

United Nations

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records\*



UN LIBRARY

JAN 5 1983

COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WWRR)

THIRD COMMITTEE  
73rd meeting  
held on  
Friday, 10 December 1982  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 73rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil)

### CONTENTS

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.3/37/SR.73  
17 December 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/C.3/37/L.53, L.68, L.74/Rev.1, L.75, L.77)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded delegations that in explaining their votes either before or after the vote on each draft resolution under agenda item 12, they were allowed to speak on any other draft resolution under that item.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 (continued)

2. Mr. CHADERTON-MATOS (Venezuela), in explaining his delegation's position on the draft resolutions relating to the three Latin American countries, said that his country could not remain neutral with regard to human rights, nor could it accept the fact that each vote on human rights in the General Assembly automatically resulted in delegations' taking sides in the East-West confrontation. Violations of human rights could not be considered "bad" when perpetrated by adversaries and "good" when perpetrated by allies. On the contrary, every violation should be subject to condemnation.

3. His delegation also rejected the singling out of Latin American countries in draft resolutions on human rights. If concern for human rights was universal, he wondered why action was not also taken with regard to other parts of the world.

4. Because of such defects, the authority of the United Nations in the promotion and protection of human rights was declining, in contrast with the serious, balanced and strictly humanitarian approach of institutions such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights or Amnesty International, both of which had achieved much more than the United Nations.

5. In Latin America, the moral void resulting from the inability of the United Nations to promote respect for human rights, would oblige his country to step up its struggle for the promotion of human rights and against tyranny. In that struggle, Venezuela hoped to rely on the assistance of countries, which until now had not been in the vanguard of the defence of human rights within the institutional framework of the inter-American system and of those members of the Organization of American States whose representatives had invoked the memory of Simón Bolívar in the Third Committee.

6. For the reasons stated, Venezuela would not participate in the vote.

7. Mr. de PINIES (Spain), referring to the draft resolutions on the human-rights situation in Chile, Guatemala and El Salvador, said that the guarantee of human rights and fundamental freedoms was enshrined in the Spanish Constitution and deeply rooted in the legal tradition of his country. He announced that, in observance of Human Rights Day on 10 December, his Government had issued a communiqué, in which it had renewed its pledge to make human rights a decisive

/...

(Mr. de Pinies, Spain)

factor in guiding all its actions. At the international level, respect and protection for human rights must be viewed not as an internal affair but as an essential element in the definition and orientation of Spain's international policy.

8. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolutions. However, it believed that a partial and discriminatory approach to that serious problem was unacceptable, since human-rights violations should be condemned wherever they occurred. Unfortunately, although serious human-rights violations took place in many countries, they were not always brought to light and condemned as they should be by the United Nations.

9. Mr. MASSMAN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that in his country's view, the United Nations should play an active role in the promotion and protection of human rights in all parts of the world. However, the same standards must be applied to all countries.

10. With regard to Chile, his delegation remained concerned about the persistent restrictions on the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It appealed once again urgently to the Government of Chile to co-operate with international bodies in the field of human rights and to take effective steps to stop all abuses. Nevertheless, it was not fair that one particular country was the subject of a debate on human rights in the General Assembly year after year, especially in view of the violations in many parts of the world, some of them far more serious than in Chile. The United Nations could not maintain such a selective approach to the problem if its commitment to the promotion of human rights was to remain credible; however, that selectivity would be perpetuated if, as envisaged in draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, the mandate of the Special Rapporteur was again extended.

11. His delegation also had a number of reservations with regard to specific parts of the draft resolution, which tended to emphasize the political rather than the human-rights aspects of the situation in Chile. The reference to the Chilean Constitution was a case in point, since a considerable number of constitutions in the world granted fewer rights than the Constitution of Chile. Moreover, some assertions in the draft resolution, such as the charge that individuals had disappeared, were not based on evidence. In addition, the draft resolution did not take note of improvements in the situation and efforts made to protect human rights. His delegation also had doubts as to whether all sponsors of the draft resolution had been motivated solely by human-rights considerations.

12. For those reasons, his delegation would support the amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom but would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

13. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) said that in addition to the human-rights violations in Latin America referred to in draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.53, A/C.3/37/L.75 and A/C.3/37/L.77, there were unfortunately violations of human rights elsewhere in the world. That fact must be borne in mind in order to avoid seriously compromising the effectiveness and credibility of efforts undertaken by the United Nations to safeguard the fundamental rights of all individuals.

/...

(Mr. Stevens, Belgium)

14. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, he said the United Nations was unable to help in remedying the persistent critical situation of human rights in Chile because of the lack of co-operation between Chile and the Special Rapporteur. It was therefore necessary to seek innovative means of approaching the problem. The United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 12 provided such an approach, and his delegation supported it. Moreover, the amendment did not prejudice the future decision of the Commission on Human Rights on that issue.

15. With regard to the situation in Guatemala, his delegation shared the concerns of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75.

16. It was distressing to note in the interim report of the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation in El Salvador that violations in that country had not ceased. His delegation urged all parties concerned to forego all acts of violence and violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

17. The purpose of all United Nations resolutions on human rights should be to help promote respect for human rights and to support efforts made in that regard. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.77 did not serve that purpose for the following reasons: it placed on the Government of El Salvador the sole responsibility for the absence of peace and tranquility in the country; it overlooked or minimized the efforts undertaken by Salvadorian authorities to improve the situation; and it seemed to contest the elections of March 1982, which, in his delegation's view, had been a positive step towards a more democratic society. His delegation regretted that the sponsors of that draft resolution had not been willing to amend the text and would therefore abstain from voting on it.

18. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) said, with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, that the Committee and the Commission on Human Rights had long been concerned with the human-rights situation in Chile. As in previous years, in 1982 the Special Rapporteur had stated that the situation was serious, with no indication that there had been a change for the better. The institutionalization of the state of emergency, under which human rights had been abrogated and the security organs enjoyed impunity with regard to homicide, illegal arrests, persecutions, abductions and cases of torture, was a particularly serious aspect of the situation. The Chilean authorities had failed to clarify the fate of the large number of persons missing since 1973. Chilean citizens were being denied the right to freedom of thought, opinion and expression, the right to trade-union association and collective bargaining, and the right to strike.

19. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 and of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.68/Rev.1. Had the sponsors of the two resolutions been able to agree on a single text, his delegation would have joined as a sponsor.

20. Ms. RASI (Finland) said that all States Members of the United Nations had made a solemn commitment to promote and respect human rights. While the United Nations had formulated an ample body of international legislation on human rights, its machinery to implement such legislation was inadequate. Her Government had consistently supported the creation of an effective machinery to safeguard respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

21. It was tragic that human-rights violations were practically a daily occurrence in a great number of countries. The report of Amnesty International had prepared a list of more than 120 countries in which there had been violations of human rights. Indeed, in some countries systematic and massive violations of human rights were part of official State policy, and there was an international consensus or near-consensus that those cases were of legitimate concern to the international community. However, on some cases brought to the attention of the General Assembly in recent years, there had been no consensus because those human-rights violations had been viewed mainly from a political perspective and often in the context of a transient political situation. Her delegation deplored that trend, which served no constructive purpose in the universal promotion of human rights. While it would vote in favour of the draft resolutions, it wished to state clearly that it would not be able to support such draft resolutions in future.

22. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said, for reasons which were well known, that her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 and the other draft resolutions under consideration under agenda item 12. It would, however, vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom, for two reasons. Firstly, the amendment would ensure the collaboration of the Chilean Government, which was necessary, if a solution to the human-rights situation in Chile was to be found. She had noted again in the current year that the information given in the report of the Special Rapporteur had been obtained not within Chile itself but rather through newspaper accounts and interviews with persons outside Chile, which were by no means infallible sources. The criteria of the United Nations, in particular of the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Labour Organisation, with regard to such investigations were that the information should be gathered with the express consent of the Government concerned and should not be obtained from politicized sources or based solely on newspaper accounts. Secondly, in voting for the amendment, she felt that she would be assisting the Special Rapporteur in his work.

23. Mr. FERGUSON (Australia) said that his delegation would support the United Kingdom amendment proposed to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, with the understanding that that decision did not prejudice his delegation's continuing concern over the human-rights situation in Chile. The historical development of the consideration of that question had given rise to a situation which, in a procedural sense, was somewhat anomalous and could create doubts about the Committee's approach to violations of human rights. The amendment was intended to remove that anomaly and would in no way prejudice the action taken by the Commission on Human Rights on the basis of its assessment of the situation in Chile.

24. Mrs. UMANA (Colombia) said that she supported the United Kingdom amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 because it made a positive contribution to the solution of the situation in Chile. The unmodified draft resolution would simply have led to the same sterile outcome as in the past. The amendment sought a way for the Commission on Human Rights to study effective means of solving the problem through dialogue with the Government of Chile.
25. Mrs. GUEIMAN (Uruguay), welcomed the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom and the wording of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.68. All States must work together in order to create an atmosphere which would create a climate of confidence, enabling the Government of Chile to collaborate once again with the United Nations. The United Kingdom amendment was designed to create such a climate.
26. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that many delegations, including his own, had stressed the need to reinforce the efforts made by United Nations bodies to combat the gross violations of human rights caused by imperialism. With respect to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, he pointed out that the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights had expressed concern at violations of human rights in Chile for the past 10 years and that there had been insistent calls for the restoration and guarantee of human rights and freedoms in that country. However, the Special Rapporteur's report showed that, despite nine General Assembly resolutions, the situation continued to deteriorate. In those circumstances, the United Nations must continue to pursue the question of human-rights violations in Chile and take all possible measures to end them.
27. It was therefore necessary, as many delegations had said, to renew the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 because it was based on reality and sought to end human-rights violations in Chile. On the other hand, his delegation considered the amendment to the draft resolution proposed by the United Kingdom delegation to be completely unfounded and would vote against it.
28. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.77, he said that concern at the continuing massive violations of human rights in El Salvador had been expressed in many statements and in the report presented by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights. It was clearly necessary to take all possible measures to end such violations and give the people of that country a chance to decide their own fate. His delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution. Similarly, it would vote for draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75 concerning the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala, since the gross violations of human rights by the authorities of that country had long been a subject for consideration in the General Assembly and in the Commission on Human Rights.
29. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said that his delegation categorically rejected draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53. It would cast a negative vote because the draft contained a series of unsubstantiated statements, distorted the situation in Chile, constituted interference in the internal affairs of a State, contained language which was openly hostile, and would maintain the existence of a special entity to study the human-rights situation in Chile.

30. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation would have liked to be able to vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment in order to improve draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, which, in its present form, was not balanced. However, her delegation did not wish to be associated with any politically inspired draft resolution. It should be noted that some of the delegations sponsoring the draft represented countries that did not practice what they were requesting Chile to do. Those vehemently opposed to the appointment of a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had stated that such an appointment would constitute interference in the internal affairs of States; yet they had singled out Chile and wished to appoint a de facto high commissioner for human rights in that country. Accordingly her delegation would abstain in the vote on the United Kingdom and on the text of the draft resolution as a whole.

31. Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba) said that the extension of the Special Rapporteur's mandate had been thoroughly discussed among the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.53 and A/C.3/37/L.68. It was necessary to extend that mandate because the situation of human rights in Chile had not improved. Accordingly, her delegation would vote against the United Kingdom amendment because it was out of order and not in keeping with the reality of the situation.

32. Mrs. de ARANA (Peru) said that Peru rejected any discriminatory draft resolution and accordingly would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53. It would vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment because the Commission on Human Rights was the proper forum in which to decide on an extension of the Special Rapporteur's mandate .

33. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment because it was a step, though a small one, towards achieving balance in the draft resolution. It would vote against the draft resolution as a whole because, as it had stated at the latest session of the Commission on Human Rights, it did not feel that the situation justified the appointment of a Special Rapporteur or the adoption of a draft resolution that was without balance.

34. The situation in Chile had improved: there was no evidence of disappearances, and there were fewer reports of torture. There had been no cases of detention without charges since 1976, the number of political prisoners had been reduced, and the authorities had allowed representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit such prisoners. The draft resolution did not recognize those changes and, instead, called upon Chile to implement measures and grant rights that were unmatched elsewhere. Chile was a freer country than a great many others, including at least two of the countries sponsoring the draft resolution. The double standard practised in the Committee was no credit to the United Nations. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

35. Mr. RIACHE (Algeria) said that there had been no new developments to indicate any improvement of the situation of human rights in Chile. That fact had been clearly stated by the Special Rapporteur, and many delegations had deplored the worsening of the situation. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur should be extended, and his delegation would accordingly vote against the United Kingdom amendment.



36. Mr. LUNGU (Zambia) said that paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, as it stood, did not impose any decision on the Commission on Human Rights to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. It merely asked the Commission to consider extending the mandate. In that context, the United Kingdom proposal was superfluous, since the Commission was free to take or not to take a decision. His delegation would therefore vote against the United Kingdom amendment.

37. Mrs. de PARRALES (Nicaragua) said that there was no justification for the United Kingdom amendment because it did not take into account the information given by the Special Rapporteur. Her delegation would therefore vote against it.

38. Mr. RUIZ CABANAS (Mexico) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution could not accept the United Kingdom amendment because it dealt with a substantive part of the draft. He was surprised that some delegations would vote in favour of the amendment yet would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole; in such a case supporting the United Kingdom amendment seemed to be pointless.

39. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that her delegation had already stated why it would vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendment. The draft resolution as a whole would require major surgery before her delegation could vote in favour of it.

40. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom) said that at the thirty-sixth session his delegation had expressed serious concern about the situation in Chile and at the selective treatment of Chile in the United Nations. At the current session it had registered that concern by proposing an amendment to the draft resolution. That should leave other delegations and the sponsors of the draft in no doubt as to the seriousness of the United Kingdom's concern and its reluctance to accept such selective treatment.

41. With respect to the statement made by the representative of Zambia, he said, firstly, that paragraph 13 invited the Commission on Human Rights not merely to consider extension of the mandate but in fact to extend the mandate. Secondly, the Special Rapporteur, in his statement to the Committee, had said that he would be willing to give up his appointment if the authorities in Chile would co-operate with someone else. His report had reflected the fact that the situation in Chile would have to be given serious consideration and that the General Assembly should not seek to prejudge the issue by requesting the Commission on Human Rights to take a specific course of action.

42. Mr. MAKKI (Oman) said that his delegation would abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.53, A/C.3/37/L.68, A/C.3/37/L.75 and A/C.3/37/L.77. That was consistent with its steadfast position of adherence to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

43. Miss RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that the United Kingdom amendment was not acceptable because it did not reflect the reality of the situation in Chile. She was astonished to see that delegations were misconstruing the statement made by the Special Rapporteur and the information set forth in his report. For example, the Special Rapporteur had stated that torture was continuing and that the methods had become more sophisticated. Her delegation would therefore vote against the United Kingdom amendment.

/...



44. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote, first on the United Kingdom amendment, and then on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 as a whole.

45. A vote was taken by roll-call on the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom.

46. The Sudan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire.

47. The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 46 votes to 42, with 42 abstentions.

48. A vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 as a whole, as amended.

49. The Lao People's Democratic Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

50. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to 16, with 40 abstentions.

51. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the Danish and Netherlands delegations, said that in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, they would not press for a vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.68 on the same subject.

52. Mr. AL-KALBASH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. TANDIA (Mali) said that they wished to change their votes on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, as amended, and to vote in favour of it.

53. Mr. KITIKITI (Zimbabwe) asked that the record should show that his delegation would have voted for draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, as amended, if it had been present when the vote was taken.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would next proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75 concerning the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Guatemala. Denmark and the Netherlands had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, and a roll-call vote had been requested.

55. Mr. MASSMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the protection of human rights was one of his Government's major policy objectives and that it condemned violations of those rights wherever they occurred. It regretted that the draft resolutions under consideration singled out three Latin American countries for special attention, since such selectivity seemed likely to harm United Nations efforts in the field of human rights. In addition, his delegation had serious reservations about certain elements of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75, which appeared to be unbalanced and inappropriate.

56. It was true that human rights had been violated in Guatemala to such an extent as to arouse deep concern, but the draft resolution took no account of the latest developments in that country and was not calculated to encourage the new Guatemalan Government's efforts to improve the human-rights situation. Despite the new Government's domestic measures and its efforts to co-operate with the international community, the draft resolution was couched in stronger terms than that adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Consequently, his delegation considered the resolution both inappropriate and untimely.

57. The draft resolution also ignored the fact that the Guatemalan Government was not solely to blame for the violence in the country since the use of force was an integral part of the anti-Government guerrillas' strategy. The wording of the draft resolution suggested that it had been inspired less by concern for human rights than by a wish to attack the Guatemalan Government's political orientation. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

58. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), said that draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75 would not assist the Guatemalan Government efforts to restore human rights. Its assessment of the situation in Guatemala was out of date, since it took no account of the changes which had occurred since March 1982. It was no longer true, as the draft resolution stated, that the situation was deteriorating. The new Government which had come to power in March had taken numerous measures to alleviate the situation and had offered its opponents negotiations without pre-conditions. That offer had been rejected by the guerrilla forces which had reiterated their commitment to overthrowing the Government by violence.

59. Despite the difficulties it was facing, the new Guatemalan Government was persisting in its efforts to alleviate suffering and to co-operate with international bodies concerned with human rights. It was therefore unfortunate that the draft resolution ignored the violence used by anti-Government guerrillas. The United Nations had called upon Guatemala to co-operate with the Secretary-General in efforts to remedy the human-rights situation in that country and the new Government was fully prepared to do so. However, the draft resolution under consideration sought to pass judgement before giving that Government a chance to act. His delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75.

60. Mr. DE CRUZ (Singapore) said that he wished to explain why his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.53, as amended, and would do likewise in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.75 and A/C.37/L.77. Those abstentions did not reflect on the merits of the resolutions but were due to his delegation's unhappiness with the injustice of confining the attention of the United Nations to one part of the world while much worse violations of human rights occurred elsewhere. Some of the worst violations of human rights were perpetrated by totalitarian States in other parts of the world, but such régimes seemed to be immune from the scrutiny of the sponsors of the draft resolutions. The United Nations must find fairer and more objective ways of pursuing the defence of human rights; otherwise his delegation would continue to abstain on draft resolutions such as those under consideration.

61. Mrs. FLOREZ (Cuba) said that her delegation considered the Guatemalan Government to be oppressive and to be the latest in a line of puppet Governments which had been imposed on the Guatemalan people by United States imperialism since 1954. The United Nations must focus attention on the violation of human rights in Guatemala, and the draft resolution was long overdue. If the United Nations condemned the massacres of Palestinians in Lebanon, it must equally condemn massacres of Guatemalans in Guatemala. Her delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75.

62. Mr. QUINONES AMEZQUITA (Guatemala) said that the draft resolution was unjust, premature and politically motivated. When politics interfered with justice and the law, the latter invariably suffered. The attacks made by the representative of Cuba on Guatemala were not worthy of a reply; they were a reflection of the struggle taking place in the world between the principles of electoral democracy and totalitarian violence. His delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75.

63. A vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75.

64. Belize, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

/...

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Peru, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Zaire.

64. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.75 was adopted by 74 votes to 16, with 45 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.