

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
61st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 29 November 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 61st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KABORE (Burkina Faso)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 111: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TRAFFIC IN DRUGS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2 750,
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/44/SR.61
6 December 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

89-57504 2207S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

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

Draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan (A/C.3/44/L.82)

1. Mr. OURESHI (Pakistan) announced that Pakistan was not a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.82, which had already been adopted.

Draft decision on the programme of work of the Third Committee contained in document A/C.3/44/L.2

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the draft decision contained in document A/C.3/44/L.2 should be deferred until the forty-fifth session.

3. Ms. AIDUAZE (Algeria), Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) and Mr. TANASE (Romania) supported the Chairman's suggestion.

4. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she could not accept the Chairman's suggestion because the same problem would arise next year.

5. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he could accept the suggestion, provided that when the draft decision was considered it would be accompanied by the summary records of the meetings at which the draft decision had been discussed.

6. Mr. WHITAKER SALLES (Brazil) said he had no objection to Egypt's suggestion.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly decides to defer consideration of the draft decision entitled 'Programme of work of the Third Committee' (A/C.3/44/L.2) to its forty-fifth session, and that, when considering its organization of work for the forty-fifth session, the Third Committee should have before it the text of the draft decision and the summary records of the meetings at which the draft decision was discussed (A/C.3/44/SR.60 and 61)."

8. It was so decided.

Draft resolution concerning the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in El Salvador (A/C.3/44/L.86/Rev.1)

9. Mr. MALAGA (Peru) said that Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.86/Rev.1. He drew attention to paragraphs 16 and 17, which had been added to the original text, and said that the word "appropriate" in paragraph 16 should be replaced by the word "immediate". The new paragraphs were designed to improve the text and to facilitate agreement and the sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

10. Mrs. GONZALEZ (Mexico), in answer to a question put by the representative of the United States, explained that the reference to persons "outside" combat situations applied to the attacks that took place on the life, integrity and dignity of persons in their daily lives, which were referred to in the Special Representative's report (A/44/677).
11. Mr. MALAGA (Peru) drew attention to an error in the first line of paragraph 16 where the word "Rapporteur" should be replaced by the word "Representative".
12. At the request of the representative of El Salvador, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.86/Rev.1, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: El Salvador.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Honduras, Israel, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire.

13. The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted by 96 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.

14. Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution although it would have preferred paragraphs 2 and 11 to have been drafted slightly differently. The President of El Salvador had repeatedly stated his determination to investigate recent atrocities and to bring those responsible to justice. It was the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN),

/...

(Mr. Raven, United Kingdom)

aided and abetted from outside El Salvador, that was primarily responsible for the upsurge of violence against the democratically elected Government. His delegation considered that FMLN bore a heavy responsibility for civilian casualties, because it chose to launch its attacks in heavily populated urban areas.

15. Mr. DAZA (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the draft resolution lacked balance. It failed to make clear that the Government of El Salvador was currently suffering real aggression, or to indicate whence the violence originated and who was responsible for it.

16. Mr. KOTEX (Ghana) said that, while his delegation was deeply concerned about the situation in El Salvador, it had abstained in the vote because it considered that questions of human rights violations should be separate from political situations. Confusing the issues invariably made it more difficult to find a solution. He trusted that the Committee would be careful in future not to become involved in action that would discredit the efforts of the United Nations to improve the human rights situation in various countries.

17. Mr. PALMA (Honduras) said that his delegation had abstained because the draft resolution merely reflected the wish of many countries, including other Latin American countries, to condemn the consequences of an internal conflict such as the one in El Salvador. Honduras, which was traditionally a peaceful country, condemned and deplored the human rights violations in El Salvador. But because of its close links with the people of El Salvador, it well understood that the violations taking place there were the result of an internal armed struggle. His delegation would have liked to see a stronger condemnation in the draft resolution of those who helped, directly or indirectly, to perpetuate or aggravate the situation. Honduras believed that the solution lay in the procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America (Esquipulas II agreement).

18. Mrs. SYAHRUDDIN (Indonesia) pointed out that her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.86/Rev.1. It had not voted in favour.

19. Mrs. VARGAS (Nicaragua) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It regretted that despite the efforts of the sponsors and the countries concerned to obtain a satisfactory, negotiated, draft resolution, the delegation of El Salvador had asked for a recorded vote. It was clear that the Government of El Salvador was also trying to disrupt the Central American peace agreements.

20. The draft resolution did not fully or accurately reflect the very serious crisis now facing the people of El Salvador, because it failed to condemn the air attacks against the civilian population by the country's armed forces, which also interfered with the humanitarian work of the International Red Cross. It should also have mentioned the assassination of the priests, condemned by the entire international community, which had been perpetrated by the armed forces of the country. The hope expressed in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution that the

/...

(Mrs. Vargas, Nicaragua)

Government of El Salvador would carry out an immediate investigation left open the possibility that the case would be forgotten and that those responsible for the crime would go unpunished - as had happened in the case of the assassination of Monsignor Romero, referred to in the eleventh preambular paragraph. Instead of helping the Commission on Human Rights in its difficult task of dealing with the human rights situation throughout the world, the Government of El Salvador was repressing its people and violating their human rights.

Draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Chile (A/C.3/44/L.87)

21. Mrs. GONZALEZ (Mexico) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.87, on behalf of the sponsors, who included Cuba and Luxembourg, and drew attention to the following amendments. In the second line of paragraph 8, the words "of all the Chilean people, including the indigenous peoples, especially" should be inserted after the word "freedoms". In the third line of paragraph 11, the comma and the word "including" after "ill-treatment" should be deleted; and in the third and fourth lines the words "and that of the indigenous peoples" should be deleted.

22. Mr. DAZA (Chile) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution. It should be recognized that important developments had taken place in his country during the past year. There had recently been a plebiscite with a broad basis of agreement on constitutional changes. He could not accept the wording of paragraph 8, which constituted an interference in the internal affairs of Chile, and did not accord with the report of the Special Rapporteur which referred to allegations of human rights violations. With regard to the five deaths that had been mentioned, all those cases were before the courts. As far as the indigenous people were concerned, a plebiscite had been held just over a year earlier in Chile, in which the Government had lost in 12 out of the 13 regions. But the region in which the Government had won, was the region where the indigenous people lived. That was an expression of the will of the indigenous people and the General Assembly should take note of it.

23. Mr. SALAZAR-SANCISI (Ecuador), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that there was no call for pulpit-pounding. All States had their faults, and criticism of certain aspects of a society did not mean that its many qualities were not recognized. Ecuador would vote in favour of the resolution and all similar resolutions.

24. At the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.87, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea,

/...

Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Chile, Qatar.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Prunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lesotho, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire.

25. Draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.87, as orally revised, was adopted by 80 votes to 2, with 50 abstentions.

26. Mr. ALFARO (El Salvador), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting because it considered the draft resolution to be biased. Chile had done its duty with regard to human rights, and would soon be holding elections. The resolution did not square with reality.

27. Mrs. TAVARES de ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, as in previous years, her delegation had not participated in the vote on the draft resolutions concerning the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile and El Salvador. The Dominican Republic opposed the selective character of those resolutions, which targeted certain States, ignoring human rights abuses in other parts of the world. It was imperative that the issue of human rights be treated universally.

28. Mr. ITO (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, with presidential elections scheduled for December 1989 and congressional elections for March 1990, Chile was entering a very important and delicate period. His delegation had abstained in the hope that, by doing so, it would encourage the Government of Chile to intensify its efforts to further the cause of human rights and democracy. Nevertheless, human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile should continue to be a subject of interest and concern, and it was regrettable that the Government of that country had decided to discontinue co-operation with the Special Rapporteur. He hoped that it would reconsider its decision and that the human rights situation in Chile would continue to improve.

29. Mr. WALDROP (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, because of concerns for balance and emphasis, his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.87. While there were still serious human rights problems in Chile, progress had been made. He appreciated the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution to take note of that progress. Unfortunately, the wording of the text unduly emphasized Chile's failures at the expense of its successes.

30. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation wished to go on record as not having participated in the vote.

31. Mrs. CASTANO (Colombia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. Colombia believed that democracy was the basis for the respect of human rights, and it commended the democratic process set in motion in Chile by the elections that would be held in two weeks.

32. Mr. PALMA (Honduras), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation shared the views of the other abstaining delegations. It was clear that changes within the Committee had not kept pace with those in the world around it.

33. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that he had unfortunately been unable to participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.87. Uganda wished to go on record as supporting the resolution and would vote in favour of it in plenary.

AGENDA ITEM 111: INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TRAFFIC IN DRUGS (continued)

Draft resolution on the global programme of action against illicit narcotic drugs
(A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2, L.91 and L.93)

34. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 contained in document A/C.3/44/L.91.

35. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda), introducing document A/C.3/44/L.93, which contained proposed amendments, said that the amendments were designed to place the procedures for implementation of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 in their proper perspective. He briefly discussed the reasons for each of the amendments.

36. Mr. SUNDBERG (Sweden) said that after lengthy consultations agreement had been reached on a number of amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2. In the second line of paragraph 3, the phrase "at the inter-agency level" had been inserted after the word "co-ordinate". Paragraph 3 (b) (iv) had been reworded to read "A realistic cost estimate for implementing the action plan, being mindful that resources are limited and that it would be necessary for agencies to focus priorities, review deployment of resources and obtain, if necessary, from their governing bodies the authority needed to fulfil their part of the plan;".

(Mr. Sundberg, Sweden)

37. The last line of paragraph 3 (c) had been reworded to read "discussion by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and by the Economic and Social Council at its next regular session of 1990". In paragraph 3 (d), the phrase "So as to enable the Secretary-General to include the information in his report to the General Assembly" had been replaced by the phrase "So as to enable the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Economic and Social Council to consider it, within their respective mandates, and to make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly". In the second line of paragraph 4, the words "Member States" had been replaced by the words "developed and developing countries".

38. A new subparagraph 5 (k) had been inserted: "The feasibility of a United Nations capability that, at the request of States, would provide training and equipment for their own anti-drug operations to inhibit the use, interdict the supply and eliminate the illicit trafficking of drugs". The former subparagraph 5 (k) had become subparagraph 5 (l). Lastly, paragraph 7 had been amended to read: "Requests the Secretary-General to give priority to narcotics control activities in his proposals for the next medium-term plan".

39. The sponsors of the draft resolution, who had been joined by Bolivia, Colombia, Ireland, Luxembourg, Japan, Papua New Guinea, Peru and Portugal, hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

40. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that the countries that had proposed the amendments contained in document A/C.3/44/L.93 were willing to accept draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 as amended. He stressed, however, that it was the task of the intergovernmental bodies to decide on the ordering of priorities.

41. Mr. WALKER (Jamaica) expressed satisfaction at the very skilful manner in which the delegation of Sweden had combined a number of draft texts. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.32/Rev.1 found draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 as amended acceptable and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

42. Ms. REBONG (Philippines) said that her delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2, as amended.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Nigeria, Senegal and Yugoslavia had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 as amended by Sweden.

44. It was so decided.

45. Mr. WHITAKER SALLES (Brazil), speaking in explanation of position, reiterated his delegation's view that nothing should be done that might prejudge the outcome of the work by the preparatory committee for the special session of the General

/...

(Mr. Whitaker Salles, Brazil)

Assembly. Although draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 did not entirely meet that concern, his delegation, in a spirit of compromise, had not objected to its adoption without a vote.

46. Mr. OLEINIK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.35 supported all efforts to elaborate a draft programme for a United Nations decade against drug abuse. Since draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.36/Rev.2 combined a number of proposals in that regard and met the concerns of the sponsors, they wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.35.

Draft resolution on the international campaign against drug abuse and illicit trafficking (A/C.3/44/L.41/Rev.2)

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.41/Rev.2, whose programme budget implications were contained in document A/C.3/44/L.90.

48. Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia), said that Cyprus, Gabon, Haiti, Italy, Pakistan, Senegal, Singapore, Sweden, Togo and the United States of America had joined the sponsors. The text of the draft resolution contained a number of errors. The title should read "International campaign against drug abuse and illicit trafficking". In paragraph 19 the phrase "the 22 per cent" should be replaced by the word "considerable". Paragraph 20 should end with the words "Narcotics Control Board", the rest of the sentence being deleted. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that it would be adopted without a vote.

49. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) said that he fully supported the statement made by the representative of Bolivia.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/44/L.41/Rev.2, as orally amended, without a vote.

51. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.