

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
68th meeting
held on
Friday, 8 December 1978
3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 68th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 50: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (concluded)

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/33/PV.68
14 December 1978
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50 (concluded)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:
REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN: We shall begin our work this afternoon by hearing the explanations of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 which were postponed this morning owing to a lack of time.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey)(interpretation from French): Over the last few years on the occasion of the adoption of draft resolutions similar to the one we voted on this morning my delegation has always stressed the importance that my country attaches to the strengthening of international security, the consolidation of peace, the development of détente and its expansion to all parts of the world, in particular to the Mediterranean region, the establishment of friendly relations, and the promotion of all-round mutually beneficial co-operation among all countries irrespective of their political or socio-economic systems. In brief I would say that we have always supported and will continue to support the sincere and legitimate aspirations which are certainly the basis and the very origin of that draft resolution. That is why we regret most sincerely the fact that this morning we were obliged to abstain in the vote on it.

Without going into details, I should like to make a general comment on that. The world today is what it is, and if we want to make the world move towards a better future we must take into consideration the main tendencies and the various analyses made within the various groupings on the present international situation. We must also take account of the public positions adopted by certain countries on some vital questions that are of great importance to them. I think that this draft resolution has not done that. Without going into details I should like to give just two examples of that.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

The reference made to certain meetings held this year shows that the positions adopted by some countries were not taken into consideration. For example, the reservations and, indeed, the opposition of my country to parts of the document published after the Belgrade Conference, held from 25 to 30 June 1978, are well known.

Secondly, in operative paragraph 10 of that draft resolution reference is made to the "implementation of the Declaration on the Mediterranean". My country was one of those which worked for the adoption of that agreement at the Belgrade meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Chance and fate led to my personally introducing that agreement, on behalf of the Mediterranean countries, to the competent organs of that Conference. I regret that I could not agree with the wording of that paragraph. I can assure the Committee that, having made great efforts at the Belgrade Conference to convince some countries which voted here in favour of that text about that agreement, there is no contradiction in my delegation's conduct.

Mr. MOSSBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has during earlier sessions of the General Assembly, on many occasions, been able to support draft resolutions regarding the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Last year, however, some elements were introduced which made it necessary for Sweden to abstain in the vote. Although some of those elements do not appear in this year's draft resolution, others have been added which oblige Sweden to abstain in the vote.

We regret the inclusion in the draft resolution of the last paragraph of the preamble which contains a reference to the World Conference to combat racism and racial discrimination, held at Geneva. Sweden could not, for well-known reasons, accept the final document of that World Conference. Consequently, had there been a separate vote on that paragraph of the preamble we would have voted against it.

Moreover, my delegation does not find that the language in operative paragraph 10 correctly reflects the role of the Mediterranean question in

(Mr. Mossberg, Sweden)

the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We also have doubts about the usefulness and advisability of underlining in this way a certain part of the Final Act of Helsinki which, in our view, must be regarded as a whole.

Finally, I must say that my delegation has some reservation also about the formulation of other parts of operative paragraph 10 and certain other elements of the draft resolution, some of which have very recently been introduced. It is with regret that my delegation has noted the introduction of such elements in the draft resolution that obliged it to abstain in the vote.

Mr. WEVERS (New Zealand): In explanation, I should briefly like to state that my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution adopted before lunch, contained in document A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security because we have reservations on several of its preambular and operative paragraphs, in particular on the last paragraph of the preamble which asks us to take note of certain actions of the international community, including a Conference the final document of which we were unable to associate ourselves with.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Having listened to some of the explanations of vote this morning, I was reminded of the character Gratiano in Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice who said: "I am Sir Oracle, and when I ope my lips let no dog bark".

I do not intend to adopt that same attitude. I only wish to remark that it is not my impression that the world stopped when the Charter of the United Nations was signed. Nor is it my impression, despite the valiant and well-intentioned contributions of those who spoke so disparagingly about the draft resolution adopted this morning on the strengthening of international security, that we have made any more significant progress on other items discussed in this forum - least of all, perhaps, on those relating to disarmament.

I need hardly add that Malta supports unequivocally the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and would like to see them fully implemented at all times and without exception. However, the inescapable fact is that they are not, and that is why we have to engage in further strenuous efforts here. This is precisely why we meet every year and why we have so many items to discuss. But we cannot downgrade any one of them in favour of others; they are all an essential part of the whole.

As regards the observations made on paragraph 10, as one of the parties to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, I respectfully beg to disagree with those observations. The references to the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in the resolutions which have been presented today and in the past - and no doubt also in the future - have taken into account the time factor. It so happens that at this particular moment, before we next meet again, a meeting within the follow-up process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is to take place which deals specifically with co-operation in the Mediterranean and which is of interest not only to the parties to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe but also to other countries that have been invited to participate effectively in this particular meeting. Hence the need on this occasion for some explanation in that particular paragraph, which in no way distorts the relevance of the entire provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

As regards the concept of a zone of peace, I ask those for whom the idea still seems strange, despite the many explanations given, to consider what Malta thinks of it and whether they cannot subscribe to the same ideals as those of a small country right in the centre of the Mediterranean.

In order to end briefly and, as I began, on a poetic note, I could find no better words than those used in a poem by the President of Malta, who, members may recall, represented my country at the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. In a poem written during his travels near Lake Constance he wrote:

"brothers in civilization,
brothers in democracy,
brothers in freedom,
brothers in love for peace,
brothers in the wish for progress,
brothers in Europe,
brothers in humanity,
brothers in the world
that whirls in space
around the sun".

We ask all countries to join us in the resolute pursuit of concrete initiatives, to be determined at the meeting in Malta, which will translate that ideal into a reality.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept that statement by the representative of Malta not as an explanation of vote - for, as he well knows, sponsors of a draft resolution cannot explain their vote on it - but rather as a final statement after the acceptance of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

With that statement the Committee has concluded its consideration of the penultimate draft resolution.

Mr. MARAGAU (Papua New Guinea): I wish to explain my delegation's position in regard to the three draft resolutions voted upon, draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.58, L.59 and L.60/Rev.1. If I had been present this morning during the voting, I should have voted in favour of all those draft resolutions. I wish this to be reflected in the records of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We now go on to the consideration of the last remaining draft resolution, which is contained in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. This draft resolution has been presented under agenda item 50, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" and concerns particularly the situation in Nicaragua.

Before we go any further, I wish to inform the members of the Committee that the delegation of Angola has decided to join the sponsors of this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of Venezuela to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to introduce on behalf of the sponsors - that is, Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Guinea-Bissau, Panama, Viet Nam and my own country - draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. The original text was distributed to the Committee yesterday.

The sponsors believe that this session of the General Assembly should not be concluded without our expressing in a resolution our concern about an existing situation in Latin America directly related to the subject that is before us for consideration. Far from strengthening international security, this situation is impairing and endangering it. It is the constant focus of international concern. The essential condition for peace and security is full respect for human rights as enshrined in the United Nations Charter. If security is to be sound it cannot be based on turmoil or the existence of injustice or inequality.

The revised draft resolution we are now submitting is the result of work carried out by various delegations that have worked with the sponsors so that the Committee would have a document reflecting the facts in a situation which is a matter of concern to the majority of the Members of this Organization. It also involves consequences of concern to the inter-American region. That is why we wish particularly to thank the countries of other regions that have joined us as sponsors. We take this as an indication of their understanding of the situation on our continent.

(Miss Lopez, Venezuela)

There have also been other countries from our continent that have contributed important ideas that have been included in the revised draft resolution. We do not believe that the draft requires further explanation. It purely and simply points out a specific situation which we do not want other people to have to suffer. That situation has reached a critical phase leading to irreparable losses for Nicaraguans and has placed burdens upon Central American countries which have had to open their doors to many thousands of refugees.

We hope that the draft resolution will meet with the support of the majority of this Committee. Its adoption will make it possible to alleviate the existing tension in the region and will promote the observance of human rights in Nicaragua.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Bolivia who wishes to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution.

Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to introduce an amendment to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution that is under consideration. We wish to maintain regional action. We also wish to express our recognition for the mediation undertaken by the Committee for friendly co-operation and conciliatory efforts which has made praiseworthy efforts in this regard.

Having consulted various delegations from the Latin American region, my delegation would venture to place before the sponsors of the revised draft for their consideration an amendment whereby the following words would be added at the end of operative paragraph 6:

"in particular, those undertaken by the Committee for friendly co-operation and conciliatory efforts composed of countries from the American continent."

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the representative of Bolivia correctly, he has proposed his oral amendment, in the first instance, for the consideration of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. I hope that the sponsors can respond to this amendment as soon as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Ecuador will support the revised draft resolution in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 because he considers that it is necessary to strengthen the basic principles of international co-existence, particularly as a rejection of any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any State, and in view of our duty to contribute to the maintenance of peace and respect for human rights.

With regard to the text of the revised draft resolution itself, Ecuador has some objections to it in that it does not mention points that are being considered within the regional organization. Ecuador considers that all efforts that will aid in the solution of the problem, particularly those involving the use of peaceful means in the settlement of disputes should be respected and supported. Thus, the efforts at mediation which are being undertaken by various countries in Latin America in the case of Nicaragua should not be ignored.

This statement of Ecuador is to be understood as falling within the context of respect for all principles of co-existence and international co-operation. Above and beyond those principles already mentioned, we must recall that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

The favourable vote to be cast by Ecuador also conforms with the spirit that has always guided the actions of Ecuador within the Organization of American States (OAS). In the general debate at this session the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador stated:

"As a basis for its participation in the international community, Ecuador has maintained fundamental principles which are at the very root of our tradition - principles such as that of the legal equality of States and that of non-intervention which is derived from the former."

(Mr. Johnson, Ecuador)

He also stated:

"By the rejection of recourse to the use of force, a decisive moral character has been given to the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes. Ecuador believes in the effectiveness of this principle in the solution of any problem, bilateral, regional or universal, and further believes that in this respect the community of nations have a serious responsibility." (A/33/PV.13, pp. 51-52)

Mr. MONTIEL ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish):

The delegation of Nicaragua has familiarized itself with the draft resolution on the situation in Nicaragua that has been distributed in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 introduced by the delegation of Venezuela.

At the outset, my delegation finds it quite strange that this document should have been introduced under item 50 which deals with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, since if one considers it, this merely represents an intervention in the domestic affairs of a country and nothing can be found in it which refers to international security.

In the draft resolution mention has been made of the violation of the sovereignty of Costa Rica by Nicaraguan military aircraft. I feel that this is a very weak pretext on which to base the draft resolution. It is true that a few months ago Nicaraguan aircraft did penetrate some few hundred metres into Costa Rican territory in pursuit of guerrillas who were abusing Costa Rica's hospitality and had made incursions into our territory. That penetration did not cause any material damage. It was investigated by the Organization of American States (OAS) which held a meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs upon the request of the Government of Costa Rica. That meeting has already expressed its views in this connexion.

It is extremely strange for three American countries, Colombia, Panama and Venezuela, which on repeated occasions have stated that they are defenders of the American regional system, to come here now and weaken the system by bringing to the United Nations a matter which is being debated in the regional system and with regard to which two meetings of Ministers for Foreign Affairs have

(Mr. Montiel Arguello, Nicaragua)

been convened, one of which precisely at the request of Venezuela, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution that is before us.

The attitude assumed by these three countries is only a demonstration of ill will towards the Nicaraguan Government. Venezuela had already demonstrated such ill will when it requested Security Council action, stating that the situation in Nicaragua imperilled security in the region. The Security Council did not allow itself to be taken by surprise and rightly rejected the request of Venezuela.

What I have said with regard to the OAS does not apply to Cuba because that country was expelled from that organization and it has on repeated occasions indicated its disdain for that organization.

In view of the foregoing, I maintain that the United Nations is not the appropriate forum for taking up a matter which is being heard in a regional organization.

I have referred to the situation in Nicaragua and I feel that it is appropriate to indicate what that situation is. Last September in my country subversive movements were receiving aid from various foreign countries, including some of the sponsors of this draft resolution. That aid has been acknowledged in public documents by the Department of State of the United States. The aim of those subversive movements was to depose the Government of my country by force.

(Mr. Montiel Arguello, Nicaragua)

I wish to point out an important fact: the Government of my country does not derive its mandate from a revolution or a coup d'état but rather from elections freely held in conformity with the Constitution. In Nicaragua there is a democratic system, and the way is open to all who do not agree with the Government to found a political party and seek to win in elections rather than making use of foreign aid to subvert order.

Contrary to what is stated in the draft resolution, there has been absolutely no repression of the civilian population but only steps to maintain peace and order. Of course, this process led to the loss of human lives, but, as I said yesterday, those responsible for that loss of life are the subversive elements which initiated the violence and the foreign countries which help them and not the Government of Nicaragua. Because of these subversive movements, the Government of Nicaragua was compelled to suspend constitutional guarantees. However, the President of the Republic has already agreed to re-establish those guarantees in full as well as to grant general amnesty to all those responsible for the subversive actions. Hence every Nicaraguan is fully enjoying human rights and there is not a single political prisoner. That is proof of the magnanimity of the President of Nicaragua and of the sincerity of his desire to achieve peace.

Going further into detail with regard to the draft resolution, I must point out that in the preambular part reference is made only to the statement of the President of Costa Rica to the General Assembly and to the message sent to the President of this session of the Assembly by the Presidents of Venezuela and Colombia. No mention is made of the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua in the general debate nor to the letter sent to the President of Venezuela by the President of my country. That omission would jeopardize the credibility and the impartiality of our Organization.

The draft resolution speaks of urging the Government of Nicaragua to respect the human rights of its citizens, whereas such respect already exists. Yesterday the representative of Panama cited a document of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. As I said at that time, that document has been criticized by my Government because, inter alia, sufficient time had not been allowed my Government to defend itself. Furthermore, the Organization of American States has not yet given its views on it.

(Mr. Montiel Arguello, Nicaragua)

As to the censure or repression of the civilian population, I repeat that there has been no repression and that it was solely a matter of re-establishing order. If the Government of Nicaragua had not proceeded in this manner, it would not have been acting in conformity with the primary duty of every Government.

It cannot in any way be said that the fact that there are subversive elements disturbing the peace in a country constitutes a threat to international security. There are many countries which have experienced or are at present experiencing disturbances. Hardly a day goes by without articles in the press on guerrillas in Colombia or Venezuela - both of which countries are sponsors of the draft resolution. It had never occurred to anyone before that the United Nations would issue resolutions relating to such disturbances of order, as that would run counter to the basic principle of non-interference of our Organization.

Moreover, the draft resolution contains statements that are vague or based on false allegations, and it would not be fitting for our Organization to take into account, as a basis for its resolutions, facts that it had not ascertained but that it had only heard from one interested party.

I should also like to point out that the operative part is completely devoid of balance, because it mentions only Nicaragua's obligations but not those of all the other States not to lend assistance to persons wishing to subvert order in my country and not to allow their territories to be used as bases for military operations against Nicaragua. In the draft code of law submitted to our Sixth Committee these facts have been described as crimes against the peace and security of mankind.

A Committee made up of representatives of Guatemala, the Dominican Republic and the United States of America is currently meeting in Nicaragua and making every effort to find a solution guaranteeing peace. This Committee was established by a resolution of the Organization of American States. The draft resolution now before us would not help in the search for that solution. On the contrary, since this is a draft resolution lacking balance and filled with censure and criticism, the result would be solely to encourage the elements that are disturbing the peace to continue their actions. Perhaps that is the intention of some of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but it is in no way consonant with the aims and purposes of our Organization.

(Mr. Montiel Arguello, Nicaragua)

The amendment which the representative of Bolivia proposed this afternoon pays a verbal tribute to this Committee of friendly co-operation, but it does not change the basic fact that the draft resolution would result in encouraging subversion.

Moreover, as I said earlier, this Organization is not the appropriate forum in which to take up a question which is already before a regional organization. Furthermore, the draft resolution is an open intervention in the internal affairs of Nicaragua and, hence, violates the Charter of the United Nations.

For all those reasons, I urge representatives to vote against the draft resolution, in the certainty that in this way they will indeed be acting to promote peace, the prestige of our Organization and the confidence which all countries must have in it.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to remind members that we are still at the stage of the debate on the draft resolution.

At the same time, the list of speakers in explanation of vote, both before and after the vote, is so long that, unless statements are kept to a reasonable length, I must seriously consider the possibility of proposing a time-limit on them. This is a step that I would take with the utmost reluctance, but, as members of the Committee are aware, it is imperative that we finish our business today.

Mr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): There is a problem in that the sponsors of the draft resolution have been unable to reach agreement as to whether they would accept the amendment submitted by the representative of Bolivia.

Before explaining our views in that regard, I should like to put it on record here that a few moments ago I received the text of a telegram from His Holiness Pope John Paul II indicating his concern over the situation in Nicaragua.

With regard to the amendment, I should like to say that it is clearly set out in operative paragraph 6 that we are urging the continuation of international efforts - that is, efforts at all international levels, and implying also those at regional levels, because if we had to emphasize the work at the regional level of the mediation Committee we would have to indicate that that Committee has thus far failed in its task, which is why we are pressing for the continuation of international efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the internal conflict in Nicaragua, which has brought about an external conflict. In other words, it has endangered the security of the States in the region.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the representative of Cuba to have stated formally that the amendment orally proposed a moment ago by the delegation of Bolivia to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 would not be acceptable to the sponsors, or at least not to all of them.

During the time that we shall pass in hearing explanations of vote before the vote, I should be most grateful if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 would consult with each other about the situation concerning the amendment submitted by the delegation of Bolivia. If nothing further transpires to modify the statement just made by the representative of Cuba, then I would see no other way out than to put the amendment of the Bolivian delegation to a vote before we take a decision on the draft resolution as a whole.

We shall now proceed to hear explanations of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

Mr. BUENO (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation prefers not to participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. This is not only because in our view the First Committee is not the appropriate body for a discussion of the situation in Nicaragua but also because my delegation is concerned over the procedural precedent that would be set by our considering a question that has not as such been inscribed on our agenda.

Likewise, we shall not participate in the vote on the oral amendment just introduced by the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): The Guatemalan delegation believes that the distressing situation in the Republic of Nicaragua that has brought such tragedy to that country falls within the jurisdiction of the competent regional body, the Organization of American States, of which my country is a founding member.

That organization has competence to deal with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security liable to involve regional action, because the activities of such organizations are compatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations under Article 52 of the Charter. It is not that the United Nations does not have competence with regard to the security aspects of these matters, but that the Members of the United Nations parties to agreements setting up such bodies should, prima facie, and as a priority, make all possible efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of any situation which, like the present one, adversely affects a country or which might endanger international peace and security.

The Security Council has already declined to take up this matter, as it is being dealt with in a fully competent regional organization. Hence, as a matter of principle, my delegation has felt from the outset that this situation falls within the competence of the Organization of American States. The matter has been brought before that organization, and all due efforts have been made to contribute to a peaceful settlement of this situation. However, above all, we are concerned that this situation should in no way degenerate into a violation of a fundamental principle of international relations - that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

Today the delegation of Guatemala voted with great pleasure in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59, which incorporates fundamental principles reiterating that there must be no interference in the internal affairs of States. This has been a matter of concern also to the inter-American organization, which has been trying to promote a peaceful settlement of this situation which essentially is of harm to the American continent.

(Mr. Castillo Arriola, Guatemala)

The Organization of American States has established a committee for friendly co-operation and conciliation to help in the search for a solution. Today we can say - because my country and Government are part of that Committee which has persistently striven for a solution - that the results of that Committee's work to date have been positive and have helped to achieve at least a temporary settlement, the release of political prisoners, a lifting of the state of siege, and the acceptance of a plebiscite in which the people of Nicaragua, free from any possible pressure, will be able to determine their own fate.

Accordingly, and bearing in mind the fact that my country and Government, as a member of that Committee, can maintain their moral authority and their independence and impartiality only in so doing, we shall abstain in the voting on the draft resolution, because we consider it inappropriate that the competence of the General Assembly should supersede the authority of the regional body involved.

We support the amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia, as it only strengthens our view that recourse must be had to the body recognized as competent by the United Nations to settle regional conflicts of this nature.

For the aforesaid reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

Mr. MONTIEL ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): I am sorry to have to repeat as an explanation of vote what I already said in the debate - that the delegation of Nicaragua will cast a negative vote on the draft resolution, as we consider it interventionist in nature and contrary to the Charter of this Organization. This is not the appropriate forum for the consideration of a matter which is being investigated by a regional organization. The draft resolution is based on falsehoods and lacks any balance whatsoever, as it makes no mention of the obligation of foreign countries to refrain from abetting the subversion of order in Nicaragua, and also because it does not contribute to peace, the main aim of our Organization. Rather, it contributes to the disruption of order.

Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The situation in Nicaragua has been carefully analysed within the regional system of American Republics, with the full and constant participation of the Governments of all countries of the American continent. Two consultative meetings of Ministers for Foreign Affairs have been held, as have successive meetings of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States. Those meetings led to the establishment of the Committee for friendly co-operation and conciliation, the report of which will be officially heard in the Council of the Organization of American States next week. We do not at this time wish to prejudge, or interfere in, that process.

A mediation procedure also emerged from the meetings held within the inter-American system, and that procedure is fully under way, and progress has been achieved.

Hence the situation in Nicaragua falls within the purview of the Organization of American States, as provided in the Charter of the United Nations, and we believe it would be unwise to obstruct the efforts that have been undertaken in the most appropriate organization. While recognizing the noble aims and motivations of the sister countries co-sponsoring the draft resolution, we must say that we are pained by the fact that this matter has been brought to the United Nations, thus prejudicing the action undertaken within the regional organization. To preserve our right to consider and judge of events in accordance with the background information brought before the Organization of American States, we therefore declare that we shall neither participate in the discussion nor vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. NEUBERT (Federal Republic of Germany): There are occasions when continuing and gross violations of human rights within the territory of a particular country reach such proportions as to be a legitimate cause for concern to the international community. It appears that such a situation exists in Nicaragua. My delegation is deeply concerned about the reports of human rights violations in Nicaragua over recent months. For this reason we shall vote in favour of the resolution as an expression of our concern.

We also wish to record our hope that efforts under way within the framework of the Organization of American States to secure a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Nicaragua and of the differences it has with its neighbours will be crowned with success. We should have liked the draft resolution to contain more specific wording on this aspect and we shall vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the representative of Bolivia.

At this point, however, I should like to add a few comments on the draft resolution. First and foremost I must state that we have serious reservations on the propriety of discussing such matters in this Committee, particularly when taking into account the recommendations of the tenth special session concerning the role of this Committee. For this reason, we think the different aspects of the situation, to which the text refers, should be dealt with in the relevant regional or United Nations forums. Secondly, we find that the wording of some parts of the draft is undesirably imprecise. We regret that the draft resolution has appeared at such a late stage, leaving no time for consultation and negotiation which, no doubt, would have led to agreement on more precise wording in a number of paragraphs. Consequently, my delegation interprets the language contained in the last preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 7 as referring to the human rights aspect of the situation in Nicaragua and not in any way as being contrary to the principle of non-intervention, as stated in article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Before I speak on the matter we are discussing, I should like to refer to the statements that, as my delegation has learned, have been made by high authorities in the Vatican regarding their deep concern over the participation of mercenaries in conflicts in various countries.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

Having said that, my delegation wishes to be very frank in what we say about the draft resolution before us. We wish to indicate how surprised we are by several aspects of the draft resolution that I should like to speak of further. But before doing so, I would point out that our statement is not motivated by the fact that the draft resolution refers to a Government that is a Member of our Organization - about that we shall not express any view, because we do not think it is a matter of concern to us. The principles of the Charter to which we are bound shall serve as our only guide. We are speaking now simply as a matter of principle. I emphasize this because my delegation deems it to be extremely important. We do not wish there to be any misinterpretation as to the position of Uruguay in this matter.

As I have said, the draft resolution before us is surprising to the delegation of Uruguay, first because of the time at which it was submitted; that is, at the very end of the work in our Committee. We are also surprised by it because it would seem - as has become more apparent after a hearing of the statements made by those who have spoken on the draft resolution - that it does not fall within the context of item 50 which refers to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Again we are surprised because the very matter taken up in the draft resolution is being considered within the regional organization, the Organization of American States. This cannot be overlooked by any of the delegations present in this room, because on 5 December 1978 Security Council document S/12955 was issued containing a letter dated 9 November 1978 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Assistant Secretary-General of the Organization of American States. In that letter the Security Council was informed of a resolution adopted by the regional body. The process followed with regard to this conflict was brought to the attention of the regional organization last year, and this year it was put before the Security Council. The Security Council did not adopt any position whatsoever.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

The matter was again transmitted to the regional organization and the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States adopted a resolution and convened the 17th consultative meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

As a result of that meeting, the Permanent Council decided to send an ad hoc committee to the area where it was alleged that events productive of conflict had taken place to conduct an investigation. The Committee is at this very moment drafting its report, which I am sure will be introduced to the Permanent Council next week.

The resolution of the Permanent Council, which was transmitted to the Security Council, as I mentioned earlier, stated the following in operative paragraph 4. I shall read it out because I consider it to be of great importance. It reads:

"The Permanent Council resolves7 to note that, as the report of the ad hoc Committee points out, the two Governments have indicated their desire and will to overcome this situation of conflict and tension between them; and to repeat the offer of good offices of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, should they consider it advisable, to encourage a friendly settlement of their differences." (S/12955, annex, pp. 1 and 2)

It is worth pointing out that by adopting a draft resolution such as the one now under consideration, we might be introducing motivations which are alien to the desire to encourage an appropriate and just solution that would respect the rights of all.

Moreover, I should like to state that Uruguay, throughout the entire history of its conduct at the international level, has always been known to be fierce in its defence of and respect for the provisions of international law and the principles set forth in the Charter, which the 150 States represented here have ratified and whose purposes and principles they have promised to uphold. Uruguay has always followed that path of conduct and has always been known as a defender of those principles. I might even say that never in our history have we promoted or encouraged any resolutions which were obviously politically oriented because such resolutions might diminish the rank and status of this body, that is, the General Assembly.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

Throughout the work in our Committee we have heard beautiful statements and manifestations of intentions with respect to disarmament and international security, which have kindled hopes in small countries, such as the one I represent, that solutions might be reached which would give peace and tranquillity to the peoples of the world so that they would no longer be threatened by the dangers of a world war.

This morning, as a result of the debates to which I have referred, the Committee adopted resolution A/C.1/33/L.59, of which my delegation was a sponsor. I should like to read out two paragraphs of that resolution to refresh the memories of members as to what the Committee decided just a few hours ago. Operative paragraph 1 reads:

"Urges all States to abide by the provisions of resolutions 31/91 of 14 December 1976 and 32/153 of 19 December 1977 denouncing any form of interference in the internal affairs of States and calling upon all States - in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and in accordance with the United Nations Charter - to undertake measures to prevent any hostile or aggressive act or activity from taking place within their territory and directed against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of another State;"

Operative paragraph 2 reads:

"Expresses the conviction that a declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States would be an important contribution to the further elaboration of the principles for strengthening equitable co-operation and friendly relations among States, based on sovereign equality and mutual respect;"

I have read out those two paragraphs of the resolution which the Committee adopted a few hours ago because we believe that resolution to be of great importance and we believe it to be related to the draft which is now before us. It is our feeling that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 contradicts resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 which the Committee adopted this morning.

(Mr. Camps, Uruguay)

I repeat: if the General Assembly were indeed to adopt this draft resolution, the principle of non-interference in matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of States would be impaired and the principle of the sovereignty of States would be impaired. In short, it would impair the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

We deeply regret that, as an epilogue to all the very wise debates that have taken place in the Committee concerning disarmament and international security, at the very last minute a draft resolution such as the one that we are now considering should have been submitted.

My country does not wish to become bound by a resolution that impairs the Charter principles I have mentioned, principles which all our States have promised to respect. Therefore, my delegation would like to announce that we will not participate in the vote on this draft.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 relating to the situation in Nicaragua because the repressive measures employed by the Government of Nicaragua against the civilian population have reached such dimensions and are so widespread in scope and so heinous in their intensity as to deserve the description of "mass killing". The conduct of the Government of Nicaragua in this particular instance ceases to be a matter of domestic jurisdiction and becomes a matter of international concern. However, my delegation would like to make it clear that this is a very special case and should not serve as a precedent for the future.

My delegation fully supports the censure of Nicaragua for violation of the sovereignty of a neighbouring State and the demand that the Nicaraguan authorities should stop military and other activities that endanger the security of the region. International security would be meaningless if Nicaragua were to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries with impunity.

Mr. ROS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 if it is amended as suggested by the delegation of Bolivia. The amplification of paragraph 6 - which is really the only part that is international in scope, since the rest is addressed principally to the Government of Nicaragua - wherein is expressed the encouragement of the General Assembly for the mediation efforts of certain countries currently under way has enabled us to overcome the difficulty occasioned for us by reservations on other parts of the draft resolution.

We thank the sponsors, and particularly the delegation of Venezuela, for the degree of understanding they have shown in accepting various suggestions made to them, although we feel that there are some concepts in the draft that make it impossible for us to support it in its entirety. Notwithstanding that, we see it as positive that the General Assembly should express its view on a situation that could lead to a threat to the maintenance of peace and security in the Latin American region. To deny the competence of the General Assembly to do so would be tantamount to casting doubt on the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, and especially on the application of Articles 35 (1) and 34.

Finally, we should like to say that the United Nations, the most representative body of the community of nations, cannot in any way or for any reason abnegate or delegate its paramount function of maintaining international peace and security.

For all those reasons we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution, provided it is amended as suggested by the representative of Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that there is now agreement on the oral amendment submitted by the representative of Bolivia for the consideration of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. To clarify that situation, which would also facilitate the ensuing explanations of vote, I call on the representative of Colombia.

Mr. RIVAS POSADA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce to the Committee that an agreement has been reached between the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 and the representative of Bolivia in respect of the amendment his delegation had submitted to the Committee.

The following is the formula that has been agreed to. The new wording of the fourth paragraph of the preamble would read:

"Considering the extreme gravity of the events that have taken place and are continuing to occur in Nicaragua, which have caused the death of thousands of people, incalculable destruction of property and repeated violations of the most basic rights, which have led some countries of the American continent to attempt to reach a peaceful solution to the internal conflict in Nicaragua through a friendly Committee of conciliatory efforts;"

In brief, the fourth paragraph of the preamble - except for the omission of "and" for grammatical reasons - would be amended by the addition of the following words: "which have led some countries of the American continent to attempt to reach a peaceful solution to the internal conflict in Nicaragua through a friendly Committee of conciliatory efforts".

(Mr. Rivas Posada, Colombia)

Thus, the operative paragraph would remain as initially submitted in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. Therefore the co-sponsors believe that, with the valuable co-operation of the delegation of Bolivia, we have been able to overcome an obstacle, thereby making it easier for the Committee to reach a decision on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal is to add to the fourth preambular paragraph the words:

"which has led some countries of the American continent to attempt to reach a peaceful solution to the internal conflict in Nicaragua through a friendly Committee of conciliatory efforts".

It follows that the original written amendment pertaining to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution is no longer in existence. Would the representative of Bolivia be good enough to confirm that?

Mr. FUENTES IBANEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The purpose of our proposal was to seek a conciliatory wording. I believe that the representative of Colombia, with the consent of the other sponsors, has achieved this.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): This draft resolution was placed before us at noon yesterday. What is more important, we received the revised version only at 10 o'clock this morning, Friday, 8 December, that is, at the end of the week, which is already over in my country. I should therefore like to state that we have not had the necessary time to obtain instructions. This is a serious subject which has been given attention in the Turkish press. Accordingly, my delegation cannot itself take a decision on the draft resolution, although we do wish to express our complete sympathy with the initiative taken by the sponsors. On this occasion I cannot but recall a similar case of tragedy which lasted 10 years and which was covered up by abuse of the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs. For the reason I have explained, my delegation will not be able to participate in the vote today. However, we shall participate in the vote when the item comes before the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, it is unavoidable that on the closing day of the work of this Committee things happen rather fast. Nevertheless, as the representative of Turkey so pertinently pointed out, even though because of the lack of instructions his delegation may not now be able to cast a vote, it will be able to do so when the matter comes up for final consideration in plenary meeting.

I understand that the representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): No, Sir, I should like to make a statement in explanation of vote, if I may, because I have heard that others have been explaining their votes. I studied draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 but, after studying it, I had to go to the Security Council and to the Fifth Committee, where many members of the Secretariat are demonstrating. I quietened them down and told them to go back to their offices. So I am doing my work. I do not know when the vote will be taken, but I have made up my mind and I wish to explain my vote. My neighbour here, the representative of Senegal, told me that the Committee was hearing explanations of vote. This is not a point of order. I only want an opportunity to explain my vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Nothing would be more pleasant for me, as the representative of Saudi Arabia well knows, than to call on him for that purpose. However, as he also knows, there is a slight difficulty inasmuch as we are working our way very carefully through a long list of explanations of votes before the vote. There are seven who wish to explain their votes before the representative of Saudi Arabia. As he knows, I have no right when he arrives to give him the floor immediately before the others.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Of course, you have no right, Mr. Chairman, but I presumed, erroneously, that the explanations of vote were almost finished.

The CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, they are not.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): There is one way out for you on my behalf. If, Sir, because of my being engaged in many things, the Committee will allow me to give my opinion in explanation of vote, I will then say goodbye to you, and then you can resume. It would be subject to that proviso. I do not want any privileges, but I feel deeply about this question and I think I should explain my vote - with the permission of those who are now listed, of course. If any of them says "No", I shall say "Thank you", and there will be no rancour. This is a simple question. I am asking to be heard in explanation of vote, and I did not know that there were still seven remaining to be heard.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

Mr. Chairman, will you kindly on my behalf ask the seven in one sentence, "Does any one of you object to Baroody explaining his vote?" If anyone says, "Yes, we object," I will say, "Thank you, and no bad feelings at all". I will try to come some other time.

The CHAIRMAN: But, Sir, if there is only one who objects, then you advance nevertheless very high up, because the others do not. But I will be glad to put that question, at your request, to others, because in the rules of procedure there is nothing that prevents a representative to yield his right to another representative. Perhaps I can make it collectively rather than individually and ask the representatives of the Dominican Republic, the United States, Sierra Leone, Costa Rica, Italy, El Salvador and Mexico whether any or all of these speakers who have been inscribed for a long time to explain their vote have any objection? I put the question this way in order to be perfectly fair and objective. What is their stand on the request by the representative of Saudi Arabia, having also heard his motives? Is there any objection? I see none.

I must, however, seek reassurance that this will not be repeated in the explanations after the vote.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Do not be so much of a pessimist as to think that the same pattern will be followed after the vote unless there is a valid excuse. I thank, through you, Mr. Chairman, without enumerating them by name - the seven representatives who have been so generous and magnanimous as to allow me to speak.

I speak because I feel very strongly about this démarche, if I may say so, as expressed in this draft resolution. Believe me, I know there are many more competent than me, as competent, and a few less competent, but they are all competent to address themselves to this question with a clear conscience. And this is what I will do with a clear conscience. I will express my stand on this draft resolution.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

First of all, I must say that it pained me to have read day in and day out about the innocents who have lost their lives in Nicaragua. Having lived quite a long time, in turbulent times, even before the First World War as a child, and after the First World War and after the Second World War, I could not state very precisely - but I would label what has happened in Nicaragua as a sort of civil war. A civil war cannot be prototyped. It is a civil war. The Government was challenged by many people. It seems that the Government was strong enough, from what we have learned from the press, to be able to withstand the onslaught by those they called "guerrillas".

Of course, any Government in power would want to label the opponents by one name or the other. I do not want to go into whether they were actual guerrillas. Sometimes, guerrillas have been, as in France, the maquis, who were glorified as being freedom fighters. Therefore, we do not want to go into the nomenclature of what is a guerrilla and what is not a guerrilla. They happen to be Nicaraguans.

It is very sad because it is usually the innocent, who are apolitical, pay the price in such wars. I will say it is a sort of civil war - an internal thing. I learned that some Latin American States, like Costa Rica, were affected by some of the guerrillas fleeing. This happens in every civil war. We know that. It is unfortunate that Costa Rica should in any way suffer by having those guerrillas or refugees - not necessarily guerrillas - who fled to its land. We commiserate with them.

But this is a most dangerous precedent if every time there is a sort of civil war, we bring it to the First Committee where the idealists amongst us hope it will have a moral impact on the country which has trouble within its borders. That is why I spoke to the representatives of Venezuela and Panama. I do not hide anything from you because Baroody has nothing to hide. I said that a member of the Nicaraguan delegation came to me to ask my opinion on certain things. I was not here when his Ambassador or Foreign Minister, or whoever represents Nicaragua here, spoke.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

I told him that I considered this a civil war. Civil wars are sometimes harsher than wars between States. I said: "if you want to show your goodwill, regardless of who is in the seat of Government, tell your Government to be generous and magnanimous and to stretch out its hand and pledge that it will not hurt those that are against it. If anything comes out of this draft resolution, it may be this reaction that you will not take vengeance if you can still maintain power but that you will discuss with them ways and means for establishing law and order, giving them their rights that are due to them as well as defending the rights of those who are with you."

Of course, this young man promised me that he would relay the message. I do not know what happened.

But no matter what happened, I believe that this draft resolution should have come before the Security Council. That is mandatory. This will not change the situation in any way. I guess it will not make us delve deeply. We, the States, do not have the time to delve deeply into the affairs of another State. Therefore, we will vote by "solidarity". Scratch my back and I will scratch yours. This is not the way to resolve in a practical manner our difficulties that pertain to a certain State.

Therefore, the Security Council has a mandatory power. From my knowledge of the Security Council over 33 years, often as not it tries to give moral support - although it takes drastic action, condemns, and does this and does that - although the Charter gives it a broader sort of power.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

For this reason I thought that both sides were brothers, just as I thought that in the Fourth Committee on the question of the Sahara. Whoever is in the Nicaraguan Government, they are the brothers of the other Latin American States. I felt quite sad in the Fourth Committee when this question of the Sahara was discussed and then voted upon. Here there were two resolutions proposed by two opponents, and they are all brothers. I told them to take the issue to the Organization of African Unity, composed of esteemed men at the summit, to arbitrate between them. Then, if they refused to do that, we would see what could be done.

I did not wish to vote for either one, or even to abstain. I shall do what I started doing in the United Nations about 15 years ago, by saying "I am present but I am not participating in the vote". If I agree with either side, I will incur the ill-feeling and the enmity of the other.

I am happy that Venezuela and Panama are there. I would ask them to be members of the committee of three. I think Guatemala, the United States and the Dominican Republic are in that group. Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, especially, are more conversant with the situation because they belong to the same region. If they can be added to the three and if the Government will pledge that they will not kill or punish the so-called guerrillas or anyone who is against them, and on condition that they may perhaps ultimately participate in governing the land, depending on elections when the proper time comes, and on the condition that there will be no vengeance by the Government against those people, they will have immunity, which should be declared here or elsewhere by a communiqué, then I think we will serve the purpose of peace, with all due respect to my Latin American brothers who are more conversant with the situation than I am, rather than by trying to take sides.

What about the others? I don't know how much affection I have for Afghanistan. They are some 15,000 miles away. They do not know what is happening there. And Algeria, of course, loves these things. Incidentally, I do not rule out Colombia or Cuba, although those who are against the Nicaraguan régime will say, "Oh, those Cubans are dangerous". I do not know about that. They are Latin Americans. Where is the danger? I am not afraid of them. I am a monarchist. It is said that they are interfering here and there and that the Russians are sending them here and there.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

This is beside the point. Be together, you Latin Americans, and try to come to an amicable arrangement. I have tried this sometimes with the Arabs. Don't think the Arabs enjoy harmony. This pains me because I would like there to be harmony. Sometimes they fight like cats and dogs and then this spills over to the outside. I have tried to bring them together. Sometimes I could almost weep for my failure because I find that they are as petty as any other human beings in any other country.

This is the explanation for my non-participation in the vote. I do hope that many will follow suit. Unless, of course, they are bound by the straitjackets of instruction from their Governments and then it is up to them to see what they can do or cannot do.

Perhaps my statement has been a little protracted because I had no chance to make a statement. I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and that of the seven who were so magnanimous and gave me the right to make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Nicaragua on a point of order.

Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): I should merely like to inform the representative of Saudi Arabia that what he requested has been granted by the Government of Nicaragua - in other words, the total restoration of the guarantees of citizenship and amnesty to all those involved in the disturbances.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has just been informed that we can only have the services of the Secretariat until 6.30 this evening. We now have remaining about seven explanations of vote before the vote and a larger number after the vote. The vote will be taken in between. Something else might also arise, and the Committee must finish its work by 6.30 p.m.

(The Chairman)

Therefore, with great reluctance, I have no other recourse than to make reference to rule 106 of the rules of procedure about the time-limit to be put on speeches. In this instance I do it with particular reluctance because I know that this matter is of great importance not only to all members of this Committee, but particularly to the Latin American members. However, there is no other alternative available and I therefore have to propose a three-minute time limit on speeches. Are there any objections?

Mr. REDONDO (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, please be indulgent and allow the representative of Costa Rica to have at least 10 minutes to express the viewpoint of his Government because it is a very closely concerned party in the matter and, indeed, is a victim of the events that are being discussed within the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall not entertain a similar appeal from another party, because everyone knows where that would lead, for if one is given 10 minutes why should not the other.

What I suggest instead - with all due respect to the representative of Costa Rica is that he keep to three minutes and, if there is time left at the end of our meeting, I shall then be glad to give him not only the remaining seven minutes but all of the ten minutes.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): I wish to second the request of the representative of Costa Rica. His delegation and mine were among those which have been so indulgent as to allow the representative of Saudi Arabia to speak. We should like to be treated in the same manner. So I insist that we be allowed the necessary time to explain our votes. I think that it is important to all those present to listen to the explanations of vote of each single delegation wishing to explain its vote, however long it requires. It is important because of the decision which we are about to take.

The CHAIRMAN: In order to explain that I am trying to proceed in as fair a manner as possible, I must say that I had hoped - and I made a request to the Secretariat - that we would be given time until 7 p.m. I have just received word that we cannot go on beyond 6.30.

However, I understand - and I cannot do anything else - these two requests by Costa Rica and Italy as a challenge to my proposal - and I meant nothing else than a proposal.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I do not have any objection to supporting the decision which you have put before us, Mr. Chairman, even though my delegation is one of the countries involved. However, if the delegations of Costa Rica and Italy believe that three minutes is very little time, perhaps a compromise would be to allow us all five minutes. But if you should abide by your original decision to allow three minutes, my delegation will go along with it.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal of the representative of Mexico is a very wise compromise. Shall we then, in good harmony, decide on five minutes?

It was so decided.

Mr. ESQUEA GUERRERO (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): As everyone knows the Dominican Republic is a member of the Commission made up of countries in our hemisphere seeking a friendly solution to the problem involving the sister State of Nicaragua. That is why my delegation's position on the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 can only be to abstain, for our vote in favour or against could be taken as being in favour or against one of the parties involved in the dispute.

The Dominican Republic would like note to be taken of its support for the principles of non-intervention and respect for the sovereignty of States and of self-determination of peoples, as well as its belief in the total validity of human rights.

Ms. SHELTON (United States of America): The United States is deeply concerned over the situation in Nicaragua, and we share the preoccupations reflected in the draft resolution under consideration.

Our concerns and our desire to help Nicaragua achieve peace, security, democracy and freedom have been demonstrated by the effort in which we have been engaged, together with Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, in Nicaragua in connexion with the international mediation effort supported by the Organization of American States. In this regard, had there been a separate vote on Bolivia's amendment, my Government would have supported it.

However, it is precisely because we are engaged as mediators in a very delicate and important negotiation - an effort which is making clear progress - that we find it inappropriate to take a position on the draft resolution.

As an indication of the progress achieved by the mediation effort, I have just learned - and I should like to announce it - that at this moment in Managua the principal opposing political groups are for the first time engaging in face-to-face negotiations, under the auspices of the international mediation effort, to achieve a national-consensus solution to the problems of Nicaragua and the modalities of achieving that solution.

(Ms. Shelton, United States)

The United States is concerned that the presentation of this draft resolution and the vote on it may have an unsettling effect on the discussions and arrangements now under way to structure a plebiscite acceptable to all sides in Nicaragua's internal political crisis. In addition, we are concerned over the introduction of this matter into this forum, especially considering that the Inter-American Human Rights Commission report on the human rights situation in Nicaragua is now before the Organization of American States.

Therefore, my Government will abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): My delegation will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 for a number of reasons.

We are of the opinion that this is not the right forum for the discussion of this particular draft resolution. It is also our humble opinion that such an initiative would best be undertaken on a regional basis or in the relevant United Nations forums rather than in the First Committee.

I might add also that my delegation co-sponsored and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59, dealing with non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

My delegation would therefore appreciate our country being recorded as not having participated in the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The position of Sierra Leone will be reflected in the records.

Mr. REDONDO (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would have liked to have more time at its disposal to explain the reasons for our vote and to give a detailed description of what has occurred between Nicaragua and Costa Rica concerning the violation of our territory. We should also have liked to describe the violations of human rights that have jeopardized and will continue to jeopardize peace in the region, if they are not stopped.

(Mr. Redondo, Costa Rica)

The situation is no longer a problem concerning the American continent alone. Rather it has become a problem that is jeopardizing peace in the world. The situation between Nicaragua and Costa Rica as a result of the violation of our territory is not just a fleeting one nor one that is easily resolved. Rather, this is a very sensitive situation that Costa Ricans deem to be of urgent concern to this Organization.

We have been patient with the Government that has restricted liberties in Nicaragua for 30 years. We have suffered injury to our sovereignty and national honour.

Consistent with our tradition as a peaceful Government of a peace-loving people, we wish to put on record that our patience has come to an end. This Organization - as we had requested, advocated and urged in the Organization of American States - is obliged to put things in their proper place and to defend countries which faithfully, clearly and conspicuously demonstrate respect for peace and for international law and commitments.

Despite the allegations of the delegation of Nicaragua, we have respected our international commitments, including risking the life of the President of our Republic who visited the scene of the events so as to ensure the impartiality of our Government in view of the serious nature of what is happening in Nicaragua concerning the violation of human rights. Many delegations are familiar with the report submitted by the Commission on Human Rights, which is composed of representatives from the United States, Venezuela, Costa Rica and other countries members of the Organization of American States. My country hopes that this Committee will adopt this draft resolution by the broadest possible majority because of the sensitive situation existing in Central America, which might at any time degenerate into a situation with unforeseeable consequences.

My delegation would like warmly to thank in advance all countries which have supported us by their vote and co-operation. We hope that when this draft resolution is submitted to the General Assembly other delegations possessing supplementary information with regard to the serious events taking place in Nicaragua will change their present abstention to an affirmative vote because human rights have been violated in Nicaragua in a way that they have not been violated in any other part of the world.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): We shall vote in favour of twice-revised draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 as an expression of our deep concern over the current situation in Nicaragua. We are taking this position in spite of a number of difficulties that the text raises for us. In particular, we would wish, first of all, to see the draft resolution containing a reference to the efforts currently under way within the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS); a specific reference containing expressions of appreciation and support for the efforts made by the regional organization on which rests, in the first instance, responsibility for similar matters, as clearly set out in the United Nations Charter; and a reference, in particular, to efforts aimed at the restoration of peace in Nicaragua and the normalization of relations between it and its neighbours.

For this reason, we were ready to vote in favour also of the amendment submitted by the representative of Bolivia. We now take note of the decision of the sponsors to meet to some extent the proposal put forth by the representative of Bolivia.

I wish to add that we find that some parts of the draft are unnecessarily imprecise, a fact that may be due to the haste in which it was written.

However, all these shortcomings in the proposal, which was introduced in this Committee rather than in the Third Committee, which is the most appropriate body rebus sic stantibus to deal with such matters, will not deter my delegation from voting in favour of the draft resolution as revised.

Besides our concern over the situation in Nicaragua and in its geographical area, we are governed in our situation by a prominent motivation: the protection of human rights. I could not better explain our position than by recalling what President Sandro Pertini of the Italian Republic stated in a message on United Nations Day which I had the honour to read in this Committee on 24 October and which is contained in the verbatim record (A/C.1/33/PV.13). Not later than yesterday, the President of Italy stated, inter alia, in a new message that:

"The Italians are proud that their Constitution embodies all the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Unfortunately, 30 years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights are being openly violated. We note civil

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

wars, violence, terrorism and unjustifiable social imbalances. Freedom is a precious and inalienable right which is absolutely non-negotiable. Therefore, we lend our brotherly solidarity to all peoples all over the world who are unjustly persecuted for their idealsⁱⁱ.

Mr. LOVO CASTELAR (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): The item before us is a very sensitive one for my delegation, particularly because my country is a neighbour of Nicaragua. Accordingly, my delegation, in order to vote, requires specific instructions from my Government. Since we have not so far received such instructions on the revised version of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 and since we require express instructions in order to be able to take a decision on the latest revised version which introduces a new element into the draft, my delegation will not participate in the vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): There are three points to which I wish to refer in my explanation of vote.

The first point regards the respective jurisdictions of the United Nations and regional organizations as far as matters involving the maintenance of international peace and security are concerned. My delegation's view on this is well known and has been stated at various times. We feel that the provisions of the Charter that are relevant and decisive are contained in Article 52, which says:

"This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35".
The relevant article here is Article 35 which says that:

"Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the ... General Assembly" --

that is, any situation that might lead to international friction.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The second point I wish to make relates to the competence of the United Nations as far as respect for human rights is concerned. Here again, the provisions of Article 13 are crystal-clear:

"The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the following purposes:

"...

"b. ... assist in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all ...".

My third point is the deep concern felt by Mexico at what is described in the title of the draft resolution as, "The situation in Nicaragua". This deep concern has been expressed by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of my country both in Mexico and in the Council of the Organization of American States, as well as in the statement which he made in plenary during the general debate at this session.

For all these reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 introduced by the representative of Venezuela on behalf of its 10 sponsors, including four Latin American delegations.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

First, however, I wish to re-read the oral revision that should be added at the end of the fourth preambular paragraph:

"which have led some countries of the American continent to attempt to achieve a peaceful settlement of the internal conflict in Nicaragua through a friendly committee of conciliation".

I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Against: Nicaragua, Paraguay

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Botswana, Burma, Central African Empire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan,

Jordan, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 was adopted by 68 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. MADADHA (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation abstained during the voting on the draft resolution on the situation in Nicaragua for a purely procedural reason and in order not to call into question the statements made here by some countries on Latin America. The position of Nicaragua in the international arena is well known. If we had supported the draft resolution, this would have created a procedural precedent in this Committee, particularly since from the outset of this session we agreed that our work should deal with disarmament. In keeping with this spirit, we referred to the Special Political Committee questions relating to outer space. Draft resolution A/C.1/33/61/Rev.1 deals with two matters: first of all, condemnation of the oppression of civilians and the violation of human rights in Nicaragua. The Third Committee or the Special Political Committee should have been dealing with that matter.

Secondly, the draft resolution deals with Nicaragua's violation of the sovereignty of neighbouring countries and the fact that it has threatened countries in the region. Our Committee has never studied such situations, because these are within the competence of the Security Council or the Special Political Committee. Even if we were to assume that the matter was on the First Committee's agenda, within the context of the item on the strengthening of international security, in the light of the contradictory statements made my delegation would not have known whether it was a question of an internal or an external nature. We would have liked to have a detailed report from the Organization of American States, or from an international inquiry committee.

Mr. CHAVDA (India): My delegation has abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 for reasons of principle. While we fully share the deep concern of all Members over the serious situation in Nicaragua affecting the security of its neighbours and the human rights of its people, we feel that there are ways, including regional efforts, of achieving a peaceful solution of the internal conflict in Nicaragua other than by the adoption of a formal resolution of the General Assembly.

Mr. VERBEEK (Netherlands): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1, as amended after a proposal by the representative of Bolivia. One may distinguish two main aspects in this draft resolution. The first is the relationship between Nicaragua and its neighbours, an aspect that we believe should be dealt with in the regional framework, where indeed talks are in progress. The second aspect is the fact that there are reports on the human rights situation in Nicaragua that have disturbed the Netherlands Government and, indeed, also public opinion in my country. Our vote is an expression of this concern.

Mr. de PONTON d'AMECOURT (France) (interpretation from French): France understands and shares the feelings expressed by various Member States regarding recent developments in the situation in Central America which gave rise to the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 by the representative of Venezuela on behalf of 10 delegations. However, with regret, the French delegation was obliged to abstain from voting on that draft resolution for reasons of principle which I will explain.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 deals inter alia with matters which constitute an internal affair of a neighbouring State. For this reason, my delegation feels that its text is contrary to the spirit and letter of Article 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter. The draft resolution also deals with the situation relating to human rights in Nicaragua. The French delegation considers that this question is within the competence of the Third Committee of the General Assembly and of the Commission on Human Rights. Moreover, we feel that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 cannot fall within the competence of this First Committee because the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly laid it down that in future this Committee would deal exclusively with disarmament and related issues.

Finally, the draft resolution was introduced to us only yesterday, and the revised text was made available to members of this Committee only this morning. It is not customary - and it is indeed regrettable - that a Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations should have to take a decision on such a serious matter in such a short period of time.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): First, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because we share the concern of the international community over events in Nicaragua, from the point of view of both human rights and fundamental freedoms and the maintenance of peace and security in the region.

Secondly, we voted in favour of the draft resolution because it contains positive elements directed towards a peaceful solution which would avoid further suffering by the people of Nicaragua. Thirdly, we voted in favour of it because, in addition to reaffirming the jurisdiction of this world Organization, it recognizes regional competence in the matter in relation to the attempts now being made to reach a friendly settlement.

However, we feel it would have been better if a draft resolution of this nature could have been introduced in time to allow delegations and the corresponding groups carefully and fairly to evaluate the implications and the juridical and political consequences in the light of the possibility that in future similar situations might arise in various parts of the world.

Mr. FULLER (United Kingdom): Gross violations of human rights within a particular country may properly become a legitimate cause of concern to this Organization. Indeed, we are aware of no other basis on which the General Assembly could properly concern itself with the internal situation of Nicaragua.

(Mr. Fuller, United Kingdom)

It follows that it is also our view that a draft resolution on this subject would have been more appropriately introduced in the Third Committee rather than the First Committee of the General Assembly. Reports of human rights violations in Nicaragua in recent months have caused my Government considerable concern. However, the wording of some parts of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 is undesirably broad and imprecise. We share many of the preoccupations expressed by the representative of France.

We wish also to record the hope that efforts which are under way within the framework of the Organization of American States to secure a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Nicaragua will be crowned with success.

We attach importance to the point made by the representative of the United States that the adoption of the draft resolution at this time may not help to bring that about.

There has unfortunately been insufficient time for consultation and negotiations, which no doubt would have led to agreement on more appropriate wording which my delegation could have supported. We shall, of course, consider and be ready to discuss the matter further in the days to come.

Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation would like to explain the important reasons which led us to cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution. The Zionist entity has not been afraid to contribute to the serious events occurring and which have occurred in the past in Nicaragua. Thousands of people have been killed and the civilian population has been repressed. Everyone knows that the Zionist entity is supplying aircraft, weapons and other military equipment to the Somoza régime. Thus, we can clearly see where the financial and military assistance which is provided to the Zionist entity by the United States of America goes. It is turned into measures of repression not only in the Arab region but also in Nicaragua, southern Africa, Taiwan and other regions throughout the world. That is why all countries which are devoted to freedom and peace should support this draft resolution and thus spare the world the danger of war.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt): My delegation has just abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. I should like to state briefly the reasons for our abstention. Notwithstanding the substance and merit of the case under consideration, and as much as Egypt persistently deplores all forms of violation of human rights and all human suffering, we do not believe that the First Committee, under the present practice in the United Nations, is the proper forum for the submission of such a draft resolution.

Mr. ANDRESEN (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 with the amendments suggested by the representative of Bolivia. We did so in view of the attention and concern with which my country follows all matters related to human rights. However, my delegation wishes to state that it shares many of the reservations that have been expressed here by other delegations with respect to doubts about whether this is the appropriate body for such consideration and to the procedural way in which the draft resolution was presented to the Committee under agenda item 50.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland) (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the very late hour, I should like briefly to explain the vote of the Finnish delegation. My delegation found itself in an exceptionally difficult position when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

On the one hand, we believe that this question does not truly fall within the purview of this Committee and that consideration of it might indeed constitute a dangerous precedent for the work of the First Committee. Moreover, agenda item 50 deals with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. It does not deal with a threat to international security, which would come within the competence of the Security Council. My delegation none the less decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution, because we do indeed understand the aim of its sponsors and of many countries in Latin America that consider that the situation in Nicaragua constitutes a danger to their region

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

and has caused innocent people to suffer. Our vote was made easier by the oral amendments introduced by the delegation of Bolivia. We felt that they did indeed improve the text. Those amendments emphasized the importance of reaching a peaceful solution with the aid of the friendly countries which are principally concerned.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1, but we did have some reservations with respect to having that question considered by the First Committee and not by other more appropriate bodies.

With respect to the flagrant violations of human rights and the internal situation in the country, we feel that this is an exceptional case and that it should in no way be used as a precedent, particularly after the decision taken at the special session of the General Assembly that the First Committee should deal only with questions of disarmament and related issues.

Mr. KITI (Kenya): My delegation did not participate in the voting and I wish to explain briefly why.

First of all, our non-participation should in no way be construed as indicating a lack of concern for the situation prevailing in Nicaragua. We are very much concerned over the violation of human rights there, as we are over such violations anywhere else. But we have been a little doubtful about the appropriateness of this Committee's taking up a question of this type particularly as we had taken a decision earlier to send all but disarmament questions to other Committees. We have also taken into consideration the apparent division amongst the countries in the region.

Hence in order that we may have enough time to study the situation further and to understand the complexities of the situation, and also so as not to jeopardize the good work that we are told is taking place, we have decided not to participate at this time, but that does not mean that we may not do so when the matter comes before the plenary Assembly.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium, after much hesitation, decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. We wanted in that way to express publicly our deep concern over the reports on the flagrant violations of human rights in Nicaragua about which we have been hearing so much in recent months.

We should like at this time to associate ourselves with the reservations expressed by a large number of speakers on this subject. We feel in particular that the question did not really fall within the competence of the First Committee. We also believe that the tardy introduction of the draft resolution under agenda item 50 is not entirely in keeping with the usual procedure of our Committee. Lastly, we feel that the current efforts being made at the regional level should be allowed to continue without any interference from our Organization at this stage. Our Organization could be seized of the situation later if a satisfactory regional solution were not found.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the Committee's consideration of the last item on its agenda, item 50.

I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I understood the representative of Turkey to make an uncalled-for and unfounded allegation of violations of human rights of Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus for 10 years. I ask him can he deny that the relevant false allegations when made by Turkey in the Security Council on 30 August 1974 and in the General Assembly in October 1975 were unanswerably refuted and proved false by extensive quotations from the six-monthly official reports of the Secretary-General for the whole 10-year period in question? And can he deny that Turkey was, on both occasions, unable to answer that indisputable and authoritative evidence? The obvious purpose of the relevant allegations and insinuations is to ease a guilty conscience for the atrocious violations of the human rights of all the Cypriots by the Turkish forces of aggression and occupation in Cyprus for four years now. Can the representative of Turkey deny that his country stands accused before the international community for the atrocious crimes it has committed in Cyprus during those four years by the horrendous report of the European Commission of Human Rights, and by other bodies that have dealt with the matter? And can he say why, if there were any violations of the human rights of the Turkish Cypriots, Turkey which is so keen on creating trouble did not go to the International Commission on Human Rights or any other body to explain the situation?

Therefore, I request that the insinuations be rejected in toto.

Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Nicaragua feels that this afternoon the countries which supported the draft resolution just approved by the First Committee have obtained a Pyrrhic victory inspired by political passions and by personal hatred of their leaders for the Government of my country and its President.

Jurists of world-wide renown and countries concerned over the fate and the prestige of this Organization abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because they felt, quite correctly, that on this occasion there has been a violation of the Charter, and that through the use of a majority not reflected in unanimous

(Mr. Montenegro, Nicaragua)

support, the competence of the First Committee has been exceeded by the taking up of an item which is not within its exclusive jurisdiction.

At this very moment when peace and calm prevail in my country, when the armed insurgence of mid-September has been ended, when a general and complete amnesty has been declared for all political and related crimes, when the state of siege has been lifted, when all guarantees of human rights have been restored, and when the press censorship law has been repealed - at this time the United Nations First Committee has approved a draft resolution which, far from contributing to a solution of the political problem in Nicaragua, as has been quite rightly pointed out, could cause it to flare up again. We feel that the sponsors of that draft resolution had no moral authority to do that, any more than had a number of delegations in their explanations of vote to express rejection of the political régime in my country, which has lived for years in a state of siege which has just been raised for elections to be held.

(Mr. Montenegro, Nicaragua)

There is a political party which creates the possibility of an alternative, and there is freedom of expression and freedom of thought, and the newspapers and magazines have been given --

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the speaker. However, I must draw to his attention that his five minutes are up. So will he please come to the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): An attempt has been made to put my country in the dock, in violation of the principle of equality under the law for all States. Let us not enthuse over 68 votes considering that there are 150 Members of this Organization.

I shall now conclude, because I see that even at the level of the Chairman international pressure has been exerted to prevent a country from exercising its right to speak following the serious accusations made against it. We have not been given sufficient time to reply to them.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The Committee has heard the language used about the policy of my country, Turkey. The representative took sadistic pleasure in hurling insults and making fallacious accusations, something he often does against my country, and I must say that I shall not do the same myself. I shall not use the same language because that language reflects the views of the Greek Cypriot leaders towards their partners in the Republic of Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriots. They are acting with diabolic Machiavellism and depressing Byzantinism. Recently we had a draft resolution before us which was introduced by Mr. Rossides, and we learned that that draft, which had been introduced in the form of an amendment, had been reworded that evening, and the next morning the sponsors of the original draft, who had consented, found before them an additional passage in the operative part of the draft. While I am not conversant with those negotiations, that shows the spirit adopted by the Greek Cypriots. Overnight you can find yourself in a different situation, utterly unforeseen, as a result of men-lacious statements.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

I shall say one thing here. I certainly had no intention of insinuating anything. However, Mr. Rossides mentioned my country, without naming it, and I shall return the bow to him, although more discreetly. However, since he used the words "aggression" and "invasion", I shall just say one more thing to him. The late President, Archbishop Makarios, was wise enough to say in the Security Council in 1974:

(continued in English)

"As I have already stated, the events in Cyprus do not constitute an internal matter of the Greeks of Cyprus. The Turks of Cyprus are also affected." (S/PV.1780, p. 21)

(continued in French)

Those are the words of Archbishop Makarios. I shall not abuse the time and patience of the Committee by giving any further quotations from the reports of the Secretary-General dealing with the tragic period covering more than 11 years. I shall simply state the following.

Having been obliged to speak in exercise of our legitimate right of reply against a fascist and lawless dictatorship, immediately thereafter my Prime Minister gave an interview in which he made an analysis of the attitude of the Greek Cypriots, and I should just like to read this one passage:

(continued in English)

"The error is that foreign policy cannot be based on emotions or feelings of hatred, whereas I think the great misfortune of the Greek Cypriots is that they are brought up, even in school, with dreams of reviving the past, and even at school their hearts are injected with hatred for Turks. I believe that hate is a burden on the human heart. Hate is a cloud on the human head. When one has hate in his heart he can neither establish good relations with others nor think healthily. There is nothing like the power of love."

(continued in French)

I have just one more point to make. I do not want to go into detail or indulge in polemics with these unfortunate people of the Greek Cypriot administration

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

who pose as the representatives of two separate communities. They have been doing this for years but in fact they are negotiating with their partners. If after this statement Mr. Rossides continues to utter insults against our country, please take note of the fact that I reserve the right to answer him in a fitting manner.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Cyprus has asked for the floor. When I accepted the post of Chairman I promised myself never to appeal to anybody for anything but to make rulings. However, since this is my last day in this chair, I can break that rule. Therefore, so that we can end this meeting, which should not take very long now if we can get on with it, I would appeal to the representative of Cyprus to desist from making another reply to the Turkish representative.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): It will not take more than one minute. The representative of Turkey, who supposedly uses good language, forgets that he has not replied to my questions. He tries to evade my questions. They were very specific and they are on record, and he is unable to reply to them. However, I will tell him that relations with the Turkish Cypriots were always harmonious and even now ex-Vice-President Kutchuk has been saying that this paradise island has been turned into hell by the army of Turkish occupation and the thousands of settlers from Turkey. They are thinking with emotion of the time when they were living together with the Greeks. This is the reality, and it can be seen from all the evidence, irrespective of what has been said in irresponsible statements. As for hatred, the opposite from what the representative of Turkey said is true. Hatred has been cultivated by Turkey. An atrocious poem called "Hate" was disseminated in Cyprus under the auspices of Turkey, and in a letter to the Secretary-General I have given quotations bearing from it. That is the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Turkey wishes to reply, and we know where that will lead. So I formally rule that no more statements in exercise of the right of reply will be made.

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed with our business and I call on the representative of Iraq who will speak on behalf of the Asian States.

Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the Asian Group I should like to express its great appreciation and thanks to you, Sir, for the effective and excellent way in which you have presided over the work of our Committee. I think that everybody would agree with me if I were to say that you deserve all due credit for having enabled us to conclude all the agenda items on time. This is principally due to you and your ability and we thank you for it.

I should also like to express great appreciation and gratitude to Mr. Cherkaoui and Mr. Palma, the two Vice-Chairmen, to Mr. Mihajlovic, the Rapporteur of the Committee and to Mr. Banerjee, the Secretary. In expressing congratulations and thanks to you, Sir, I should also like to thank all the unknown soldiers, namely the secretaries, interpreters and technical staff who have made great efforts and co-operated closely with us for many long meetings.

Lastly, I should like to say how happy I was at the ability of the various groups here to come closer to agreement and the warm relationship which has enabled us to reach a successful outcome here. Many resolutions adopted by the First Committee will have an impact on the future. Those resolutions were adopted against threats and aggression against peoples, particularly against the developing countries which have been subjected to suffering and exploitation by colonialists. These countries all now aspire to peace based on justice and not peace based on the exploitation of those peoples.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Norway who will speak on behalf of the Western European and other States.

Mr. KOLBY (Norway): It is my privilege and pleasure on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, our appreciation for the efficient and firm manner in which you have presided over the proceedings of our Committee during the current session of the General Assembly.

I should also like to express our sincere appreciation to the other members of the Bureau whose constructive efforts have been most valuable. Our thanks are also extended to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Sytenko, to his deputy, our Committee Secretary, Mr. Banerjee, and to the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Bjornerstedt, as well as to all the other members of the Secretariat for the conscientious way in which they have performed their work and for their close co-operation with all the members of the Committee. We would also like to thank the interpreters for their important contribution to the deliberations of our Committee.

The First Committee this year has had a very heavy agenda containing many important and complex items. Member countries have expressed their views on a broad number of issues relating to disarmament and international security. We have adopted a record number of resolutions which we feel have advanced our efforts in several areas. That would not have been possible had it not been for the joint efforts of the members of the Committee under your able leadership. Each General Assembly is a challenge to the capacity of our Organization to act in a way in keeping with the demands of an inter-dependent world. I believe that our Committee has contributed to meeting that challenge also this year.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Romania who will speak on behalf of the Eastern European States.

Mr. MIRCEA (Romania): Mr. Chairman, I should like to convey to you sincere congratulations on behalf of a number of delegations of the East European Group for the wise manner in which you have guided the deliberations of this important Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. The fact that as a result of what was agreed upon at the special session, the First Committee this year dealt only with the question of disarmament and the related international security question, made its activity particularly intense covering a wide range of subjects which finally were reflected in a record number of resolutions. Under these circumstances, of great importance were your personal skill and ability, your experience in United Nations activities and your permanent concern to maintain a constructive and working atmosphere in which to carry out the deliberations in a rhythmic and ordered manner.

Our congratulations are also conveyed to the other members of the Bureau of the Committee, to the representatives of the Secretariat at all levels and to all those who, in one way or another, have contributed to the fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to our Committee.

As to results obtained, we should like to point out that they can be considered as new steps on the road opened up by the special session devoted to disarmament. But, at the same time, we believe that it is our duty to underline on this occasion also, that the most important task in the field of international politics is at present the achievement of a radical turning point in the negotiations to curb the arms race and, going further, to adopt effective disarmament measures, first and foremost of nuclear disarmament. That is required in the vital interests of the whole of mankind and world civilization.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Congo who wishes to speak on behalf of the African States.

Mr. GANGA-MBALA (Congo) (interpretation from French): It is a real pleasure for me, Sir, and indeed it is an honour for my country, the People's Republic of Congo, to be here and to speak on behalf of the African States in this august Assembly. For almost two and a half months at this thirty-third session of the General Assembly our Committee has worked with great determination and in a most admirable manner, and in the time allotted to us we have been able to conclude our work. We should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm some African principles on international policies.

As can be seen from the result of the last summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the African States want nothing more than to create a very healthy climate in our area and to consolidate peace, co-operation and understanding so as to be able to devote ourselves to economic development. We will spare no effort to that end.

Along the same lines, African States in so far as they are able, endeavour to ensure that the programme of détente progresses and we also work towards disarmament, particularly general and complete disarmament which is the final objective of all our enterprises. These excellent intentions, unfortunately, often come up against efforts to undermine and divide on the part of some who have been hampering the achievement of a rapid solution to the problem of southern Africa and thus endangering African peace and security and unity.

(Mr. Ganga-Mbala, Congo)

This concern was shown by the non-aligned countries which, at the Belgrade ministerial meeting last July, condemned the increasingly flagrant interference in the affairs of independent countries, through efforts to influence their socio-economic development and their foreign policies and, indeed, to limit their independence. The Ministers then continued by saying:

"The modes of foreign interference include direct and indirect aggressive actions, pressures, subversion and organized vilification campaigns, directed especially towards undermining the independent development of the non-aligned countries and destabilizing their Governments, to which end recourse is also made to armed interventions by special forces and mercenaries. These methods are increasingly employed by the racist régimes and other colonial forces in their bids to regain lost positions or gain new positions." (A/33/206, Annex I, para. 25)

As can be seen from the excerpt from the Belgrade Declaration that I have quoted, it is an important document.

In spite of the problems we face we hope that the African delegations, like all delegations indeed, have given of their best in order to ensure that our debates progress in the right direction. However, all the results achieved during our debates were obtained thanks to your wisdom, Sir, your ability and capacity. This is certainly no surprise to us because we are aware of the firm devotion with which your country, Finland, has supported our work and the cause of the restoration of peace in the world.

We should also like to express our congratulations and our deep appreciation to all the members of the Bureau, for all their assistance to you and to the Committee as a whole. We have taken decisions and reaffirmed some decisions here. There is food for thought in the future and for the tasks which we have to carry out for our peoples. We trust that next session our work will be very positive and that we will be taking a decisive step forward in our search for a better world in which true peace will prevail, people will live in peace and tranquillity and the nuclear threat will be simply a matter of history, just as colonization is for Africa now.

(Mr. Ganga-Mbala, Congo)

Lastly, once again on behalf of the African Group, I should like to reaffirm our very best wishes for health, happiness and prosperity to the Bureau and to all members of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of El Salvador who will speak on behalf of the Latin American States.

Mr. LOVO CASTELAR (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish):
Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to address to you on behalf of the Latin American Group our appreciation and gratitude for the outstandingly effective manner in which you have presided over our Committee, a difficult task. Your impartiality and your tact have been indeed outstanding.

Likewise, we would like to express our appreciation to the other officers of this Committee and members of the Secretariat who have made a tremendous effort to assist us.

The First Committee has now concluded its work in a most satisfactory manner. Our debates have been fruitful and we have approved a large number of resolutions which relate to the most important objectives of the United Nations. The concern of mankind as a whole to avert the nuclear threat, to halt the arms race, to resolve the problems of international peace and security, and other items as well, have been given an in-depth and thorough consideration by this Committee. There is no doubt that these results will have a positive impact on subsequent efforts made by the United Nations in this area. May I repeat our appreciation to you, Sir, for your excellent work.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Egypt who will speak on behalf of the Group of Arab countries.

Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, it is an honour for me to express to you on behalf of the Group of Arab countries our most sincere appreciation and thanks for the effective manner in which you have presided over the work of our Committee during the various stages of our work here. You have demonstrated tremendous integrity and firmness. As a result the Committee has been able to conclude its work on schedule. We would also express our appreciation to the Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur and the other members of the Bureau as well as the members of the Secretariat who have all worked in close co-operation with you so as to enable you to help us achieve success in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no more speakers on my list, but I believe that the Chairman has the privilege of putting his name on the list of speakers whenever he so wishes. He also has the privilege of not being bound by his own rulings, so I shall not limit myself to five minutes although I warn other representatives that this does not mean that they will be able to do the same thing, nor will I be able to give anyone a right of reply to my remarks, however objectionable they may be to some representatives present in this hall.

I am a man of few words, although it may not so have appeared to the members of the Committee during the weeks we have spent together, but I understand that it is required that the Chairman gives, if not a summing up - and certainly not a consensus statement on behalf of the Committee of what has transpired and what we have achieved - at least his own evaluation of what has taken place in the First Committee. That is what I shall proceed to do although not at great length.

(The Chairman)

But before that, and with the requisite degree of humility, I must thank all the speakers who have spoken today on behalf of their regional groups and been good enough to express varying degrees of satisfaction, first of all with the work of the Committee and secondly with the work of the Bureau with which I have had the privilege to work, and also with the work of the Chairman, who, as I have had occasion to emphasize on some occasions, is the servant of the Committee. But whatever merit there has been to the work of this Committee and its achievements, procedurally as well as substantively, it obviously is the merit of the Committee and its individual members. All the Chairman can do is to try to guide the work in accordance with the rules of procedure in the direction which might facilitate the Committee's work. In so doing, he must of course constantly reflect the will and expectations of the Committee and its members.

I think it is important to make a note of the fact that both in substance and in procedure the First Committee has this year had a revised mandate and a revised profile. This is by virtue of the decision of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. Because of it the Committee has been able to concentrate almost exclusively on matters of disarmament and related security issues. It is my opinion that that decision and new procedure has further clarified and indeed enhanced the status of the First Committee as a main deliberative body in the field of disarmament.

This year we have also had a number of other new practices. We have dispensed with the practice of having only one all-encompassing general debate and we had two other general debates on the review and appraisal of the results of the special session, as well as the question of the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and the question of strengthening international security. We also agreed very early on on a new and possibly "revolutionary" practice by concentrating the action on the draft resolutions on disarmament in one and the same framework, and I think that the very fact that we were able to deal with those 41 draft resolutions within one week is indeed proof positive that this practice may at least have the great merit of being practicable and efficient, not only because it is concentrated but also because it gives so much time at earlier stages for consultations and drafting that amendments and things of that kind can practically

(The Chairman)

be eliminated. If my successor next year were to ask my opinion I would warmly recommend to him the same procedure.

I now come to expressions of gratitude, which would really take a very long time if I were to launch myself into such expressions, because it is my feeling that I should have to thank every member of this Committee by name for their constant co-operation and particularly for their understanding of the difficulties the Chairman faces from time to time. Not only the Chairman faces them, the whole Bureau does so as well. The Chairman is really the expression of a collective body of people who work very closely together, as the Committee is aware. On that score I would first of all want to direct my very warm thanks to the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Mr. Hugo Palma and Mr. Cherkaoui, who has already had to leave us to catch an aeroplane. They have been extremely obliging and understanding in replacing me in the chair when necessary.

The Rapporteur, Ambassador Mihajlovic, still has his main work ahead of him. Other members may have already completed their work, but his main task remains to be done.

I am also very grateful that we have been able to work together as the Bureau. I have had invaluable advice on difficult procedural points and in the planning and scheduling of work. And not only advice. There have also been very intelligent conversations and it has been great fun from time to time.

In earlier times I have myself had occasion to work in the Secretariat, and therefore I know a little about the burden the Secretariat carries in these tasks. The main burden-bearer, if I may use such a term, is the man on my left, Mr. Banerjee, the Committee Secretary. I think that he has treated me with exceptional kindness because we have been friends for so many years and at this late date he could not really change his preferences.

The same is true of the Assistant Secretary-General and Director of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, Mr. Bjornerstedt, who is also a friend, colleague and working companion in the Secretariat of many years who therefore also feels obligated to approach me with exceptional kindness and helpfulness.

The chair on my right is empty but it has as often as possible been filled by the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Sytenko, who, although comparatively new to his duties with the Secretariat,

(The Chairman)

has nevertheless shown a keen interest in disarmament and has spent as much time in the First Committee as has been possible after his other duties, which, of course, pertain mainly to the Security Council. I have benefited from his support and advice if not on procedure then very much on broad political issues and aspects of various matters.

It remains only for me to say that it is a matter of personal regret to me that these are my last moments as Chairman and that as from tomorrow I shall descend from the elevated post of Chairman to the very modest post of an Excellency.

Once again I thank all the friends on this Committee, whom I may safely expect to meet next year.

The meeting adjourned at 7.35 p.m.