inter alia*, adopted a resolution on apartheid in South Africa and the criminal practices which the Portuguese colonialists and the illegal minority régime in Southern Rhodesia were seeking to perpetuate in southern Africa. Apartheid, which was the most evil form of the denial of human rights, should be condemned by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. She denounced the bantustans of South Africa and the fact that an attempt was being made to extend them to Namibia and Rhodesia, with a view to perpetuating white supremacy in southern Africa. Although some delegations had made a vain attempt to reply to the accusations levelled against their Governments' neo-colonialist policies, the Committee should demonstrate its resolute intention to put an end to the intolerable violations of political and trade union rights in Africa and to the criminal treatment inflicted on the nationalists in Portuguese Territories, to whom the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War should be applied.

6. For those reasons, her delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1637 and Add.1 and 2. It was the duty of all, in the International Year for Human Rights, to struggle tirelessly against racial discrimination and the denial of fundamental rights and oppose the systems established by South Africa and Portugal.

7. The CHAIRMAN noted that there were no more speakers on the list and declared the general debate closed. He invited those representatives which had expressed their intention of exercising their right of reply to take the floor.

8. Mrs. TAIROVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the United Kingdom and other delegations which had accused the Soviet Union of pursuing a discriminatory policy against the Jewish and other religions, said that those accusations were pure slander invented by imperialist propaganda. All religions were tolerated in the Soviet Union and the Islam community, in particular, lived in the greatest freedom. The Muslim populations of the Caucasus and Central Asia, in the Republics of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Azerbaidzhan, continued to worship and to practice their religious and national customs, as foreign delegations visiting the Soviet Union had been able to see for themselves. The United Kingdom's false accusations were simply an attempt to sow dissension between the Soviet Union and the Arab States, but no attack could harm their fraternal relations.

standard of living was very high in the Soviet Union and the Jews benefited from the general prosperity, as did all citizens. Statistics showed that there was a high percentage of Jews among students, professors and doctors and that the number of synagogues, as against Orthodox churches, was very high. Those delegations which had bewailed the lot of the Jews in the Soviet Union should rather save their pity for the sad plight of the Arab refugees in Palestine, whom the United Kingdom representative had not even mentioned. The United Kingdom's accusations were part of a deliberate campaign of slander against the Soviet Union, but the Committee would not give credence to such lies.

10. Miss LOPES (Portugal) regretted that certain delegations had used the subject of human rights for purely political ends. The question should be treated with the greatest impartiality, and each delegation should first see what needed to be done in its own country, before assuming the right to criticize others. Her delegation could easily adopt the role of accuser, as it was common knowledge in which countries human rights were being violated; but it did not wish the discussion to become acrimonious. It would not reply in detail to the unjust accusations levelled against its country, as it had already done so many times in the competent organs of the United Nations; it would therefore merely reject them.

11. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) reserved the right to prove to Portugal and its friends, which considered that the question of human rights should be dealt with elsewhere than in the Third Committee, that it was the body competent to deal with the subject, even if other United Nations bodies had already done so.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1. The Committee could choose between two courses, either to suspend the meeting to enable the co-sponsors to prepare a definitive text or to take up draft resolution A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1 and come back to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1 later.

13. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said he favoured the first course.

14. Mr. MEHIRI (Tunisia) supported that opinion.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would suspend the meeting to enable the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1 to consult each other.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.25 p.m.

16. The CHAIRMAN invited the Director of the Division of Human Rights to indicate the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1, which was before the Committee.

17. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) thanked the members of the Committee for their kind words about him and other members of the Secretariat.

18. Under rule 154 of the General Assembly's rules

tive implications of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1. Those financial and administrative implications were contained in document A/C.3/L.1643. The draft resolution invited the Secretary-General to take certain measures—operative paragraph 7 in particular invited "the Secretary-General and the United Nations organs and specialized agencies concerned to take action, as appropriate, on the resolutions and recommendations of the Conference". Implementation of those resolutions and recommendations, to the extent that they concerned the Secretary-General and the United Nations, would entail an expansion of activities, principally in connexion with the elimination of racial discrimination and the existing programme of advisory services in the field of human rights.

19. Intensification and expansion of United Nations activities concerning racial discrimination was recommended in several resolutions by the Conference, particularly resolutions II (Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance), III (Measures to achieve rapid and total elimination of all forms of racial discrimination in general and the policy of apartheid in particular), VI (Measures to eliminate all forms and manifestations of racial discrimination), VII (Establishment of a new, additional United Nations programme on racial discrimination), XXIV (International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination), and XXVIII (Measures to achieve rapid and total elimination of all forms of racial discrimination in general and of the policy of apartheid in particular). In most instances, the activities proposed in those resolutions would be additional to those already in process. Resolution VII, in particular, recommended that the United Nations "should develop constructive programmes designed to assist governments, organizations and individuals in their efforts to eliminate racial discrimination ... in particular by making available to them the results of research into the causes of racial discrimination and measures to eliminate them ...". It requested the Secretary-General inter alia "to prepare regular reports summarizing material from the studies of the problems of race relations ... prepared by the specialized agencies ... and other institutions, international and national ... and to make these available to the United Nations bodies concerned ...".

20. The Secretary-General considered that implementation of those resolutions and, in particular, preparation of the reports in question would necessitate an increase in the staff of the Division of Human Rights, namely, the addition of two Professional and General Service posts at an annual cost, including common staff costs, estimated at \$52,900.

21. In addition, many Conference resolutions recommended new activities to be undertaken under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights. They were, in particular, resolutions VI (Measures to eliminate all forms and manifestations of racial discrimination), XIX (Legal Aid), XX (Education of youth in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms) and XXI (Realization of economic, social and cultural rights). Those resolutions requested the Secretary-General: (a) to give due emphasis to the elimination of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural fields,

in the implementation of the programme of advisory services; (b) to provide the necessary resources within the limits of that programme, to facilitate expert and other technical assistance to Member States seeking to extend the availability of competent legal aid; (c) to plan biennial seminars for youth, under the programme of advisory services, on subjects of special concern to youth; and (d) to take measures within the framework of the programme so that States could share their experiences on effective methods and means adopted for the realization of economic, social and cultural rights.

22. Any expansion of advisory services in the field of human rights would necessitate an increase in the funds available for that purpose under part V of the regular budget for the technical co-operation programme. The amount of resources the General Assembly would decide to allocate to that part for 1969 had yet to be examined by the Fifth Committee, in the light of the decisions already taken by the Second Committee on the programme of activities. In addition, the Secretary-General was requested to report to the UNDP Governing Council, at its seventh session in January 1969, on the objectives of the regular technical assistance programme and its relations with UNDP programmes and make any recommendations he deemed appropriate. At the present stage, therefore, the Secretary-General could not indicate how far it would be possible to extend the activities listed under part V of the budget as regards advisory services in the field of human rights in 1969. If it proved possible to extend those activities it would then be necessary to make some additions to the staff of the Division of Human Rights in order to enable it to implement the expanded programme. In that case, however, the Secretary-General would endeavour, initially at least, to meet the new 1969 needs with the staff already available.

23. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1, announced the following oral amendments: at the request of the delegation of Cyprus, two new operative paragraphs had been added, reading as follows:

"1. Expresses its gratitude to the Government and people of Iran for acting as hosts to the International Conference on Human Rights, for the excellent arrangements and for the hospitality extended to all participants;

"2. Also expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the Executive Secretary for the effective preparation and organization of the Conference."

In former operative paragraph 3, the words "a historic" were replaced by the words "an important and timely" which better expressed the idea that the Proclamation of Teheran was part of a whole and not an end. In former paragraph 5, the phrase "and the work of the Conference, as appropriate" should be added after the word "Teheran". Finally, former paragraph 9 should read as follows: "Decides to keep under review the resolutions of the Conference in connexion with related agenda items". He hoped the members of the Committee would have no difficulty in adopting the draft resolution unanimously.

24. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) suggested that in the proposed new paragraph 2, the phrase "and all the staff members of the Secretariat who serviced the Conference" should be added after the words "Executive Secretary".

25. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested, in the spirit of the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestion, that the beginning of the new operative paragraph 2 should read: "Also expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the Secretariat of the Conference for ...". He thought that the term "Secretariat" would cover all the staff members, at all levels, who had either helped in the preparation of the Conference at Headquarters or had serviced the Conference at Teheran.

26. His delegation suggested further that in former operative paragraph 3 the word "Welcomes" should be substituted for the word "Endorses", as some reservations had been expressed in the general discussion. In the hope that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1 would be adopted unanimously, his delegation would refrain from making any other suggestions and would approve the draft in its present form.

27. Concerning the financial implications of former operative paragraph 7, an estimate of which had been given by the Director of the Division of Human Rights, he wished to recall that several years ago the staff of the Division of Human Rights had been strengthened by the establishment of new posts to enable it to carry out the study of racial discrimination. In 1965-1966, the Division's staff had again been strengthened to assist Mr. Santa Cruz in preparing his report. That study had now been issued, and the staff members recruited for that purpose were still there. No increase in staff was therefore necessary, as those persons would now be available to work on the proposed studies. That being so, the Soviet delegation to the Fifth Committee would request that there be no increase in staff.

28. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), on behalf of the sponsors, accepted the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestion and proposed that the new paragraph 2 should read: "Also expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General, the Executive Secretary of the Conference and the members of the Secretariat for effectively preparing and servicing the Conference". That wording had the merit of covering both the staff members who had worked at Headquarters and those who had worked at Teheran. The sponsors had not yet been able to study the Soviet representative's suggestion concerning former paragraph 3.

29. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not find the wording proposed by the Swedish representative for new paragraph 2 satisfactory and preferred the wording proposed by his delegation.

30. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that the Executive Secretary must be mentioned.

31. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) pointed out, with reference to new paragraph 11, that a number of the Teheran Conference resolutions, e.g. resolutions IV

representative to clarify that point. In any event, his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1.

32. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) agreed that what the representative of Upper Volta had said was quite true. He was prepared to consider any suggestion for improving the text of new paragraph 11, on the understanding that the Teheran Conference resolutions were not to be the subject of a special agenda item of the General Assembly but were to be considered in connexion with the more general questions to which they related.

33. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) would prefer to have the word "continuous" retained in new paragraph 11, since its deletion considerably weakened the word "review"; he proposed that the paragraph should read: "Decides to keep under continuous review the resolutions which have emerged from the Conference".

34. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica), referring to the observations of the representative of Upper Volta concerning new operative paragraph 11, said that it was true that a number of the resolutions adopted at Teheran concerned items which were not on the agenda of the General Assembly or which had appeared on it only intermittently. However, some questions dealt with by the Teheran resolutions were considered regularly by the General Assembly, e.g. the elimination of racial discrimination, violations of human rights, and the status of women. Eight draft resolutions concerned questions which had been of particular concern to the Teheran Conference, but which had never been placed on the Assembly's agenda; they would be on that agenda in the future, since the Secretary-General would have to report on them to the Assembly; the Commission on Human Rights, moreover, would probably submit recommendations to the Assembly. The purpose of new operative paragraph 11 was to see to it that the General Assembly kept under review the resolutions adopted at Teheran.

35. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that the Conference resolutions were of such importance that it was necessary to ensure their implementation or at the very least the application of the ideas they contained. He was satisfied with the replies to his question.

36. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), replying to the Soviet representative's observations, said that the staff of the Division of Human Rights was fully occupied by the tasks entrusted to it, and that, in fact, it could not be considered large enough to carry out all the tasks assigned to it by United Nations organs. Mr. Santa Cruz' study on racial discrimination had not yet been completed, and when it was, in 1969, the staff members who were working on it would have to be assigned, by virtue of the decisions of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, to three new studies, on slavery, the protection of minorities and genocide. The implementation of the decisions of the Conference would represent a substantial increase in the activities of the United Nations in the field of human rights and the carrying

37. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), wishing to take into account the Upper Volta representative's perfectly justified observation, proposed that in new paragraph 11 the words "to the extent possible" should be inserted after the words "keep under review".

38. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) supported the draft resolution under consideration, and approved the addition of two new paragraphs whereby the General Assembly would express its gratitude to Iran and its appreciation to the Secretariat. She thought, however, that in former paragraph 4 the word "realization" or "enjoyment" would be more appropriate than the word "implementation" and, in the English version of former paragraph 6, she would prefer the word "interest" to be substituted for the word "concern".

39. Her delegation could not agree to the financial implications of paragraph 7 as stated by the Director of the Division of Human Rights. Any intensification of programmes which might prove necessary from resolution VII of the Teheran Conference should be done within existing resources through a reordering of priorities. She did not agree that the other resolutions cited by the representative of the Secretary-General would have financial implications. The Conference resolutions concerning the advisory services programme did not call for an expansion of that programme, but rather for a reorganization of the programme.

40. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) approved the insertion, in new paragraph 11, of the words "to the extent possible"; he saw no objection to the substitution, in former paragraph 4, of the word "realization" for the word "implementation" or, in the English version of former paragraph 6, of the word "interest" for "concern".

41. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) accepted the suggestion that the word "realization" should be used in

former paragraph 4 and the word "interest" in the English version of former paragraph 6.

42. Mr. JAHANBANI (Iran), on behalf of his delegation and Mr. Hoveyda, thanked all those who had said kind words about his country; because of the addition of the new paragraph 1, his delegation would withdraw as a sponsor of the draft resolution.^{1/}

43. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) announced that Hungary had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.^{1/}

44. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the members of the Secretariat were extremely touched by the expression of appreciation in new operative paragraph 2 but did not think it necessary, or even particularly helpful to have that paragraph in the draft resolution.

45. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) thought that the new paragraph 2 should be retained. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by acclamation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by acclamation.

46. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) said that her delegation, while approving the resolution just adopted, reserved its position with regard to the financial implications stated by the Director of the Division of Human Rights.

47. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) said that the fact that her country had supported the resolution just adopted did not mean that it approved all the resolutions adopted by the Teheran Conference; in fact, Israel maintained its reservations in respect of some of those resolutions, as expressed at Teheran.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

^{1/} In document A/C.3/L.1623/Rev.1/Add.1, subsequently circulated, Jordan, Hungary and Romania were added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution and Iran was deleted from the list.