

71. Mr. CORREA (Chile), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that all Member States would have the opportunity to judge for themselves the character of Soviet assistance to developing countries, when they received copies of a treaty on fisheries between Chile and the Soviet Union which he had requested the Secretary-General to circulate. The provisions of that treaty would imply illustrate the extortionate tactics employed by the Soviet Union against developing countries.

72. At the preceding meeting, he had referred to the Soviet versions of the international division of labour and détente because of the experiences his country had had in that regard. To the Soviet Union, an international division of labour simply meant the subordination of the economies of the developing world to its own, while détente was merely a ruse for Soviet infiltration of the economies of the developed industrialized countries.

73. While the Soviet Government professed to support détente, its secret police had broken into and searched the home of a noted Soviet author. An instructive insight had been provided by Andrei Sakharov when he had said, in commenting on that incident, that true détente was incompatible with the persecution of those who in the impartial pursuit of truth defended the causes of social justice, human rights and genuine world peace.

74. Mr. KOVALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the representative of Chile had strayed considerably from the question at hand. Soviet assistance had been provided to Chile at the request of the Government of Popular Unity and had been designed to assist that country in its struggle to liberate its economy from foreign dependence. The achievements under the Government of National Unity had subsequently been trampled underfoot by the fascist junta. It was no accident that the representatives of the military junta, in marked contrast to other delegations in the Second Committee, had made no reference to the sovereign right of developing countries to dispose of their national resources, since the present

Government was in the process of selling out Chile's national wealth to foreigners. The military junta had unleashed bloody tyranny on the country. During the discussion on UNICEF, the representative of Chile had shed crocodile tears over the misery of the children of Chile. However, many representatives had had the opportunity to see how happy the children had been in 1971, when the Governing Council of UNDP had met in Santiago during the period of the people's triumph. The children were crying now because the fascist junta had deprived them of their mothers and fathers and turned the children themselves into beggars. In brief, the fascist junta had reduced the country to a state in which terror dominated.

75. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that great calm and patience were needed to listen to the false accusations made by the Soviet representative. There were 9 million people in the Andean region who had learnt at first hand what it was to suffer under Soviet tactics.

76. The display of happy children which the Soviet representative had seen in 1971 had probably been staged by the Government for the benefit of the visitors, a practice not unfamiliar to the Soviet representative. If he had travelled throughout the country he would have seen poverty and misery. The Chilean Government was currently pursuing a policy of income redistribution which would restore to the people the purchasing power they had lost as a result of inflation during the period of the Allende Government. Chile was thus attempting to return to normality. He did not expect the Soviet delegation to understand, however, since a mentality which had taken centuries to form would not be changed in a matter of days.

77. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Central African Republic, Grenada, Lesotho, Paraguay, and Uganda had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1352.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

1619th meeting

Tuesday, 29 October 1974, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1619

AGENDA ITEM 44

United Nations Institute for Training and Research: report of the Executive Director (*continued*)* (A/9614, A/C.2/L.1344 and 1345)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the draft resolution relating to UNITAR

(A/C.2/L.1344) and announced that the delegation of Burundi had become a sponsor of the amendment relating thereto (A/C.2/L.1345).

2. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium), Vice-Chairman, said that both texts had been the subject of informal consultations, that numerous proposals had been put forward, but that it had not been possible to complete consideration of them. That being the case, he suggested that the Committee should postpone its decision until the end of the week.

* Resumed from the 1614th meeting.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the two texts in question to Friday, 1 November.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 45

Operational activities for development (continued)*
(A/9603, chap. VI, sect. B; E/5466, E/5543/Rev.1):

- (a) United Nations Development Programme (DP/69, A/C.2/L.1348/Rev.1, 1349/Rev.2 and 1350);
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund (E/5557 and Corr.1);
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5498 and Corr.1);
- (e) United Nations fund for population activities;
- (f) United Nations children's fund (E/5528);
- (g) World Food Programme

4. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Dahomey, Guinea, Honduras, Lesotho, Nicaragua, Uruguay and Zambia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1348/Rev.1. The delegations of Iraq and Lebanon had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1349/Rev.2.

5. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium), Vice-Chairman, said that the informal consultation group had continued its discussions concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1348/Rev.1, that progress had been made, but that further consultations were necessary. He therefore requested the Committee to postpone consideration of the texts in question until the end of the week.

It was so decided.

6. The CHAIRMAN stressed that thenceforth it would no longer be possible to postpone consideration of the aforementioned draft resolutions and he requested delegations to co-operate in order to arrive at a consensus. If they were unable to do so before 1 November, it would be necessary to put the texts to the vote.

AGENDA ITEM 42

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (continued)**
(A/9603/Add.1 (part I), A/9615, TD/B/503 and Supp.1 and Supp.1/Add.1, A/C.2/L.1353 and 1356-1360)

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Burundi, Dahomey, Lesotho, Mali, Rwanda, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1353; that the delegations of Burundi, Gabon and the Syrian Arab Republic had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356; that the delegations of Colombia,

Dahomey and Singapore had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357; that the delegations of Burundi, Colombia, Dahomey, Mali, Rwanda and Zaire had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358; that the delegations of the Central African Republic, Chad, Lesotho, Mali and Zaire had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1359; and that the delegations of Burundi, Colombia, Lesotho and Pakistan had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1360.

8. Mr. HAMID (Sudan), Vice-Chairman, said that he had been unable to consult delegations concerning the draft resolutions relating to UNCTAD. Nevertheless, he proposed that consideration should be given to a number of draft resolutions which did not seem to him to require consultations, in particular draft resolution A/C.2/L.1360, under which the Committee would decide that the fourth session of UNCTAD would be held at Nairobi and would thank the Kenyan Government for its invitation, and draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356, under which the Second Committee would commission the President of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General to request the Chilean Government to release Mr. Almeyda, the President of the third session of UNCTAD, immediately.

9. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) proposed that the Committee should await the outcome of the consultations before beginning consideration of the draft resolutions relating to UNCTAD. He wished to take the opportunity to announce that Egypt had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1360.

10. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he did not think it would be useful to defer consideration of the resolutions mentioned by Mr. Hamid. He therefore requested the representative of Egypt to withdraw his proposal.

11. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should begin considering draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1353, A/C.2/L.1356 and A/C.2/L.1360.

It was so decided.

12. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1353, which he was introducing on behalf of the sponsors, reiterated the appeal already launched at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (resolution 3174 (XXVIII)) and the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board (resolution 119 (XIV)), under the terms of which all Member States and the international agencies, including IDA in particular, had been invited to take urgent measures to help the least developed countries. The situation of those countries, already distressing in ordinary times, had been further aggravated by the current economic difficulties and it had become essential to implement the decisions taken with regard to them, in particular those relating to trade, such as the Tokyo Declaration of 14 September 1973 on multilateral trade negotiations, adopted at the Ministerial Meeting of GATT, under which the least developed countries were to receive special assistance. Much remained to be done in the financial sphere also.

13. After commenting on the preamble, he went on to explain the four operative paragraphs. The intergovern-

*Resumed from the 1614th meeting.

**Resumed from the 1613th meeting.

mental group referred to in paragraph 1 would have the task of facilitating the implementation of decisions already taken at the third session of UNCTAD. That would not, of course, exclude the elaboration of additional measures in the financial and commercial spheres.

14. The appeal made in paragraph 2 was addressed to all States and all specialized agencies which had not duly complied with UNCTAD resolution 62 (III).

15. With reference to paragraph 3, he appealed to Member States to replenish the resources of IDA before it went bankrupt. Whatever measures had already been taken by the World Bank Group, they were clearly insufficient. At the resumed fifth-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council (1924th meeting), Mr. McNamara, President of the World Bank Group, had pleaded the cause of the least advanced countries and it was to be hoped that he had not done so in vain.

16. In conclusion, he hoped that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1353 would be adopted unanimously without a vote.

17. The CHAIRMAN announced that Nepal had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1353.

18. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) expressed the hope that consideration of the draft resolution could be postponed until the following meeting, since he had not received instructions from his Government, 28 October being a holiday at Washington.

19. Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) expressed the hope that the delay would result in greater support, contrary to what had happened at the twenty-seventh session during consideration of a draft resolution on the same topic.

20. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1353 should be deferred until the next day.

It was so decided.

21. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356, which he was introducing on behalf of the sponsors, must be considered in the light of the report of the Trade and Development Board, which, at the first part of its fourteenth session, had examined the question of the functioning of UNCTAD. The President of the third session of UNCTAD, Mr. Clodomiro Almeyda, was imprisoned in Chile and unable to assume his functions. According to the opinion of the Legal Counsel, the office of President was assumed by a person and not by the country of which that person was a national; therefore, Mr. Almeyda must still be regarded as the incumbent President of UNCTAD. It was regrettable that UNCTAD had been deprived of the experience and competence of its President at a time when they would have been of value to it. He stressed how much the sponsors wished to secure the release of a man who had played a leading role at the third session of UNCTAD, and to save him from the fate which the Chilean Government seemed to have in store for him. He asked for a roll-call vote on the draft resolution, and requested that the Committee should transmit the text adopted to the General Assembly immediately after the vote.

22. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that his delegation fully supported the substance and purpose of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356. That attitude was not based on a political position with regard to events in Chile, but was the expression of a humanitarian feeling and a concern to safeguard the prestige of UNCTAD.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the usual procedure, explanations of vote should be given after the vote.

24. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said he was surprised to see that a movement organized by the Soviet Union was not openly directed by it. The question raised in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356 was not as simple as the representatives of the Upper Volta and the Sudan had wished to suggest, since it fell within the framework of a whole policy of verbal aggression against his country and Government led by the USSR, first in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly and then in the Main Committees. A draft resolution attacking his country had been submitted recently to the Third Committee, and his country was constantly being criticized by the USSR and its satellites, which showed a total lack of respect for his delegation and Government.

25. In order to take a decision with full knowledge of the facts, members of the Second Committee should understand the internal situation in his country. It was a country which had had juridical and democratic institutions for 160 years. Democracy had been interrupted only in 1891, in the 1930s, and, of course, in 1973. None the less, his country's democratic tradition was exemplary and there were few such instances in the world. Within that democracy, there were disturbed minds which had sought to introduce the Marxist model into political life. In fact, President Allende had been elected by only 30 per cent of the vote and had defeated the rightist candidate by only 30,000 votes. Therefore, two thirds of the population had been opposed to him. In order to be elected by the Congress, he had been obliged to sign the statute of democratic guarantee, under pressure from the Christian Democratic Party, which was the majority party, but immediately after his election President Allende had begun to violate that statute and to apply the laws as he saw fit, without taking into account the traditions of Chilean democracy. Agrarian reform was a typical example; undertaken in the 1960s, it had provided for the expropriation of any holding over 4 hectares in area, but President Allende had widened those provisions to include all holdings, whatever the area, and had not paid the compensation provided for by law. The result had been a decline in production of such magnitude that agricultural products worth more than \$600 million had had to be imported. After expropriating all the land, the Allende régime had encouraged workers to take over industrial enterprises, which had soon brought about the results with which everyone was familiar: a drop in output, and rationing.

26. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Yemen), speaking on a point of order, said that the Second Committee had not met to listen to a lecture on the history of Chile, but to consider a draft resolution.

27. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Chile to confine his remarks to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356.

28. Mr. CORREA (Chile), said that he was not in the habit of making long statements, but the draft resolution in question had political overtones which obliged him to describe the situation in his country.

29. Once the workers had taken over enterprises and factories, the Chilean economy had been engulfed by inflation because the State had been forced to mint money in order to offset the losses suffered by the economy, which amounted to a total equivalent to the national budget. On top of that, daily acts of violence had been committed, encouraged by the Government, accompanied by strikes, demonstrations and acts of rebellion which had made work impossible, and whose aims had been purely political. Towards the end of the Allende régime, the forces of the left had begun to infiltrate the army and had sought to incite the military to revolt against their superiors.

30. Mr. KANDÉ (Senegal), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the representative of Chile had taken into account the highly pertinent remark of the representative of Yemen.

31. The CHAIRMAN again appealed to the representative of Chile.

32. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) said that he did not wish to intervene in the internal affairs of Chile, but there was a procedural question to be settled: explanations of vote should be given after the vote, as the Chairman had said. The explanations which the representative of Chile wished to give did not fall within the normal framework of the Committee's work. He therefore moved that the debate on the matter under discussion be closed, in accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, permission to speak on the closure of the debate should be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion should be immediately put to the vote.

34. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that the Committee's attitude demonstrated the pressures brought to bear by the Soviet group. That group was not really interested in the fate of Mr. Almeyda; it was only seeking to make political capital out of his release. In order to make a decision on the matter, the Committee should hear what he had to say against the draft resolution. That was why it would be untimely to close the debate.

35. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) spoke against the closure of the debate. It was for the Chairman to decide whether a representative's statement had not dealt with the subject under discussion, and if so, to call the speaker to order under rule 109 of the rules of procedure. But if the debate was closed, no other delegation would be able to speak, and his own delegation would like to give its views on some specific points. For that reason, he requested that the motion for closure should be withdrawn and the representative of Chile be able to continue his statement, observing the Chairman's suggestions.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on the motion for closure of the debate.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela, Zambia.

The motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 53 votes to 28, with 33 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356.

At the request of the representative of Upper Volta, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland.

Against: Uruguay, Chile, Nicaragua, Paraguay.

Abstaining: Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bhutan, Bolivia,

Burma, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356 was adopted by 78 votes to 4, with 33 abstentions.

36. Mr. CAICEDO (Colombia), explaining his vote after the vote, recalled that his delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2106/Rev.1 concerning torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment inflicted on detainees and prisoners, which was before the Third Committee, and he said that it was necessary to condemn not only physical torture but also the psychological torture represented by certain degrading forms of detention. Mr. Almeyda was not a criminal in ordinary law and he (Mr. Caicedo) wished to press the case of a man who had contributed so much to the establishment of links among the countries of America. Accordingly he had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356.

37. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) observed that the draft resolution raised some problems. His Government was very concerned with the question of human rights in Chile and in particular with the case of Mr. Almeyda, but he wished to stress that the Committee should concern itself not only with well-known persons but also with more obscure individuals that had been deprived of their liberty, in Chile as in other countries. Those who had most to say on the question were often the least well placed to do so. It was to be hoped that the adoption of the resolution would prompt some countries to give more thought to the fate of their own political prisoners.

38. Furthermore, the Second Committee, which dealt with economic questions, was not the appropriate body to submit the draft resolution in question. It was a problem of human rights that fell more properly within the province of the Third Committee. Moreover, an international body should not take up individual cases. Admittedly, the Trade and Development Board had recently adopted an almost identical resolution, resolution 111 (XIV), but there was a difference between a body with a limited membership such as UNCTAD and a universal organization such as the General Assembly. In fact, the Committee was requesting the Secretary-General, in the draft resolution that had just been adopted, to interfere in the internal affairs of Chile.

39. He would have preferred to have stated his position before the vote and he protested against tactics designed to prevent delegations from speaking. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356.

40. Mr. CORREA (Chile) regretted the excessive politicization of the Committee's debates, a development that harmed its efficiency and had caused delegations to vote without having been able to learn the position of the Chilean Government and the facts. It might be pointed out that some of the sponsors of the draft resolution were known for their violations of human rights. He cited the USSR, where the most basic individual rights were cynically

trampled under foot; the Libyan Arab Republic, where, under the laws promulgated by the Libyan Government, thieves had their right hand cut off, and those who committed armed robbery had a hand and a foot cut off; he also cited Yemen.

41. It was the delegations of those countries that were requesting the release of an individual detained in Chile not for political reasons, as his delegation had already stated, but for a crime in ordinary law; Mr. Almeyda had been arrested, not as a result of a governmental decision but of a decision by the judicial authorities, for embezzlement. In fact, in 1971 Mr. Almeyda's Chef de Cabinet, later Minister for Foreign Affairs, had made a visit to the United States carrying \$60,000 belonging to the Chilean Government and he had returned to Chile with \$50,000 which he had deposited in Chilean banks in Mr. Almeyda's name. It had been possible to bring the affair to light after the change of Government in 1972. In Chile the judicial authorities were autonomous and quite independent of the political authorities.

42. Mr. SCHUPPUS (Togo) asked for the length of explanations of vote to be restricted. The Committee had a heavy time-table and it was pointless to fall behind.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that the rules of procedure empowered him to limit the time to be allowed for such explanations. He therefore asked the representative of Chile to make his explanation short.

44. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that it was normal that the totalitarian countries, in which the judiciary had no independence, should not understand his delegation's position, but he was sure that the democratic countries would. The case of Mr. Almeyda fell within the competence of the judiciary and the Chilean Government was not in a position to take any decision on the subject.

45. He wished to emphasize that the draft resolution which had just been adopted constituted open interference in the internal affairs of a State, in flagrant violation of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. That showed that the influence of the totalitarian countries was increasingly preponderant within the Organization.

46. The Second Committee, and the Trade and Development Board before it, had overstepped the limit of their powers and were acting on the basis of political criteria, which had nothing to do with the work of the Committee. The countries which had adopted the draft resolution in question must be prepared to accept in future similar draft resolutions concerning themselves.

47. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution under consideration because it wished Mr. Almeyda to be released and also because it had supported an analogous text at Geneva, at the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board, and did not wish to alter its earlier attitude. However, he regretted that the right of speech had not been respected, and that the delegations which opposed the draft resolution had not been able to make themselves heard.

48. Mr. ETUK (Nigeria), supported by Mr. SEYDOU (Niger), said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution to show that it approved of its humanitarian character; it did not in any way mean that his delegation wished to intervene in the internal affairs of Chile.

49. Mr. CHEÛLE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, first because it considered that the Committee was not competent to deal with questions which were in no way of an economic or financial nature, and secondly because it wished to respect the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another country, set forth in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

50. Mr. GERBASI (Venezuela) acknowledged the humanitarian motives which had inspired the sponsors of the draft resolution and the outstanding qualities shown by Mr. Almeyda as President of the third session of UNCTAD. However, his delegation had abstained because it considered the solution of the problem to be essentially a matter for the Chilean Government.

51. Mr. JÄÄSKELÄINEN (Finland) said that he had voted for the draft resolution under consideration and for humanitarian reasons had supported the analogous resolution adopted by the Trade and Development Board. The Nordic countries had already had the opportunity in the past to express in a communiqué their concern at the violations of human rights throughout the world and particularly in Chile, and they had appealed to the Chilean Government to release political prisoners. In his opinion, draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356 fell within the competence of the Second Committee since it was based on a decision of the Trade and Development Board.

52. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it approved of its deeply humanitarian purpose. Mr. Almeyda had been imprisoned for more than a year in inhuman conditions and treated as an ordinary criminal. All the members of the Committee were aware of the qualities of that great Chilean patriot and had had the opportunity to appreciate them when he was President of the third session of UNCTAD.

53. The Trade and Development Board and the Third Committee had already asked for the release of Mr. Almeyda, and the Third Committee had furthermore requested the Chilean Government to re-establish human rights in the country and refrain from flouting the decisions of the United Nations.

54. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) observed that his delegation had voted against the motion to close the debate; it considered that every delegation had the right to be heard. It had abstained on the draft resolution to show that, while it was particularly concerned at Mr. Almeyda's situation and certainly supported the humanitarian character of the draft, it none the less considered that the task entrusted to the Secretary-General by the draft resolution constituted interference in the internal affairs of Chile that was incompatible with the principles set forth in Article 2 of the Charter.

55. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) shared the opinion expressed by some of the previous speakers that it was not the business of the Second Committee to deal with questions of that kind. In considering draft resolution A/C.2/L.1356, the Committee was in fact overstepping its mandate. His delegation noted with concern that the debate had been closed before all those who had wished to speak on the question had been able to do so. He considered that the representative of Chile had not digressed from the subject and it was sad that he had been prevented from continuing.

56. With regard to the substance of the draft resolution under consideration, he drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the public statement made by his delegation in the Third Committee on the question of human rights in Chile.

57. Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey) stressed that in voting for the draft resolution his delegation had not yielded to the pressures of the totalitarian countries and had voted quite independently.

58. Because of Mr. Almeyda's role in UNCTAD—which was one of the items on the Second Committee's agenda—an organization of which he remained President until the opening of the fourth session of the Conference, his delegation considered that the Committee was perfectly entitled to concern itself with his fate. It was for that reason, and also for humanitarian reasons, that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution.

59. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) said that he was fully aware of the role which Mr. Almeyda had played in UNCTAD; if he had abstained, it was simply because he considered that draft resolutions of that kind should preferably be submitted in the Third Committee.

60. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) pointed out that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it considered that Mr. Almeyda should be released and also for the reasons which it had expressed in the Third Committee. Furthermore, he recalled that his delegation had also voted for the almost identical text submitted at the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board.

61. On the other hand, it had voted against the motion to close the debate because it considered that everyone had the right to be heard.

62. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation noted with satisfaction that an overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee had supported the draft resolution. He considered that result to be the best possible answer to the slanders and insinuations of the representative of the fascist Chilean junta.

63. The draft resolution was wholly acceptable because its purpose was to obtain the release of a man whom the members of the Committee had known personally and with whom they had worked when he was President of the third session of UNCTAD.

64. The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973, had paid tribute to the members of the Government of Popular Unity of Chile who, like Mr. Almeyda, had fought to counter the aggression of imperialism and reaction. By adopting the draft resolution under consideration, the General Assembly would be expressing its wish to add its voice to the other progressive voices of the world. It was to be hoped that the measure would help to put an end to the terror reigning in Chile and would encourage the Government of that country to cease violating human rights so flagrantly.

65. His delegation considered the draft resolution that had been adopted, following upon many other resolutions on the same subject adopted by the General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the ILO General Conference and the Trade and Development Board, was a practical means of re-establishing human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile. His delegation therefore hoped that Mr. Almeyda would be able to preside over the opening of the fourth session of UNCTAD.

66. Mr. KACIMAIWAI (Fiji) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution under consideration because, first of all, it felt that the question fell within the competence of another United Nations body, and also because it thought that it was primarily the responsibility of the Chilean Government to settle that matter. Moreover, he did not understand why only Chile was discussed since other countries also had political prisoners. However, the position taken by his delegation should not be interpreted as a sign of indifference to the question of human rights.

67. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of the Upper Volta had requested that the Second Committee's decision should be transmitted immediately to the General Assembly without waiting until all questions relating to UNCTAD had been considered. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the proposal was accepted.

It was so decided.

68. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ethiopia, Mexico and the Philippines had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1360.

69. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan), introducing A/C.2/L.1360 on behalf of the sponsors, recalled that, in decision 113 (XIV), the Trade and Development Board had expressed its gratitude to the Government of Kenya for its invitation to hold the fourth session of UNCTAD at Nairobi and had recommended to the General Assembly that it should accept that invitation and should decide that the session be held at Nairobi in May/June 1976 for a period not exceeding four weeks.

70. During the 10 years of its existence, UNCTAD had proved to be a most valuable instrument for the cause of progress and development, by making the peoples and countries of Asia and Latin America increasingly aware of the problems confronting them in the field of trade and development and of the activities which could be under-

taken by the United Nations to solve them. It had also made the peoples of the developing countries more aware of the need to co-operate in the settlement of problems arising in the field of trade and economic development, particularly those affecting the developing countries. Kenya was a particularly happy choice, since it was a country belonging to a continent which offered great opportunities for development and the people and Government of Kenya were among the foremost champions of development on that continent. Moreover, the establishment of the headquarters of UNEP in Nairobi clearly showed that the international community recognized the importance of Kenya's role in international co-operation in the field of economic and social development. He and the other sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

71. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) informed the members of the Committee that the programme budget established for 1976-1977 made provision for funds to cover the cost of that Conference, but that the cost had been assessed in terms of holding the Conference in Geneva. If the General Assembly decided to organize the Conference in Kenya, an agreement would have to be concluded with the Government of that country to ensure that it would defray the additional costs that the change would involve, in accordance with paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV).

72. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) proposed that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1360 should be adopted forthwith without a vote.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution was adopted.

73. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya) thanked the members of the Committee for the honour they had conferred on his Government by accepting its invitation. His Government would begin consultations immediately with the UNCTAD secretariat to study the preparatory work that would be necessary and would assume all responsibilities devolving upon it at the administrative and financial level.

74. He also thanked the representative of Japan for the kind remarks he had made about his country.

75. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, felt that the representative of Chile had sought to humiliate his country by speaking of the law relating to the punishment of thieves adopted by the Libyan Government in 1972 and by saying that that law constituted a violation of human rights. The Libyan people were proud of their laws, which were derived from Islamic laws. Since the law in question had entered into force, no thief had been sentenced in that country; moreover, because of the high standard of living of the Libyan people, there was no longer any need for anyone to steal. If Islamic laws had been applied in Chile, the heads of the leaders of that country might have had to be cut off, rather than their hands or feet. The remarks by the Chilean representative clearly showed that he was completely ignorant of conditions in the Libyan Arab Republic.

76 Mr. CORREA (Chile), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that some representatives had sought to give the impression that the case of Mr. Almeyda was a violation of human rights. The representative of the German Democratic Republic, in particular, had claimed that the person in question had been detained in inhuman conditions. During the last three months, American officials had been able to see for themselves that he was well treated; on 1 June, the Mexican Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated that Mr. Almeyda was in excellent physical and mental condition. In point of fact, he had been accorded special treatment because of the high position he had held. Those who had abstained from voting had clearly indicated that, in that particular case, they did not believe that the basic rights of Mr. Almeyda had been violated. The Second Committee was, as it were, violating human rights since it had adopted a draft resolution without listening to what his delegation had to say on the subject. That clearly demonstrated the degree of blind politicization arrived at by that organ.

77. The Chilean Penal Code, which had been in force for 100 years, had not been amended recently. Under that code, the fact that Mr. Almeyda had been President of UNCTAD did not constitute an extenuating circumstance. Chile, faithful to humanitarian principles, would not treat Mr. Almeyda in the way that Imre Nagy had been treated. However, in order to revert to a normal situation, his Government was obliged to purge dangerous persons and to rid itself of thousands of aliens who had sought to unleash the revolution in Chile. It was normal for the Government to take action to restore its authority. It seemed that there were two criteria, according to whether Chile or other

countries were involved. In point of fact, few countries enjoyed the social peace and security prevailing in Chile.

78. With regard to the statement by the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, it had never been his intention to humiliate anyone; he had simply deemed it necessary to draw attention to a legal system which clearly departed from the usual norms. The Libyan press itself had reported that during the past 14 months, 2,000 left-wing opponents had been arrested in that country and put in concentration camps in the desert; a campaign of terror, unprecedented since the Mussolini era, was in progress and prisoners in the camps were being tortured until they died.

79. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic) said that the statements quoted by the Chilean representative were completely false and constituted interference in the internal affairs of his country. In point of fact, the Islamic régime guaranteed complete freedom for all Libyans; in that regard, the representative of Chile would do better to keep silent.

80. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that it was very possible that the news reported by the Libyan press was incorrect, but that by the same token there was no proof that the statements concerning the situation of Mr. Almeyda were true. Mr. Omar spoke of interference in the internal affairs of his country whereas it was his delegation that had interfered in the internal affairs of Chile by sponsoring the draft resolution. The Chilean delegation had never intended to intervene in the internal affairs of any country.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

1620th meeting

Wednesday, 30 October 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1620

AGENDA ITEM 60

Assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations (A/9603, chap. III, sect. B and chap. VI, sect. E):

- (a) Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator: report of the Secretary-General (A/9637);
- (b) Aid to the Sudano-Sahelian populations threatened with famine: report of the Secretary-General (A/9733, A/9737)

1. Mr. BERKOL (United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator) said that the hurricane which had recently hit Honduras had caused considerable loss of life and material damage, and that the country would need three or four years to regain its pre-disaster level of development. That event showed how formidable an obstacle disasters constituted to the development of many countries. In many disaster-prone developing countries, the damage caused far

exceeded the total value of the bilateral and multilateral assistance received. In some countries in South East Asia with a population growth rate of the order of 3 to 3.5 per cent, typhoons alone could cause damage amounting to 1 or 2 per cent of the gross national product, which meant that, just in order to maintain their economies at the same level, those countries had to achieve an annual rate of growth of about 5 or 5.5 per cent; as that rarely happened, they were in fact regressing in relative terms.

2. Such a situation was not, however, inevitable. In general, the international community had so far dealt with disasters after the event and then chiefly from a humanitarian and social point of view. Similarly, his Office, in the first two years of its existence, had had to give priority to mobilizing and co-ordinating international relief, but it had tried at the same time to make preparations for a long-term approach. At the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, in the Third Committee, he had launched the