

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



UN LIBRARY

DEC 20 1977

UN/SA COLLECTION

SIXTH COMMITTEE

68th meeting

held on

Friday, 9 December 1977

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 68th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 113: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW ON THE WORK OF ITS TENTH SESSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION ON THE WORK OF ITS TWENTY-NINTH SESSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 118: MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES, INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM (continued)

* 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.6/32/SR.68

13 December 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 113: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW ON THE WORK OF ITS TENTH SESSION (continued) (A/C.6/32/L.14)

1. The CHAIRMAN said he had been informed by the sponsors that they would not press for a vote on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.14, and that he had been requested to read out the following statement: "On the understanding that it is up to the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Carriage of Goods by Sea to decide on the invitation and status of NGO-participants, and in the hope that the Conference will give favourable consideration to the matter, the General Assembly takes note of paragraph 58 of the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its tenth session and requests the Secretary-General to invite the organizations referred to in that paragraph."
2. Mr. HUANG Chia-hua (China) said his delegation wished to reaffirm for the record that, when the Secretary-General invited the interested governmental and non-governmental organizations to participate as observers in the United Nations Conference on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, it was necessary to implement strictly General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.
3. Mr. ZEHENTNER (Federal Republic of Germany) recalled the invitation of his Government to the United Nations Conference on the Carriage of Goods by Sea to meet in Hamburg and said that his delegation was very pleased that that invitation had been accepted. He hoped that the Conference would draw the widest possible participation, in view of the importance of the subject to international trade, friendship and understanding. The necessary arrangements for the Conference had been made between the Secretariat and his country's authorities, and all preparations had been made to welcome participating delegations to Hamburg. His delegation hoped that the Conference would yield results satisfactory to all concerned.
4. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it there was no objection to the statement concerning the United Nations Conference on the Carriage of Goods by Sea which he had read out.
5. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 112: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION ON THE WORK OF ITS TWENTY-NINTH SESSION (continued) (A/C.6/32/L.19)

6. Mr. RYBAKOV (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria had been omitted by error from the list of original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19. Bolivia, Liberia, and the Sudan had expressed the wish to be added to the list of sponsors.
7. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho) indicated that Morocco, too, should be added to the list of original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19. Introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, he said that the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twenty-ninth session had been the most important

item on the agenda of the Committee, as was borne out by the fact that 25 meetings, rather than the scheduled 18, had been devoted to that item. Nearly all the members of the Committee had spoken on it and the high quality of the debate attested to the value of the work of the Commission. Draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19 reflected the views expressed during the debate and was the result of a consensus. It was designed to enable the Commission effectively to discharge its tasks, particularly with regard to the questions of State responsibility, succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties, and treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between international organizations. In formulating the recommendations of the Committee, care had been taken that the workload of the Commission should not be excessive. Finally, the draft resolution reflected the Committee's endorsement of the Commission's conclusions and recommendations.

8. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH (Jordan), Rapporteur, said he assumed that, in accordance with its past practice, the Committee wished the report on the item under discussion to contain not only the texts of proposals and amendments submitted and decisions taken, but also an analytical study of the views expressed by representatives during the debate, and that it therefore wished to take a decision to that effect, in view of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII) on publications and documentation of the United Nations. Based on the experience of previous years, it might be estimated that an analytical summary of the main tendencies of the debate in the Committee would require some 90 pages, and would thus cost approximately \$24,750, according to information furnished by the Secretariat.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19 was adopted by consensus.

10. It was so decided.

11. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had expressed no objection to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19, but wished to clarify that with regard to operative paragraph 9 of that resolution, providing for the strengthening of the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs, it was the understanding of his delegation that the proposed action would draw upon ordinary allocations so as not to require an increase in the budget of the Organization. On that understanding, his delegation supported the draft resolution.

12. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation for the clarity of the presentation of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19 made by the representative of Lesotho and for the valuable guidance which the Chairman had provided in reaching a consensus regarding that draft resolution.

13. His delegation was gratified that the recommendations regarding the future work of the Commission on the important problem of State responsibility were not inconsistent with his delegation's view of the singularly interrelated character of parts I, II and III of that text. It was his understanding that operative paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19 was entirely consistent with the view that it was not possible for Governments to comment, other than in a preliminary way, on a part of that text without seeing the whole of the text.

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

14. His delegation had been among those which wished to call to the attention of the Commission the possibility of requesting preliminary written comments from Governments at interim stages in its work. He trusted that, although that suggestion was not expressly contained in the draft resolution, it would be brought to the attention of the Commission. It was always useful to give Governments an additional opportunity to describe their views in detail and with the precision that was possible only in written form. His delegation had been struck in recent years by the somewhat inefficient method adopted by the Committee in handling the report of the Commission. There was an increasing tendency to read extremely detailed statements which, although interesting and worth-while, were too detailed to enable other delegations to respond and thus give rise to the lively exchange of ideas which the presence of Committee members in New York should make possible. It would be preferable for such detailed statements to take the form of written comments, which would in turn permit statements to focus on particular features. That approach would be in the long-term interests of the Commission and make more efficient use of the presence of representatives at the General Assembly. With those considerations in mind, and recognizing that the matter would be called to the attention of the Commission, his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19.

15. Mr. LANG (Austria) said that his delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19. However, he wished to indicate that, in accordance with the view expressed by his delegation in the general debate regarding the advisability of beginning work on certain items on the programme of the Commission, it was his understanding that the long-term programme outlined in operative paragraph 7 of that draft resolution did not limit the freedom of the Commission either to suggest new topics for study or to give a lower priority to certain topics mentioned in that paragraph, depending on the circumstances prevailing at the moment of decision.

16. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel) said that his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19, but would have preferred that operative paragraph 4 give the Commission greater freedom in the matter of priorities.

17. With regard to the statement of the Rapporteur, he felt that, at a time of great financial stringency, the question of the necessity of an analytical report at so high a cost should be given further consideration during the year ahead. The views of the Commission in that regard should be considered.

18. He also wished to draw attention to the considerable inconvenience which, in the view of his delegation, was caused by the new system of presenting the summary records of the Committee's discussions and to express the hope that, in preparing the analytical report, those responsible would ensure that they had before them the corrections to the summary records.

19. Mr. PEDAUYE (Spain) expressed the appreciation of his delegation for the role the Chairman had played in helping to reach a consensus regarding draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.19. His delegation, which was a sponsor of that draft wished to emphasize the particular importance of operative paragraph 9

regarding the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs, which was carrying out a very important task. He also stressed the importance of ensuring that new personnel of the Codification Division were as highly qualified as its current personnel.

20. His delegation agreed that it was advisable for Governments to send written comments to the International Law Commission. However, given the high quality of the statements made in the Committee regarding the work of the Commission, it might also be advisable in the future that verbatim records, rather than summary records, of those statements be prepared, in order to facilitate the work of the Codification Division and in order to enable Governments which did not make written comments to place their views on record. The latter idea was intended, not as a formal proposal, but as a suggestion for future consideration.

AGENDA ITEM 118: MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES; INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM (continued) (A/C.6/32/L.13, L.17)

21. The CHAIRMAN announced that Afghanistan and Somalia wished to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13).

22. Mr. KPOTSRA (Togo), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism, as well as the statements made on that subject in the Sixth Committee, indicated that the difficulties encountered by the Ad Hoc Committee were in part the result of the vague and complex character of its mandate.

23. Paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), establishing the Ad Hoc Committee, had entrusted it with the task of considering the observations submitted by Governments and presenting, in its report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, its recommendations for possible co-operation for the speedy elimination of the problem, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 3 of that resolution, which reaffirmed "the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and racist r gimes and other forms of alien domination" and "the legitimacy of their struggle, and particularly the struggle of national liberation movements, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the organs of the United Nations".

24. Although international terrorism was unanimously condemned and although it had been suitably defined in debate on the question, views still differed as to how best to arrive at measures to prevent effectively the recurrence of such acts of violence. Some delegations wished first to study one aspect of the question, while others only considered the other aspect as worthy of attention. In order to escape from that impasse, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13,

(Mr. Kpotsra, Togo)

more than ever convinced of the importance of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee for all mankind, had proposed that the General Assembly should renew its confidence in the Ad Hoc Committee, inviting it to continue its work in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), first by studying the underlying causes of international terrorism and then by recommending practical measures to combat it.

25. Based almost exclusively on General Assembly resolution 31/102, the draft resolution was nevertheless a considerable improvement on it, as it gave the Ad Hoc Committee more precise objectives and granted it one year's respite by requiring it to report only to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

26. The preliminary study of the underlying causes of international terrorism, which all acknowledged that they were aware of, and which should therefore be all the easier to study, was likely to enable the Ad Hoc Committee more easily to arrive at recommendations aimed at combating international terrorism.

27. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, while aware that the question at issue was not one which could a priori lead to unanimity, felt nevertheless that the approach proposed increased the chances of success of the Ad Hoc Committee. Therefore, motivated by a desire to reach a consensus likely to improve the climate of work of the Committee, they had made every effort to seek a compromise. They were obliged to note, however, that the reactions to their numerous conciliatory overtures were far from reflecting the spirit of co-operation and fair play about which they had been tutored in former times. The impression prevailed that those who had originally advocated consideration of the question of international terrorism were now loath to see the Ad Hoc Committee resume its work quite simply because things were not developing as they would have liked. However, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 would like to continue to believe in the political will of Member States to take all possible steps to combat international terrorism and therefore hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that he believed it was intended to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13.

29. Mr. KPOTSRA (Togo) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution would prefer it to be adopted by consensus.

30. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that he wished to explain in advance the vote which would be cast by his own delegation. His delegation had informed the Chairman that it wished the resolution to be put to the vote, and had not subsequently changed its mind. However, there seemed to be some unnecessary confusion. While appreciating the difference of views on the topic, he did not believe that anybody lacked the spirit of compromise. He did not know who had maliciously conveyed the impression that his delegation was not prepared to show such a spirit. He had no difficulty in agreeing with much of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, although he doubted whether the third preambular paragraph was

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

relevant, and had substantive difficulties with operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 7, identical to those experienced by his delegation with regard to General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII) which it had reluctantly been obliged to oppose. Such difficulties had increased as a result of the inclusion of the word "first" in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, all delegations, including those favouring the inclusion of the word "first", were willing to seek a middle ground, and his delegation had been prepared to proceed with a resolution of a procedural nature in order to obtain a consensus, despite its difficulties with the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee. The representative of Togo would not have inferred a lack of co-operation if he had realized the actual extent of the co-operation prevailing in the Committee. He accepted that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 considered it important to reiterate the language to which his delegation objected. However, the current session of the Sixth Committee had been characterized by a considerable spirit of co-operation, and despite their differing views all delegations agreed on the deep concern felt over acts of terrorism and the need for States to investigate their causes and seek measures to combat terrorism at the international level.

31. The CHAIRMAN observed that a spirit of co-operation and compromise had prevailed throughout the current session of the Sixth Committee, although its members entertained different views on some matters.

32. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that the debate on international terrorism had revealed many points of agreement. All Governments were concerned that measures should be adopted against terrorism, as a crime which threatened mankind and took innocent lives. It was agreed that international co-operation was required to deal with it. The Ad Hoc Committee had done excellent work, but it lacked precise terms of reference, and its terms of reference would not become clearer as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 in its entirety. His delegation reserved its position with regard to paragraph 1, which merely expressed concern over acts of international terrorism, and contained no absolute condemnation of them as an international crime. There was no unanimity concerning the resolution, nor had the United Nations achieved a precise definition of international terrorism, although it was possible to obtain a consensus on procedure and on the major issues involved. The ideal would be for the Sixth Committee, as the legal committee of the United Nations, to adopt all its resolutions unanimously; however, in the current case it was necessary to put the resolution to the vote, since not all delegations wished to be committed by its terms.

33. At the request of the representative of Tanzania, a vote was taken by roll-call.

34. The Central African Empire, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay.

35. Draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 was adopted by 89 votes to 9, with 24 abstentions.

36. Mr. CORDOVA (Ecuador), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation condemned international terrorism and therefore supported any resolution which proposed measures aimed at finding a solution to the problem. If the resolution had been voted on paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have abstained on paragraph 7, as it considered that the Ad Hoc Committee had a fundamental obligation to submit recommendations on measures to combat terrorism, without prejudice to a study of its underlying causes.

37. Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) said that the General Assembly had earlier condemned international terrorism as a crime against humanity which must be prevented and punished. However, in the Ad Hoc Committee there had been more rhetoric than evidence of a sincere desire to take action against terrorism, and no resolution had been adopted which was adequate to secure the suppression and punishment of the crime. His delegation had abstained from voting, since it considered that the draft resolution just adopted postponed practical consideration of the problem, and was in fact a delaying tactic to prevent the United Nations from dealing vigorously with it. He could not accept the use of violence or terrorism by any organization, State or group on the pretext that the aims involved were freedom, self-determination or national sovereignty. In his view, operative paragraph 7 of the resolution was contrary to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee, in that it gave priority to studying the underlying causes of terrorism, and relegated to second place the practical measures to be taken against it.

/...

(Mr. Montenegro, Nicaragua)

Such a draft resolution could delay for many years the adoption by the United Nations of a satisfactory definition of terrorism and of measures against it. No progress had been made in that direction since the item was first considered by the General Assembly in 1972, and it might suffer the same fate as the Definition of Aggression, whose formulation and adoption had taken three decades. The debate had shown that mistaken premises were involved, acts of terrorism being referred to as the struggle of liberation movements. In his delegation's view, terrorist acts could not be divided into those which were "justified" and those which were not; all acts of terrorism should be condemned, regardless of the motives of their perpetrators.

38. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 for the same reasons that it had voted against General Assembly resolution 31/102. As it had stated at that time, his delegation believed that there was nothing to be gained by reconvening the Ad Hoc Committee until a more favourable climate existed for consideration of the question. That view still applied. It would have been better simply to include the item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. His delegation had made it known to the sponsors of the draft resolution that it had been prepared to support a procedural resolution of that type. Unfortunately, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on an appropriate text.

39. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) said that his delegation, while it had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, regretted that it did not contain an explicit condemnation of terrorism as an illegal and unacceptable act, regardless of the perpetrators. Furthermore, without complete international co-operation to eliminate such acts, no effective measures could be taken to implement the principles of the Charter and of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13.

40. He was confident, however, that, in the course of its future work, the Ad Hoc Committee would condemn terrorism, and would establish the appropriate legal machinery to deal with it, without prejudice to the study to be carried out, and according special attention to the possible causes, so that they could be eliminated or taken into consideration by the competent judicial authorities when determining the responsibility of the perpetrators of such acts.

41. There could be no confusion between terrorism and the legitimate means used by peoples subjected to colonialist and racist régimes or other forms of alien domination to attain self-determination and independence, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of United Nations bodies.

42. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 for the same reasons that it had opposed General Assembly resolutions 3034 (XXVII) and 31/102. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee was a distortion of the measures needed to combat international terrorism. He associated himself with the statements made by the representative of Australia in the plenary, on 8 December 1977, and by France in the Sixth Committee regarding the outrageous terrorist hijacking of an aircraft in Malaysia. That had been the second such incident to have taken place during the current session. It might have been

/...

(Mr. Rosenne, Israel)

preferable if the Sixth Committee had devoted greater attention to working out practical measures to eradicate the scourge of international terrorism, which was harmful to the cause of international détente.

43. Mr. ONDA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 because, like General Assembly resolution 31/102, it did not contain the elements essential for the suppression of international terrorism. During the negotiations on the draft resolution, his delegation, like others, had demonstrated a spirit of co-operation and compromise, in order to achieve a consensus. Given that same spirit of co-operation, the Committee would be able to achieve wider agreement on the question in the future.

44. Mrs. de PASTORI (Uruguay) said that she had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 because it suffered from the same defects as General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII). As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism, and in other international forums, her delegation had worked for a specific and definitive condemnation of international terrorism, regardless of its cause, its purposes, or the means employed.

45. In the hope of achieving effective action in that regard, her delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 31/102, while expressing reservations at the lack of such a final condemnation. Those reservations had been motivated by the fact that, although four years had elapsed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), the United Nations had been unable to adopt any constructive solutions. The equivocal terms in which the draft resolution was couched, specifically paragraphs 3 and 4, would fill with doubts those who were hoping for effective solutions from the General Assembly. Those reservations would be unnecessary if paragraph 1, instead of simply expressing deep concern, had strongly condemned acts of terrorism which took a toll of innocent lives, as had been the case in the draft resolution submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee by her delegation in 1973.

46. Paragraph 7 was completely unacceptable since, although it was of vital importance to study the underlying causes of terrorism, such a study should not be used as a pretext for postponing action to protect innocent victims. Moreover, a study of the causes would not automatically result in the elimination of the problem. If a separate vote had been taken on that paragraph, her delegation would have voted against it.

47. Mr. MUSEUX (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 because it did not call for measures which would be feasible despite the differences which existed in the international community and which constituted a cause of violence. Inhuman and barbaric acts should be prohibited, regardless of the circumstances. The Ad Hoc Committee should concentrate first on preventing such odious acts.

48. Mr. LANG (Austria) said that his delegation had abstained with regret from voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13. His country had twice been the victim of acts of international terrorism. Those acts had shown that no Government or

(Mr. Lang, Austria)

country could consider itself immune. Austria had joined the campaign against terrorism and had a very positive record in that regard.

49. International terrorism could be fought only by concrete measures, and not by learned studies. Public opinion in most countries expected the United Nations to wage a vigorous struggle against the loss of innocent human lives. However, almost no constructive dialogue had taken place at the most recent meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism. On the contrary, the views expressed had been completely incompatible. It would have been preferable to discontinue the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a provisional basis, since the current mandate appeared too vague and controversial to provide clear guidelines. After an interval of two or three years, the General Assembly could assess the results of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and, in the light of that assessment could give the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism a new and more specific mandate.

50. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, although different interpretations existed as to what constituted terrorist activities, a clear distinction should be drawn between such activities and those of recognized national liberation movements, the reason for whose existence was supported in the United Nations Charter and in a number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

51. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, it would have voted in favour of that draft. In his view, the draft resolution did provide for the protection of innocent human lives. The fact that it called for a study of the underlying causes of terrorism should not be considered as detracting from its value.

52. Mr. TSIKOURIS (Greece) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 because it felt that the distinction drawn in paragraph 7 between a study of the underlying causes of terrorism and the taking of practical measures to combat it was not in keeping with the spirit of General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII) by which the Ad Hoc Committee had been established, and, in particular did not meet the requirements of paragraph 2 of that resolution.

53. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 for the same reasons that it had given in explaining its vote on General Assembly resolutions 3034 (XXVII) and 31/102. Furthermore, the provisions of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution constituted a modification of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee by giving priority to the study of the underlying causes of terrorism, rather than to practical measures to combat it. His Government would, of course, continue to support the efforts of the international community to eliminate causes of injustice throughout the world.

54. It was regrettable that the Sixth Committee had found it necessary to vote on the draft resolution, since a unanimous decision would have facilitated the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. It was also regrettable that the efforts of a number of

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

delegations to arrive at a more generally acceptable text had proved fruitless. His delegation would continue to make every effort to ensure the successful outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

55. Mr. NDONG (Equatorial Guinea) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, it would have voted in favour of that draft.

56. Miss ISSEMBE (Gabon) said that her delegation had been unable to participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13. If it had done so, it would have voted in favour of that draft.

57. Mr. LARSSON (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 for the same reasons that it had abstained in the voting on General Assembly resolutions 3034 (XXVII) and 31/102. The draft resolution still lacked a specific condemnation of all acts of international terrorism. Furthermore, experience had shown that the revised mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee would not promote fruitful deliberations. Although his delegation in no way minimized the importance of the underlying causes of terrorism, a study of those causes would be of a political, economic and social nature rather than a legal nature and its subject-matter was already being dealt with by other United Nations bodies. Nor should such a study be allowed to hinder progress in other fields, particularly in finding ways of combating, and if possible suppressing, acts of terrorism.

58. Mr. BOSCO (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 for the same reasons that it had given in explaining its vote on General Assembly resolution 31/102. While his delegation could have supported a purely procedural resolution, it could not accept the provisions of paragraph 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. Furthermore, while he recognized the importance of a study of the underlying causes of terrorism, he did not believe that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, as set out in paragraph 7, would facilitate the work of that Committee in its difficult task.

59. Mr. DUCHÊNE (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13 because, despite the growing scope of the problem of international terrorism, the text of the draft resolution still contained recommendations which were out of place in the Sixth Committee and diverted it from its principal task. Nevertheless, his Government would continue to assist, within or outside the United Nations, in formulating measures to prevent and punish acts of terrorism.

60. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) said that, if her delegation had been present during the voting on draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.13, it would have voted in favour of that draft.

61. Mr. TAIBI (Algeria) said that his delegation had participated in the consultations held to arrive at a text which could be adopted by consensus. He expressed appreciation for the efforts made by certain delegations during those consultations and deeply regretted that it had not been possible to achieve a consensus.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.