



CONTENTS

	Page	Page
Agenda item 50: Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded) Report of the First Committee	1493	Agenda item 22: Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination 1511
Agenda item 60: United Nations Industrial Development Organization: (a) Report of the Industrial Development Board; (b) Strengthening of operational activities in the field of industrial development in the least developed among the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General; (c) United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency: report of the Secretary-General; Report of the Second Committee (part I) (d) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director	1506	Agenda item 23: Election of members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries 1511
Agenda item 62: Operational activities for development: (a) United Nations Development Programme; (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund; (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General; (d) United Nations Volunteers programme; (e) United Nations Fund for Population Activities; (f) United Nations Children's Fund: report of the Secretary-General; (g) World Food Programme; (h) United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries Report of the Second Committee	1509	<p>President: Mr. Indalecio LIEVANO (Colombia).</p> <hr/> <p>AGENDA ITEM 50</p> <p>Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)</p> <p>REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/33/486)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PRESIDENT (<i>interpretation from Spanish</i>): I shall now continue calling on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/33/486. 2. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (<i>interpretation from Spanish</i>): My delegation, together with other countries, sponsored the draft resolution which was adopted by the First Committee on the situation in Nicaragua, because we felt that this was a responsibility that could not be side-stepped. 3. In our opinion, this session of the General Assembly could not conclude without stating the facts as they are presented in draft resolution IV in paragraph 13 of document A/33/486. The situation in Nicaragua is not only a flagrant violation of human rights, but also, because of the tensions which it creates in the region, a danger to the security of our continent, and particularly of Central America. 4. The representative of Nicaragua, in his statement at the previous meeting [<i>84th meeting</i>] and in other statements, only reaffirmed our convictions about the nature and timeliness of the draft resolution which we shall adopt today thanks to the support of the large number of delegations which are aware of the gravity of the problem for our region. 5. I wish to inform the representative of Nicaragua—I do not know whether he is present—that the question pertaining to the situation in his country and its consequences for our region could not have been neglected by the Security Council since it has never been studied by that organ. We have reserved our right to present it when we consider it to be relevant, independently of the regional organizations.
Agenda item 63: United Nations Environment Programme: (a) Report of the Governing Council; (b) Reports of the Secretary-General Report of the Second Committee		
Agenda item 64: Food problems: report of the World Food Council Report of the Second Committee		
Agenda item 66: United Nations University: (a) Report of the Council of the United Nations University; (b) Report of the Secretary-General Report of the Second Committee		
Agenda item 18: Election of fifteen members of the Industrial Development Board	1510	
Agenda item 19: Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme	1510	
Agenda item 20: Election of twelve members of the World Food Council ..	1511	

6. I do not wish to speak at greater length, because 40 years of abuse by the Somoza dynasty in that country and in the region have made of Nicaragua a sadly notorious case, the main characteristics of which are suitably expressed in the draft resolution on which we are about to vote.

7. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): The human rights situation in Nicaragua is of deep concern to my Government. We deplore the loss of life, the violence and the bloodshed which have taken place there. May I add that we share the concerns of the sponsors of draft resolution IV over the threat to the peace and security of the region.

8. My Government is deeply committed to peace, security, democracy and freedom in Nicaragua, and to doing what we as a Government can do to assist in achieving these objectives. It is precisely for these reasons that we, together with the Dominican Republic and Guatemala, are engaged in a mediation effort supported by the Organization of American States [OAS]. We believe that this effort and the efforts within the OAS itself are the principal means of bringing about peace, democracy and the promotion of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms which the people of Nicaragua are seeking.

9. I should also like to point out that next Monday, the Permanent Council of the OAS will receive the report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the human rights situation in Nicaragua. On the same day the OAS also will receive the report of the *Ad Hoc* Commission of Observers, which investigated the most recent incident between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Therefore, in view of our role as mediator in the very delicate and important negotiations under way in Nicaragua, an effort which is making clear progress towards a national political consensus solution to Nicaragua's problems, we find it inappropriate to take a position on draft resolution IV. For this reason, my Government will abstain in the vote.

10. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): More than 40 years ago Nicaragua was, as the poet said, sold from hill to hill and from ocean to ocean. The imperialist North American Government and Anastasio Somoza consummated an historic betrayal in the homeland of Rubén Darío. Then as now mediation efforts sponsored by the northern neighbour were under way. The tyrant Somoza invited Augusto César Sandino, a General of free men and a tireless fighter for the rights of the Nicaraguan people, to join him in what he said would be an embrace of reconciliation and national unity. This was a miserable scheme to assassinate Sandino and thus liquidate the heroic struggle being waged in Segovia against imperialism and those who had sold their country and later transformed Nicaragua into a private feudal state subordinated to Somoza interests and Yankee monopolies.

11. The history of our America has many examples of such deceit. What imperialism could not obtain by bribery and crime it obtained by sending its marines to invade the soil of America. Cuba, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Guatemala, Panama, Nicaragua and Mexico, among others, have been the victims of Yankee interventions and depredations in this century and in the past.

12. For several months—not to speak of its decade-long struggle—the people of Nicaragua has been waging a heroic rebellion headed by the Sandinista National Liberation Front, which has had the support of the vast majority of the people in the country. It is only the military superiority of the so-called National Guard, supplied by the Pentagon for four decades and more recently by the Government of Israel, that has prevented the overthrow of the infamous despot, who with typical ferocity has proclaimed that he is ready to eliminate half the Nicaraguan people, if necessary, in order to remain in power. It is fitting to say this so that this General Assembly may be aware of what is happening in Nicaragua.

13. The world press has quoted the representatives of the Nicaraguan people and of the Red Cross denouncing the crimes, repressions and sedition committed by the National Guard. Almost 10,000 men, women and children, young and old people have been killed, wounded or injured since the beginning of the popular insurrection in September 1978. And that number is growing.

14. A communiqué of 13 December from San José, Costa Rica, reported the discovery of eight graves and two corpses of students who had allegedly been imprisoned by the National Guard in September last in the city of Chinandega. The previous day, a youth of 20 years, Manuel Ortega, was killed by a patrol of the National Guard in the city of Diriamba, after he was captured. Twelve students, professors and employees of the autonomous National University of Nicaragua, declared a hunger strike that same day, 13 December, to protest against a reduction of the University's budget decreed by the régime as a reprisal because of the active opposition of that house of learning to the Somoza tyranny.

15. The Mexican newspaper *Excelsior* posthumously published the statements of Father Gaspar García Laviana, who died in combat against the troops of tyranny on 9 December. The prelate affirmed:

“As an adopted Nicaraguan, I have seen with my own eyes the wounds of my people. I have seen the iniquitous exploitation of the farmer, crushed by the boots of the land-holders who are protected by the National Guard, which is an instrument of repression for the régime. I have seen how a few have become obscenely wealthy under the protection of the Somoza tyranny. I have seen the humiliating carnal trade to which young girls are subjected when they are handed over by the powerful to become prostitutes. With my hands I have touched villainy, mockery, betrayal, repression, as represented by the domination of the Somoza family in power.”

Father García Laviana belonged to the Order of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart. He had lived in Nicaragua for nine years. A year ago he joined the ranks of the Sandinista National Liberation Front. He went on:

“I went into my work as an apostle and soon I began to discover that in their hunger and thirst for justice the oppressed and humiliated people whom I have served as a priest wanted more than the comfort of words; they wanted the comfort of action.”

16. During the repression which has been unleashed, Costa Rica on more than one occasion has been the subject of armed aggression by the Nicaraguan Government. The violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that country have left dead and wounded in their wake. Further, the National Guard of Nicaragua has kidnapped peaceful citizens on the territory of Costa Rica.

17. These are irrefutable facts. These are deeds which have placed in danger the peace and security of the region. For these reasons, Cuba decided to become a sponsor of the draft resolution which was adopted by a majority in the First Committee and which is now being placed before this plenary meeting of the Assembly.

18. It has been said that nothing is happening in Nicaragua except that a group of subversives are trying to disturb peace and order. According to the representative of the Somoza family, the National Guard has hastened to come to the defence of the Constitution and restore order, a bizarre way of explaining the cowardly assassination of thousands of defenceless citizens and the violations of the boundaries of a sovereign and independent country.

19. The angelic Somoza Government almost appears to be offended, the victim of a terrible conspiracy of terrorists and subversives who iniquitously are trying to remove Nicaragua from its lord and master. The blood of the Sandinistas and the sweat of the people bear witness against this. "Amnesty, mediation," they proclaim, but those words constantly remind us of the crimes committed in the 45 years of Somoza terrorism. Some want to make that régime appear saintly before the OAS, but we know that the OAS is no more than a puppet organization which allowed the Central Intelligence Agency to remove Jacobo Arbenz from Guatemala in 1954 and sanctioned the mercenary aggression against my country in 1961 and the invasion of Santo Domingo in 1965. The OAS has thus become an imperialist instrument which has never served a just cause in our America and has not even taken a decisive stand against Somoza because of his aggression against Costa Rica.

20. But there is more, because it was this same so-called "regional organization" which approved the economic boycott decreed by the United States against Cuba, simply because the latter had carried out a socialist revolution which freed it for ever from the domination which had been established by the United States at the end of the last century.

21. Have we forgotten that the Playa Girón mercenaries, who were armed, organized and trained by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, left from a Nicaraguan port, that Somoza had gladly made available to his Yankee partners and associates? I can assure you that the Latin American peoples remember this vividly. It is also fitting to recall it because we are facing an international criminal who is now repeating his crimes. Let us not be deluded by siren songs, by the mendacious affirmations of those who are responsible for the crimes, repressions and criminal deeds of the Somoza régime. The international community must act in solidarity with Costa Rica, a country with a recognized democratic and peaceful tradition. It must lend its support to the Nicaraguan patriots

who are fighting against a dynastic tyranny, imposed and sustained by a foreign Government. In brief, it must vote in favour of the draft resolution we are now considering.

22. Lastly, I must alert this General Assembly to the attempt that is being made, an attempt already denounced by the Nicaraguan patriots, to maintain the Somoza system without Somoza. Behind many professions of faith in humanity and pacification, there is the secret intention of preventing a popular victory in Nicaragua, of arriving at a covenant with the tyrant so that he may go to a convenient and temporary golden exile, while maintaining intact the tyranny which was established decades ago, in other words, rendering null and void what has already cost thousands of valuable, innocent young lives to the Sandinistas.

23. The people of Nicaragua, which is heroically battling for its freedom, will not allow yet another betrayal. Anyone who believes the contrary is unaware of the profound dignity of the peoples of the Americas. José Martí proclaimed it in verses which today resound in the cities and jungles of Nicaragua:

"Love for one's country is not a ridiculous love of the earth, nor of the grass which overgrows our path; it is an invincible hatred of the oppressor, an eternal rancour against anyone who attacks us."

24. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Panama had not intended to speak at this stage of our work in the Assembly, but the statement made by the representative of Nicaragua yesterday compels us to clarify certain questions.

25. The competence both of the First Committee and of the Assembly in plenary meetings was very well explained by the representative of Mexico in the statement he made in the First Committee,¹ and there is no need, therefore, for me to dwell on the arguments so brilliantly expounded by him.

26. The position of Costa Rica, with which Panama is in complete solidarity, deserves the utmost credibility from this Assembly. We are constant witnesses of what Costa Rica represents in the Latin American community. If any country can be proud of having a neighbour such as Costa Rica, it is Panama. Not only does the Costa Rican Government have a great tradition of democracy, but the Costa Rican people are hard-working, and daily we Panamanians learn spiritual lessons from them, lessons of dignity, good faith, and the spirit of being a Latin American.

27. Accordingly, given the situation in which Costa Rica now finds itself—which is the situation not of Costa Rica alone but of the entire Central American isthmus—Panama feels bound to reiterate and to reaffirm here before this Assembly of the world community its complete support for and solidarity with the nation of Costa Rica, a nation devoted to the preservation of peace, to the enhancement of international co-operation and to compliance with the

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, First Committee*, 63th meeting, and *ibid.*, *First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

legal, ethical and moral principles which should guide peoples in our times. I say that it is not only the situation of Costa Rica because Panama believes in, and most fervently adheres to, the principle of non-intervention precisely because it is a country which, as a result of its geographical location as a centre for interoceanic communications, has through the centuries been the victim of the intervention of great Powers. Panama respects the principle of non-intervention, but the Central American isthmus is devastated today by an interventionism which flows from one country that has been unable to resolve its own internal problems and drives thousands and thousands of refugees into its neighbouring countries, particularly Costa Rica, Honduras and Panama.

28. This situation, which is serious, affects the economies of those countries and the peaceful coexistence of the peoples of the Central American isthmus has been brought to the attention of this Assembly by three eminent, respected Latin American statesmen. The Presidents of Colombia, Venezuela and Costa Rica, with the moral authority given them by the very special circumstance that they are three Heads of State elected by the freely expressed will of their peoples, have addressed this Assembly² and have explained that it is confronted by a grave, serious and deep-rooted situation which affects not only the Central American isthmus but also the entire American continent, that is to say a situation which affects the peace and security of the region, as is reflected in draft resolution IV in document A/33/486. And, I repeat, that situation is within the competence of this Assembly, and we cannot but be convinced by those three Latin American statesmen, who deserve the respect, esteem and affection of the peoples of Latin America.

29. Having said that, I should like to refer very briefly to the situation of the Latin American continent, which is made up not only of Governments but also of their peoples. Those of us who believe in the unity and integration of Latin America consider that Latin America is a collective nation which has a collective image, a collective personality, the Latin American personality. And that Latin American collective personality now asks delegations present here to make a pronouncement which will serve to set a new course for Latin America as a part of the third world.

30. Without going into personalities, without pointing an accusing finger, there are certain ethical, human and legal values which are part of the essence of civilization and of our contemporary way of thinking and attitude and indicate that in no country may fundamental values be destroyed or the right to life be jeopardized, or the tenets of international humanitarian law violated, just as there must not be summary collective executions of persons who belong to a people just because they commit the crime of expressing dissidence or opposition to a Government. Nor is it possible to overlook certain international institutions such as the Red Cross, or to falsify the image of the Red Cross, to destroy its vehicles, or to make improper use of its emblem, or to assassinate those who provide help in its name.

² See document A/33/275, annex (Message from the Presidents of Colombia and Venezuela) and the 11th meeting, paras. 72-126 (statement of the President of Costa Rica).

31. There must be no attacks against farming populations; there must not be arbitrary detentions; and nor must boys between the ages of 14 and 21, who often are relatives of the members of the Government themselves, be assassinated simply because at that age they believe that there is a pure conscience which is against any corruption, anything criminal, anything that is undignified or unworthy of a nation. There must not be attacks on the physical freedom of persons; there must be responsible administration of justice not subordinated to a régime that is in power. Freedom of thought and expression is sacred. Freedom of conscience, religion and worship means that there must be respect for priests or ministers of any religion, whatever it might be. There must be respect for the right of assembly, the right to form trade unions, the right to political association, and the sacred exercise of the right to vote.

32. When all these values, which are the values of our time and which constitute what the Secretary-General calls a part of our contemporary spirit, are violated, then this world Organization, which represents those lofty values, the hope of the oppressed peoples, and the horizon of hope of all human beings who believe in a better world where peace and justice will prevail, cannot remain indifferent. As the representative of Mexico said, one cannot speak of these things on a regional level; they must be dealt with on a world level. These are permanent values which must be respected.

33. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] requires respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States. When that territorial integrity and sovereignty are violated, as was the case of Costa Rica, then that violation deserves condemnation, censure and rejection. There must be remedies to correct such situations so that they will not be repeated. The delinquent country must be told: "Halt. You cannot continue to violate that which is part of the ethical conscience of mankind". There is there a crime which cannot be tolerated, and that crime, which is being committed against Costa Rica, which is a country of peace, which has no army, and with which Panama is in total solidarity, cannot be permitted by the world community. That is what the Presidents of Colombia, Venezuela and Costa Rica have said to this Assembly.

34. That is why we trust that those delegations which, for reasons of prudence that we respect, abstained or were absent should cast their votes here today—and in particular the Latin American countries of which, we must say to our satisfaction, the overwhelming majority have expressed themselves in favour of this draft resolution.

35. I shall conclude by referring to the report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the situation in Nicaragua.³ The report, which is the result of a visit to Nicaragua, was approved by the Commission, in plenary session. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, at its meeting on 16 November, determined categorically beyond any shadow of a doubt, without vacillation or euphemisms, that the Government of Nicara-

³ Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, *Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Nicaragua* (Washington, D.C., Organization of American States, 1978).

and have shown signs of progress. If progress continues to be made in the positive direction pursued so far, a satisfactory solution could be achieved.

45. Therefore, the delegation of Guatemala was obliged to refrain from participation in the substance of this matter because it believes its present responsibility in the matter is to intensify its friendly co-operation with and conciliatory efforts regarding all the parties concerned, guided by the highest possible sense of equity and impartiality, within the framework of the Committee of the OAS which I have already mentioned and by means of other action to be carried out by other organs of the regional system to which the interested parties members of the OAS have had recourse.

46. Mr. RIVAS-POSADA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The decision the General Assembly must take on draft resolution IV, which appears in paragraph 13 of document A/33/486, regarding the situation in Nicaragua is proof of how the Organization views its duties. The First Committee has already decided overwhelmingly in favour of a text which clearly expresses the deep concern of the United Nations at the events which have occurred in Nicaragua. It is now for those same States in this plenary meeting to confirm that decision, which faithfully reflects the clamour of international public opinion.

47. This is no passing caprice of a few delegations interested in casting aspersions on a Government or in interfering in the domestic affairs of a State Member of the Organization. Violations of human rights and of the sovereignty of neighbouring countries by the authorities in Nicaragua are a permanent threat to peace and security in the region, and are the cause of justifiable concern by the international community. Those who have raised their voices in protest against events in Nicaragua come from all parts of the world and all regions. Mankind as a whole has condemned the disproportionate and indiscriminate violence against the defenceless civilian population, the difficulties placed in the way of assistance and rescue operations by humanitarian institutions, the torture of detainees, the disregard of the right to protection and shelter, the violation of freedom of expression, association and conscience, and the systematic transgression of the civil and political rights of the citizens. Three Heads of State, in communications addressed to this Assembly, have expressed their abhorrence of those excesses and their rejection of such practices, as have the spokesmen for a large number of States Members of the United Nations. Many eminent persons, including His Holiness Pope John Paul II have urged that an end be put to the suffering inflicted on innocent civilians, the victims of an oppressive and voracious régime.

48. The draft resolution, for which my delegation will vote, in no way ignores the importance of regional efforts to arrive at a peaceful settlement in Nicaragua. On the contrary, it contains an appeal that they be continued. It does not censure a Government in the abstract, but only some events which are a threat to international tranquillity. It does not represent interference in the internal affairs of a country, nor does it try to create barriers to the action of a Government facing difficult circumstances. It simply requests that the authorities in Nicaragua ensure respect for

fundamental human rights and that they cease action which endangers the security of the region and threatens the sovereignty of neighbouring countries. And it calls upon all States to adopt the necessary measures to discourage the old system of the recruitment of mercenaries practised in Nicaragua.

49. World public opinion has sat in judgement and in all conscience has condemned the sad events in Nicaragua. The General Assembly of the United Nations cannot fail to endorse that judgement of condemnation. That is our hope, and we therefore invite all delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

50. Miss DE LA MAZA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As we have already said in the First Committee, the Dominican Republic is a member of the Committee of countries of Latin America which are trying to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the conflict afflicting the neighbouring country of Nicaragua. My country is also a member of the *Ad Hoc* Commission of the OAS which is looking into the accusations of territorial violations made by the brother republic of Costa Rica.

51. For these reasons, the position of the delegation of the Dominican Republic in regard to draft resolution IV recommended by the First Committee in its report can only be to abstain, since our vote might otherwise be interpreted as our taking a stand in favour of or against any of the parties involved mentioned in this draft resolution. By virtue of this, the Dominican delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution IV in the report of the First Committee.

52. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is not without a certain sadness that I refer to the subject which is now being considered by the General Assembly. It is a problem occurring in Central America, a region to which my country is proud to belong.

53. The five Central American countries, which were born at the same time and together attained their independence at the beginning of the last century, have made tremendous efforts to maintain their unity, and some time ago even succeeded in establishing a very advanced kind of common market, which forged closer ties between them in the economic field and which was a sign that they could recreate their political unity, which in 1821 led to their being called "the United Provinces of Central America".

54. Unfortunately, events which have occurred in recent years have made more difficult the continuance of the efforts to achieve economic integration of Central America, and the present problem of Nicaragua is one more complication.

55. What has been fundamentally discussed in the First Committee is not in fact the quarrel between Costa Rica and the Nicaraguan régime about armed incursions into Costa Rican territory. With regard to that subject, which is pre-eminently international in character, the General Assembly could without doubt adopt energetic recommendations which El Salvador would have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting. But the draft resolution which is about to be voted upon here in the Assembly does not refer solely

gua "in a grave, persistent and generalized manner has committed the violations mentioned below". I shall not repeat them now because they were read in the First Committee.⁴ The representative of Nicaragua has tried to question the conclusions of that Commission. The Government of Nicaragua thus has made a statement which is totally contrary to these impartial, definitive, and absolutely irrefutable conclusions of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

36. So that representatives may have the information they need to make a judgement, I shall enumerate the members of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, which condemned the Government of Nicaragua, which is still awaiting a decision by the OAS. This world organization, which is above all regional organizations must take a decision in this respect. Who were the members of that Commission? Its President on that date was Mr. Andrés Aguilar, who is very well known to all of us here because of his brilliant conduct as Chairman of the Second Committee of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. I need hardly speak at length about Andrés Aguilar. Members know him as well as I do. The current President of that Commission which endorsed the condemnation was Mr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abranches of Brazil. And the conclusion of Dunshee de Abranches is a message to the Government and to the nation of Brazil. It is a message to the entire Latin American community. It is the message that peoples demand justice, that Governments cannot suddenly absent themselves, or abstain, or fail to face problems of this kind. This is the same message that was addressed to the Government of the United States by its representative in the Commission, Tom J. Farer, a professor at Rutgers University, a person with vast moral authority, who is not a government official, who is impartial. It is also the message of Carlos García Bauer, the great Guatemalan jurist, and of Fernando Volio Jiménez of Costa Rica. It is the message also of Marco Gerardo Monroy Cabra of Colombia, who is today Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice in that country. Not only is this their message, it is also the message of the entire Commission. What is more, we are very pleased that Argentina and Mexico, countries with a great legal tradition in Latin America, recorded their affirmative vote, as we trust that all Latin American countries will do in this case, and as we trust that all Governments of the third world will do.

37. Not only is this their message. Who were the members of the Executive Commission? They were Mr. Edmundo Vargas Carreño, a Chilean university professor and a member of the Inter-American Juridical Committee; Mr. Charles Moyer, well known in the United States, the assistant Executive Secretary; Mr. Roberto Alvarez, an eminent Dominican jurist; Mr. Jorge Suárez Marill, a United States citizen of Cuban origin. All of these constitute in reality a consensus of the continent.

38. That is the word that comes to us from the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. That is the message for the Governments of all the peoples of this continent: that in Latin America there is a conscience—also

reflected in governmental organizations—which demands justice, which loves peace, but which also demands respect for the principles of justice and ethics.

39. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked to be allowed to explain the abstention of Guatemala in the vote on draft resolution IV on the situation in Nicaragua in document A/33/486.

40. On behalf of the delegation of Guatemala I explained in the First Committee the reasons for our abstention in the vote on the draft resolution. I should like to take this opportunity to repeat to the General Assembly in summary form the position of Guatemala on this complex matter.

41. Guatemala's abstention in the vote is based exclusively on the fact that, together with the delegations of the Dominican Republic and the United States of America, we are members of the friendly *ad hoc* Committee of Conciliatory Efforts, which, pursuant to the action agreed upon by the Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, was set up within the OAS for the purpose of finding a peaceful, permanent and democratic solution to the grave situation which has recently prevailed in Nicaragua and which has affected other countries in Central America. The fundamental intent of this abstention is to preserve for my country the moral authority, freedom of action, and impartiality necessary to carry through to the end the delicate and complex mission entrusted to the Committee to which I have referred.

42. In the First Committee I said that the problem of Nicaragua has features which affect the security and peace of the central American area, and which undoubtedly fall within the competence and jurisdiction of the Security Council, the body which, met at the request of Venezuela but declined to consider this question. There is no doubt in my mind that the reason for this was that the regional inter-American system had already decided to accede to the request of certain interested States to convene those organs which, pursuant to the Charter of the OAS, have the task of taking action to solve problems affecting peace and security in the continent, since that Organization has jurisdiction and competence and is recognized as a regional organization with the prerogatives appertaining thereunto as set forth in Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

43. In our statement in the First Committee during the current session we mentioned the authority of both the Security Council and the General Assembly under Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations, especially the provisions of Articles 34 and 35, which in particular establish the right of all Members of the United Nations to bring any controversy or situation liable to lead to international friction to the Security Council or the General Assembly for their consideration. However, we believe that the efforts of the inter-American system have been aimed at finding a peaceful, permanent and democratic settlement of the complex situation, a settlement which would not violate any of the principles so dear and indispensable to all countries, including the principle, *inter alia*, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

44. The results of the work of the friendly *ad hoc* Committee of Conciliatory Efforts have been significant,

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, First Committee*, 66th meeting, pp. 82-87, and *ibid.*, *First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, co. 1, p. 20.

to the international problem between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, but rather embraces questions related to respect for and protection of human rights, a subject which, speaking in general terms, does not fall within the framework of the disarmament questions allocated to the First Committee.

56. Nor does this subject fall within the province of the General Assembly, because this draft resolution raises an issue which is a domestic matter; and not only here but in general, and above all in international law, the intervention of a State, or even of international organizations, in the internal affairs of another State is, generally speaking, prohibited.

57. I have heard here certain delegations—and one in particular at yesterday's meeting—say that certain things can be dealt with in the United Nations even though they are not dealt with specifically in treaties or international agreements or conventions. Speaking as a jurist, I believe that that is a genuine error. If human rights in part have come to be within the purview of international organizations it is because States have agreed to that. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in Paris in 1948, the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Men of the same year⁵ and the Covenants signed on human rights enjoy the support of the international community and limit the competence of international organizations to intervene in such cases.

58. It is not that internal jurisdiction has disappeared from the realm of human rights; not at all; that is a mistake. In the human rights field it is not the United Nations alone which has a right to participate, while the particular States have no right. That is another mistake. In the purely domestic realm of political policy, internal policy, States, in my view, retain their full sovereign exercise of those rights.

59. We consider, in all modesty, that a subject like that referred to in the draft resolution on the question of Nicaragua should not be resolved on the basis of the specific interests of certain countries or groups of countries or on the basis of what would appear to be superficial opinions on questions of human rights, brought up here by delegations in whose countries, flagrantly and arrogantly, there has been continued violation of those same rights; countries which now pose here as champions of the Universal Declaration approved in Paris on 10 December 1948. In saying this, I am not referring to all the Members of the Organization in general, but to specific countries, and I deliberately include Latin American countries.

60. For these reasons, and whether we like it or not, this is a subject which is under discussion by the OAS, an organization connected with the United Nations; it is a regional organization of the United Nations, and it is considering this very important matter. In the OAS a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers for Foreign Affairs began work some time ago and has not yet finished its work. If it is considering this subject, therefore the logical and natural thing is for this question not to be dealt with

here, because juridically speaking this would be an infringement of the prerogatives of international organizations.

61. I should like the representative of Costa Rica to understand that we support his country in its claim that it has been the victim of incursions by the armed forces of a foreign Power. If he had put forward a draft resolution condemning those acts, we would have voted in favour of it, as we did in a similar situation in Washington, in the Permanent Council of the OAS. We wish the representative of Costa Rica to understand that we admire his country's seriousness, democratic nature and freedom, as well as the fact that relatively speaking it has no army; and we hope that the worries, dangers, fears, apprehensions and anxieties caused by the fact that Nicaraguan elements have crossed its borders by force and returned to Nicaragua, having given rise to problems which the Government of Costa Rica should not have to face, will soon be allayed.

62. As a Central American I should like to see this problem resolved, but it will not be resolved on the basis of this draft resolution. It will be resolved in other places and by other means. In El Salvador we vehemently desire to see this problem settled and, if possible, to see the Government of Nicaragua, by decisive and energetic action, contributing to ending this deplorable situation.

63. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico has already had an opportunity of explaining its vote in the First Committee. We voted in favour, as we shall here, of what in the First Committee was draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 and is now draft resolution IV in document A/33/486.

64. We believe it would be redundant to repeat at this rostrum our reasons for voting in favour. Accordingly, I shall confine myself to pointing out that our reasons are reproduced in full in the verbatim record of the meeting of the First Committee held on 8 December.⁶

65. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution IV in document A/33/486. My delegation will be very frank in explaining its position on this draft resolution, but before doing so we should like to make it clear that our statement is not prompted by the fact that the draft resolution refers to one country or one Government in our region; we should have acted in the same way had a draft resolution been directed against any State Member represented here.

66. We do not speak of the internal affairs of any country, nor do we state our opinions, believing that this is not our concern. In this respect we are bound by the purposes and principles of the Charter, to which we are committed. Therefore, our desire to speak at this time is prompted simply by a position of principle. I emphasize this because my delegation considers it to be very important. We do not wish to have the position of our country interpreted incorrectly.

⁵ See The International Conferences of American States, Second Supplement, 1942-1954 (Washington, D.C., Organization of American States, 1958), pp. 263-270

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, First Committee, 68th meeting, and ibid., First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

67. First of all, as we see it, draft resolution IV does not come under agenda item 50, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". We do not believe that it comes under this item or stems from the debate in the First Committee.

68. Secondly, we believe that this draft resolution, instead of helping matters, might jeopardize any solution to the conflict among the countries concerned. The matter is before our regional Organization, the OAS. The OAS decided to send an *Ad Hoc* Commission to the places where the events were said to have occurred to investigate, and it is about to consider the report of that *Ad Hoc* Commission. Furthermore, negotiations are being carried out by a peace-making committee consisting of the United States of America, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. Thus, if we approved a draft resolution such as the one we are now considering, we might introduce elements alien to the legitimate desire for a satisfactory and just solution which will respect the rights of all.

69. Thirdly, I wish to state that my country followed attentively all the First Committee debates on disarmament and international security. In view of the manifestations of good intentions, particularly by the great Powers, it is our hope that solutions may be found which will bring peace and tranquillity to the peoples of the world and freedom from the threat of a world war, particularly a nuclear war. With regard to the draft resolution, therefore, my delegation would regret the adoption, as an epilogue to all the good intentions that have been expressed, of a draft resolution which is a threat to international peace and security and consequently is contradictory to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

70. Fourthly and lastly, we wish to say that throughout its history Uruguay, in its international conduct, has characteristically, consistently and zealously defended the rules of international law and therefore the purposes and principles of the Charter, which the 150 States Members represented here have accepted and therefore are bound to observe.

71. In accordance with all this, as I have said, therefore, Uruguay's attitude has always been characterized by the defence of international norms. In our history we have never advocated or supported draft resolutions with an obviously political intent such as the one now before us.

72. We consider, further, that the adoption of such resolutions places the authority of this Organization in jeopardy, and might even destroy it. We would here be violating the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and the sovereignty of States. Furthermore, we would be distorting the principle of self-determination of peoples.

73. Accordingly, my country does not wish to be involved in a resolution that places in jeopardy all those principles of the Charter, which all States have committed themselves to observe. With that understanding, I wish to announce that my delegation will not participate in the vote on this draft resolution.

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take decisions on the four draft

resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report [A/33/486]. Representatives will be given an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken on this item.

75. Draft resolution I is entitled "Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution I was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 33/73).

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Poland has asked to be given the opportunity to make a brief statement at this time.

77. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): By adopting the Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace the General Assembly has just performed an act of great significance. This Assembly does not often resort to the form of a solemn declaration, which is an international document of an order higher than that of conventional resolutions. Among the more than 4,000 General Assembly resolutions, the history of the United Nations has known only a score of such declarations, which concerned subjects of vital importance to the world and to the international community. These declarations have stood the test of time and have helped to improve the political climate of

relations among States, which was also the moving spirit and intent behind the initiative crowned with the adoption of the Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace.

78. This important Declaration has thus become the most comprehensive political document in the record of accomplishment of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. Its primary purpose is the strengthening of international security and détente, the building up of confidence among nations and the creation of a more propitious atmosphere for progress in disarmament by way of measures which the Charter of the United Nations defines as the determination "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

79. The idea of the Declaration, originating as it does from Poland, has its roots in the progressive foundations of our school of the law of nations; in the writings of the giants of the political and educational literature of the Polish Renaissance and the Age of Enlightenment; in our unflinching and immutable will to independence and our national liberation struggles in the course of over 120 years under partition and foreign domination. It derives from the lasting maxim of Polish liberation fighters in many countries of the world: "For your freedom and ours". It has also been prompted by the vicissitudes of our more recent history. Twice in this century Poland has emerged from the fires of war completely devastated. Few nations can better appreciate the price of peace than my own. Few have suffered so much from the lethal implements of war as has the Polish nation. During the Second World War, started by the Nazi invasion of Poland, mine was the generation forced to take the unwanted six-year night journey into darkness and to pay terrifying price in innocent blood, suffering and destruction, yet emerging victorious and determined to raise its land from the ashes of war. Indeed, in the short span of a lifetime of one generation we have raised the country from the destruction of war; we have built a modern society, in a reborn State within a socialist formation, a State which for the first time in its history on all sides borders friends and allies, linked together by the community of ideology and interests, by unflinching alliances and fraternal co-operation.

80. Some may, as they in fact did, perceive traces of Polish "romanticism" or "idealism" in the proposal for a Declaration [A/C.1/33/2]. Perhaps there might be some truth to that. But let me stress most emphatically that the initiative which led to its adoption has, first and foremost, been a product of Poland's contemporary realism as to both the necessity and the feasibility of preventing a new world war, a nuclear catastrophe which would threaten the very survival of mankind. Never in the future would we want for ourselves or for the generations to come to have to refer to our present times in terms of a "pre-war" or "inter-war" period. The Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace offers a realistic and indeed tangible programme on how to make that profound craving come true.

81. The delegation of Poland is fully aware that the success of the initiative to adopt the Declaration has been determined by a number of factors, among which the unusual topicality of its subject-matter and the constructive spirit of co-operation and understanding among the mem-

bership of our Organization, played their crucial role. I wish in the first place to reiterate our great appreciation to the sponsors of the Declaration who joined us, inspired as they were by the same concerns, preoccupations and ideas as we were. Hence our special gratitude goes to those delegations for their outstanding share of the contribution to the cause of preparation of societies for life in peace.

82. We thank our closest friends and allies, the States of the socialist community, for their full, unhesitating support for the initiative from the very first day it was formulated.

83. We address feelings of genuine gratefulness to the States of Africa, Asia and Latin America for the support we received from them in the true spirit of our traditional friendship, solidarity and co-operation with the non-aligned and developing States. We convey sentiments of our appreciative recognition to the States of the Western group, particularly those of Western Europe, for their business-like attitude in the course of our consultations and the support they have lent in the very spirit of constructive political dialogue and co-operation between my country and theirs.

84. The delegation of Poland wishes to appeal to all national delegations to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly to give due prominence to the Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace and in their respective reports to their Governments. An important step has been taken. Let us make sure that the creative chances opened up by the Declaration in no way recede.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As your President I wish to emphasize the importance of the resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly because it constitutes a fundamental declaration of principles by reason of its far-reaching nature and noble motives that inspired its sponsors. This text represents a milestone in the history of our Organization.

86. We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution II, entitled "Non-interference in the internal affairs of States". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda,

Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution II was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 33/74).

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution III entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution III was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions (resolution 33/75).

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution IV entitled "The situation in Nicaragua". A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Malawi, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: Nicaragua, Paraguay

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, Central African Empire, Chad, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Thailand, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Zaire, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 45 abstentions (resolution 33/76).

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

90. Mr. HARMON (Liberia): In explanation of vote, and of what has largely influenced our action on all draft resolutions disposed of at the levels of the Committee and of the plenary Assembly, the Liberian delegation wishes to make a brief comment on the work of the First Committee, particularly with regard to its decisions and general contributions in the monumental task it had set for itself to endeavour to halt the arms race. The question that faces us is, Can we claim that we have registered a measure of success? It is our feeling that to a substantial degree, certainly to a promising extent, that question merits a positive answer.

91. I hope I am not seeing a mirage, but there is some perceptible evidence of slowdown from the frenzied speed

the arms race had assumed in the early part of the year. Media headlines dramatizing the race have considerably waned. Also, we feel the first rumblings of an awakening public consciousness of the dangers in which our race threatened to engulf us. Major Governments engaged in the race are showing signs of giving second thoughts to some of the vast arms programmes on their drawing boards. I refer especially to the spirit of accommodation manifested by the two super-Powers. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks stress less of the negative and more of the prospect of a final accord. Two other major Powers have decided to engage actively in future arms negotiations: France, one of the big Powers, has decided to join the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, and China is apparently moving to a more active role on the disarmament issue. Thus the five big Powers have moved from their dispersed positions to a closer circle of common co-operation. That should in itself contribute substantially to the efforts to reduce the arms race.

92. In the First Committee itself we sense a measure of satisfaction, in contrast to some of the bitter disappointment expressed by a number of representatives following the results of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. Again, I would caution that we should not let ourselves be deluded by the first dim rays in the bleak world of the arms situation; but neither should we be blind to those first rays when they begin to shine. Hence as we move into a new order of disarmament—and that seems to be our direction—we shall repeatedly find ourselves walking a fair line between pessimism and optimism. We for our part are learning that both have their place in the new disarmament strategy. The sharp words of criticism by pessimists tend to act as a prod to action. On the other hand, optimism, when justified by even a small measure of victory, escalates, stiffens the will and turns a despairing public opinion to a renewed belief that a process of disarmament is a realizable possibility. That in itself is important.

Mr. Maina (Kenya), Vice-President, took the Chair.

93. Actually the Committee has moved far beyond its limited objective of—it is to be hoped—halting the arms race. My delegation reads into the Committee's extensive debate and some 40 resolutions the implication that the old concept of disarmament had become obsolete and had to be replaced by a new concept of the rôle of militarism in our changing world. The many new concepts emerging from the Committee add up to a more comprehensive view of the armaments institution, especially in the field of nuclear weapons. With the Liberian draft resolution we hope that from this range of new ideas a new philosophy of disarmament will be born.

94. In moving into a new area of thinking, the Committee has, in the opinion of the Liberian delegation, more tightly linked the disarmament complex to the New International Economic Order and to a new and altered relationship in the whole vast problem of international peace and security. It has initiated a trend towards moving arms agreements from purely political agreements to accords by legally binding conventions. On the tactical level, the Committee has democratized the decision-making process to provide for the equal rights of all nations and brought the

disarmament issue into the fold of the United Nations. With the creation of a Disarmament Commission with full membership and the advisory board of eminent persons the issue of disarmament may now be deemed to have become a truly United Nations issue.

95. The First Committee has done its work—fully, valiantly and creatively. That, too, is cause for optimistic expectations. It gives us pleasure to note that much of the credit for a job well done must go to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Ilkka Pastinen of Finland, whose skill, patience and statesmanship piloted the Committee through its enormous agenda in a business-like manner, maintaining an atmosphere conducive to friendly co-operation. By his skilful captaincy he has brought the ship successfully to port. My delegation pays a tribute also to his associates and to all members of the Secretariat and the staff, on whom the agenda imposed unprecedented difficulties. They carried out their task with signal success.

96. At this point and in this hall Liberia also wishes to pay a special tribute to our President, who has contributed greatly to the success of the work of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

97. And, of course, we would pay a tribute to our valiant Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim, who, despite the many problems imposed on him by the augmented business of the Security Council, has shown that, even with the many political problems he has taken up, the administrative function of his office has met the challenge. But, most of all, we are grateful for his great initiative and leadership in maintaining the momentum of the new disarmament effort, which is so important for our future endeavours.

98. I shall close on an important note, for the record. Liberia's votes on all the draft resolutions have been objective and consistent with our policy of seeking peaceful solutions to world problems and threats of war, rather than confrontation.

99. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania wishes to share with the Assembly certain thoughts in explanation of our vote on draft resolution I entitled "Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace". The text of the Declaration contains several principles which are very familiar and which have appeared in many previous documents of the United Nations or other international organizations. Those principles are reflected in the context, which adds no new substantial element to them.

100. The text also contains formulations and ideas which lend themselves to conclusions different from those which should be drawn from an analysis of the lessons of history and the present development of the world situation, or from an analysis of the character and interrelationships of the various political and social forces active in the world today. In order to evaluate what might be the effect of such a document, we should take account of the fact that the principles contained in the Declaration have been constantly violated by the enemies of peace and humanity, and that the imperialist Powers and super-Powers have indulged in great deal of speculation in regard to them. The purpose

of the Declaration is to promote the solution of the problem of war and peace. But the sources of war are not indicated therein. The principal dangers threatening peace in the world are not mentioned either.

101. We think that the problems of war and peace cannot be explained or resolved by a single phrase saying that wars begin in the minds of men or that it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed. We cannot support the ideas which suggest that so far men have been waging war because they cannot prepare to live in peace. The causes of war are much more complicated. The various wars are the consequence of the objective laws of the historical development of societies at different periods. Thus the principal source of wars of aggression today is the aggressive policy of the imperialist super-Powers. The true causes of aggressive wars lie in the efforts of imperialism and reaction to oppress and exploit the peoples. It is true that the danger of war, including that of a world war and an atomic war, will exist as long as imperialism and its belligerent policy exist. But, also, there is a possibility of preventing world war by firmly opposing the aggressive policy of the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers. The danger of such a war can be warded off if people take it upon themselves to further the cause of peace and carry the task through to the end.

102. For the reasons just mentioned, the Albanian delegation did not take part in the vote which has just been taken on draft resolution I.

103. The Albanian delegation did not take part either in the vote on draft resolution III recommended by the First Committee in the same report, because it has reservations about certain paragraphs. In our view the world situation is not marked by any signs of encouraging progress towards the strengthening of international security. Peace and security in the world are still threatened by the aggressive policies of the imperialist Powers and super-Powers. Sources of tension exist everywhere and new explosive elements are accumulating.

104. Paragraph 10 of draft resolution III refers to the so-called security in Europe and to the Mediterranean situation. We are convinced that since the so-called Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was convened in Helsinki in 1975 nothing has really changed in Europe. The Belgrade meeting of the Conference demonstrated once again that the Conference's decisions on security in Europe have remained a dead letter. Europe is still a field for hegemonistic activity on the part of the super-Powers. The military bases are still there and the American and Soviet armies continue to be stationed in the territory of several European countries. The aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization bloc and the Warsaw Pact bloc continue to strengthen their military potentials and their military budgets. Other imperialists, furthermore, are trying to muddy the waters and increase tension in Europe.

105. The situation remains complicated in the Mediterranean. There are hotbeds of tension in that area. The two super-Powers have concentrated large fleets there and are competing ceaselessly for spheres of influence and positions of dominance. In our view the proclamation of certain parts

of the world as zones of peace does not do away with the danger of war. We believe that, in order to serve the interests of peace and security in the Mediterranean, foreign military bases in that area should be dismantled and that the Mediterranean countries should not permit the fleets of the super-Powers to anchor in their ports either for re-provisioning or for so-called friendly visits.

106. Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolutions I and III. The reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in draft resolution I is vague and inadequate, and it seems to have been added as an after-thought. Because of Israel's preoccupation with violations of human rights against Jews, particularly in the USSR, Israel had therefore to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution even though we are in the fullest agreement with the central theme and its proclaimed aim.

107. Draft resolution III is a loosely worded document brimming with well-worn political *clichés*, some of which have in the course of time become code words for a selective application of human rights and a one-sided interpretation of the Charter. It has 11 preambular and 14 operative paragraphs, none of which introduces a single new or constructive idea for the strengthening of international security.

108. By mentioning the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in the eleventh preambular paragraph, the draft resolution draws inspiration from a decision which was rejected by all countries where men are free to speak. Had political freedom in the world been more widespread, most countries would have been free to express their revulsion at the manipulation of a praiseworthy objective for the conduct of anti-Semitic and racist campaigns. In countries where the press is free, draft resolution III is going to be ignored, as so many resolutions of the General Assembly have been. If more such resolutions are adopted, the United Nations is going to be more and more ignored wherever men are in earnest in their quest for peace. Israel therefore voted against that draft resolution.

109. Mr. FULLER (United Kingdom): When draft resolution IV, entitled "The situation in Nicaragua", which was just adopted, was put to the vote in the First Committee, my delegation abstained in the vote, but said that we should be considering the matter further. I should like to explain why we were instructed to vote in favour of the same draft resolution today, to record some of our reservations about the wording of the resolution and to make clear how our positive vote should be interpreted.

110. The resolution addresses itself to the situation in Nicaragua and to tensions between Nicaragua and neighbouring States. My Government is concerned about the tensions which have arisen between Nicaragua and some of its neighbours.

111. We are aware that regional efforts are under way to assuage these tensions and we wish those efforts every success.

112. As concerns the situation within Nicaragua itself, we think that the wording of the resolution is undesirably

broad and imprecise. In our view there is only one aspect of the internal situation of any Member State with which the United Nations can properly concern itself if it is to act in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7, of its Charter and that aspect is the observance of human rights.

113. As we have often said before, gross violations of human rights within the territory of a Member State can appropriately become a legitimate cause of concern to this Organization. As the draft resolution is worded, some of its provisions—and particularly operative paragraph 2—might be open to the interpretation that the General Assembly was concerning itself with other aspects of the domestic situation in Nicaragua.

114. In the light of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, my delegation cannot accept that such an interpretation is permissible. In accordance with our understanding of the Charter, we must therefore regard all references in the draft resolution to the internal situation in Nicaragua as being addressed solely and exclusively to violations of human rights.

115. Over the past months there have been continuing reports of gross and widespread violations of human rights in Nicaragua. Many of these reports have been widely publicized and have caused considerable concern. My Government is disturbed by these reports and very concerned by the human rights situation in Nicaragua. In the light of further consideration since the vote in the First Committee, it has concluded that it is right to vote in favour of the draft resolution, subject to the reservations and explanation which I have set out, as an expression of that deep and continuing concern.

116. In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my Government's sincere hope that the regional efforts which are mentioned in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution and which are aimed at securing a peaceful resolution of conflict in Nicaragua and respect for human rights in that country will be successful.

117. Mr. TERNSTRÖM (Sweden): My delegation did not explain its vote when draft resolution I, "Declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace", contained in document A/33/486, was adopted by the First Committee.

118. I should now like to make a few comments on that draft resolution against the background of the doubts we have expressed concerning the advisability of making declarations of this nature in other draft resolutions. We believe that it is important that every effort be made to lay the foundations for a peaceful future for all mankind. However, we have certain reservations with regard to the text that has just been adopted.

119. Certain formulations may give rise to misunderstanding concerning the spirit and scope of important international instruments and declarations, particularly in the field of human rights. We should have liked to see a more prominent reflection of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two International Covenants on Human Rights. We also have certain reservations regarding the selective choice as to the reflection of international instruments of importance in this context.

120. Thus we should like to make it quite clear that the text just adopted, in our understanding, in no way detracts from the United Nations Charter, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)] or the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, adopted in Helsinki in 1975. For us all parts of these documents remain of equal importance. As we see it, the basic conditions for peace would have been more truly reflected if less ambiguous language had been chosen, *inter alia* in the areas that I have just mentioned.

121. Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium felt that it should maintain its affirmative vote on draft resolution IV in document A/33/486 relating to the situation in Nicaragua. We believe that the appeal it contains for respect for the human rights of the civilian population of Nicaragua and the territorial integrity of neighbouring countries is important. My country hopes that it will be heeded by the governmental authorities in Nicaragua as an appeal devoid of any animosity.

122. I should like to say how happy my Government is at the information it has received with regard to the mediation efforts at present under way and the contacts established between the parties directly concerned with a view to bringing about a peaceful settlement of the dispute between them. The Belgian Government wishes to express the hope that those efforts will soon be successful and that mediation undertaken within the framework of the OAS will be continued without its being necessary for our Organization to intervene.

123. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The affirmative vote cast by my delegation in the vote on draft resolution IV, "The situation in Nicaragua", is to be understood exclusively in terms of the importance which we attach to the human rights problem.

124. In this connexion I should like to recall what my delegation said a few days ago in the Third Committee:

"The persistent violation of fundamental human rights, wherever it may occur, must be condemned, and it is not possible to maintain that it is a matter exclusively within the internal competence of States."⁷

125. Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation was not able to participate in the vote in the First Committee on the draft resolution on the situation in Nicaragua because, since the draft was submitted rather late, we lacked the minimum time necessary to obtain instructions. However, we later received instructions to vote in favour of the draft resolution in the General Assembly. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity of giving the following explanation.

126. Bearing in mind the contents of this draft resolution, which the Assembly has just adopted under agenda item 50,

⁷ For a summary of this statement, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Third Committee, 71st meeting, paras. 116-122, and ibid., Third Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

I can say that my delegation agrees with many of the reservations expressed by several delegations that supported the text when it was discussed in the First Committee. Nevertheless we also consider this to be an exceptional case of human tragedy that has reached grave proportions and has international repercussions. Accordingly, in voting in favour of this draft resolution we have acted out of humanitarian considerations and have deliberately avoided a formalistic legal analysis. My delegation therefore wishes this position, which may be called *sui generis* because of the exceptional nature of the case, to be recorded in the verbatim record of this meeting.

127. May I also say a few words on another of the four texts we have adopted. The Turkish delegation has already, in the First Committee, explained its reservations on draft resolution III and deplored that it found it necessary to abstain in the vote. Without wishing to repeat the reasons that led us to take that stand, I simply wish to remind the sponsors of the draft that such texts dealing globally with the strengthening of international security and containing elements of vital importance for the future of mankind certainly deserve more careful elaboration and adequate wording in order to obtain a wider and more diversified majority in which my delegation could and would take its place. But such is not the case—far from it—in this text, and we sincerely regret that.

128. Mr. PIZA-ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express my gratitude to the delegations that supported and voted in favour of draft resolution IV, on the situation in Nicaragua. In general, I wish to thank the United Nations for adopting this text, which is a supreme voice of encouragement for free men everywhere and for afflicted peoples of Latin America and elsewhere in the world, for Costa Rica and above all for the more than 2 million Nicaraguans that are beginning to glimpse the hope of freedom.

129. We are particularly grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution and to the delegations which have so brilliantly and convincingly defended it in the Assembly as well as in the Committee. The resolution we have just adopted will resound in every corner of the Latin American continent and in the world as a whole because the United Nations is thus honouring its commitment to the peace and security, to human rights and to the cause of free peoples. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM 60

United Nations Industrial Development Organization:

- (a) Report of the Industrial Development Board;
- (b) Strengthening of operational activities in the field of industrial development in the least developed among the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;
- (c) United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency: report of the Secretary-General;

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PART I)
(A/33/399)

- (d) Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM 62

Operational activities for development:

- (a) United Nations Development Programme;
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme;
- (e) United Nations Fund for Population Activities;
- (f) United Nations Children's Fund: report of the Secretary-General;
- (g) World Food Programme;
- (h) United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries;

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/33/415)

AGENDA ITEM 63

United Nations Environment Programme:

- (a) Report of the Governing Council;
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/33/412)

AGENDA ITEM 64

Food problems: report of the World Food Council

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/33/443)

AGENDA ITEM 66

United Nations University:

- (a) Report of the Council of the United Nations University;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/33/463)

130. Mr. THEOPHILOU (Cyprus), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present the reports of the Second Committee on agenda items 60, 62, 63, 64 and 66. Those reports are contained in documents A/33/399, A/33/415, A/33/412, A/33/443 and A/33/463 respectively.

131. The three draft resolutions in paragraph 17 of Part I of the report of the Committee on agenda item 60 [A/33/399] were adopted by the Committee without a vote.

132. In paragraph 32 of its report on agenda item 62 [A/33/415], the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of six draft resolutions and, in paragraph 33, two draft decisions. All the draft resolutions, with the exception of draft resolution VI, and the two draft decisions, were adopted by the Committee without a vote. Draft resolution VI, entitled "United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries", was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

133. All the draft resolutions in paragraph 22 of the report of the Committee on item 63, [A/33/412], were

adopted without a vote, except draft resolution IV entitled "Plan of Action to Combat Desertification". The Committee adopted paragraph 4 of that draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 89 to 7, with 26 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 8 abstentions. Moreover, paragraph 23 of the report contains a draft decision to which is annexed a draft resolution submitted under this item. The Committee recommends that the Assembly adopt the draft decision transmitting this draft resolution, entitled "Marine pollution", to the next session of the Assembly for its consideration. I should also like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the statement made by the representative of France on behalf of the sponsors of that draft resolution, after the adoption of the draft decision transmitting it to the next session of the General Assembly.⁸

134. Paragraph 9 of the report of the Committee on item 64 [A/33/443] contains one draft resolution, which was adopted without a vote.

135. In paragraph 10 of its report on item 66 [A/33/463], the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions, which were adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.

136. The PRESIDENT: I would remind members of the Assembly that the positions of delegations with regard to the recommendations contained in the reports of the Second Committee to the Assembly are reflected in the relevant summary records of the Committee.

137. The General Assembly will now consider part I of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 60 [A/33/399]. We shall now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 17 of part I of its report.

138. Draft resolution I is entitled "Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution I is contained in document A/33/444. The Second Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/77).

139. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Industrial development co-operation". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 33/78).

140. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Revision of the list of States eligible for membership of

the Industrial Development Board". The Second Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 33/79).

141. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn to document A/33/504, containing a note submitted by the Secretary-General on agenda item 60 (d), "Confirmation of the appointment of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization". In his note, the Secretary-General proposes to reappoint Mr. Abd-El Rahman Khane as Executive Director for a further term of four years, ending on 31 December 1982. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to confirm that appointment?

It was so decided (decision 33/312).

142. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will take up next the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 62, concerning operational activities for development [A/33/415]. We shall now take a decision on the six draft resolutions and the two draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee. We shall turn first to the six draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 32 of its report.

143. Draft resolution I is entitled "United Nations Children's Fund". The Second Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/80).

144. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Health needs of Palestinian refugee children". The Second Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 33/81).

145. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme". The Second Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 33/82).

146. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "International Year of the Child". The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 33/83).

147. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "United Nations Volunteers programme". The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 33/84).

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Second Committee, 51st meeting, para. 63, and ibid., Second Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

148. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI is entitled "United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria,⁹ Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 23 abstentions (resolution 33/85).¹⁰

149. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the two draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 33 of its report [A/33/415].

150. Draft decision I is entitled "Rules of procedure of pledging conferences". The Second Committee adopted draft decision I without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 33/419).

151. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II is entitled "Administrative expenses of the United Nations Capital Development Fund". The Second Committee adopted draft

⁹ The delegation of Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁰ The delegation of Cuba subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

decision II without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 33/420).

152. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 63, entitled "United Nations Environment Programme" [A/33/412].

153. I now call on the representative of the Congo, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the group of African States.

154. Mr. BIKOUTA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I merely wish to state that Botswana, Burundi, Guinea, Malawi and Uganda are the countries recommended by the African group of States for five of the seats allotted to that group in the Governing Council of UNEP. The name of the sixth candidate will be provided later.

155. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 22 of its report. Draft resolution I is entitled "Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme". The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 33/86).

156. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Co-operation in the field of the environment concerning natural resources shared by two or more States". The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 33/87).

157. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Measures taken for the benefit of the Sudano-Sahelian region". The Second Committee adopted it without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 33/88).

158. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution IV, entitled "Plan of Action to Combat Desertification". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait,

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Nigeria, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 33/89).

159. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to turn their attention to paragraph 23 of document A/33/412, which contains a draft decision entitled "Marine pollution", which has been recommended by the Second Committee. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 33/421).

160. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

161. Mr. PALMEIRO (Brazil): My delegation wishes to reiterate the statement made in the Second Committee regarding the adoption of draft resolution II.¹¹

162. The Brazilian delegation expresses its appreciation of the constructive manner in which the delegation of Sweden conducted consultations on this matter. Those efforts have resulted in a resolution which my delegation was able to approve without objection, in spite of the references in the text to documents on which our reservations are well known.

163. Mr. SHASHANK (India): My delegation would like to reiterate its statement of reservations made in the Second Committee on the adoption of draft resolution II.¹²

164. The PRESIDENT: We shall now turn to the consideration of the Second Committee's report on agenda item 64 [A/33/443], in paragraph 9 of which the Committee is recommending that the General Assembly adopt a

draft resolution entitled "Mexico Declaration of the World Food Council". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 33/90).

165. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will consider agenda item 66, concerning United Nations University, at a later state.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Election of fifteen members of the Industrial Development Board

166. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the election of 15 members of the Industrial Development Board to replace those members whose term of office expires on 31 December 1978. The 15 outgoing members are: China, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Iran, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Romania, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta and Venezuela. Those members are eligible for immediate re-election.

167. I should like to remind members that after 1 January 1979 the following States will still be members of the Industrial Development Board: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chad, Democratic Yemen, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America. Therefore those States are not eligible for election.

168. Under rule 92 of the rules of procedure, all elections must be held by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations. May I, however, recall the recommendation of the General Committee, adopted by the General Assembly at its 4th plenary meeting on 22 September 1978, to the effect that: "the General Assembly should, whenever it deems appropriate, dispense with the time-consuming balloting procedure in the case of uncontested elections to subsidiary organs" [A/33/250, para. 15]. Furthermore, I should like to recall that that procedure was waived for the election of members of the Industrial Development Board at the thirtieth, thirty-first and—except in the case of one group—thirty-second sessions.

169. In order to save the time of the General Assembly, I would suggest that members agree to dispense with the secret ballot once again in the present election if the number of candidates endorsed by a particular regional group corresponds to the number of seats to be filled in that group. In such cases those candidates would be declared elected. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly decides to proceed to the election on that basis.

It was so decided.

¹¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Second Committee*, 48th meeting, para. 24, and *ibid.*, *Second Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

¹² *Ibid.*, para. 23.

170. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Asian group of States, the representative of Iraq.

171. Mr. NISAIF (Iraq): I have the honour on behalf of the Asian group of States to inform the General Assembly that the problem of the election for the Industrial Development Board has been solved. The candidates of the Asian States for the three vacant seats are now China, Malaysia and Iraq.

172. On behalf of the Asian group I should like to pay a tribute to the delegations of Iran and Mongolia and to express our appreciation of their co-operation, which led to an agreed slate.

173. The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce that the Chairmen of the regional groups have informed me of the following candidatures—six from list A: Burundi, China, Iraq, Malaysia, Nigeria, Togo; five from list B: Australia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Malta, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; three from list C: Guatemala, Mexico, Panama; and one from list D: Poland.

174. Since the number of candidates endorsed by each group corresponds to the number of seats to be filled in that group, I declare those candidates elected members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1979.

Australia, Burundi, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iraq, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Togo, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were elected members of the Industrial Development Board for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1979 (decision 33/313).

AGENDA ITEM 19

Election of twenty members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

175. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to the election of 20 members of the Governing Council of UNEP to replace those members whose term of office expires on 31 December 1978. The 20 outgoing members are: Belgium, Central African Empire, Cyprus, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Iraq, Kuwait, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Those members are eligible for re-election.

176. I should like to remind Members that after 1 January 1979 the following States will still be members of the Governing Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America,

Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire. Therefore those States are not eligible for election.

177. Under rule 92 of the rules of procedure, all elections must be held by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations. May I recall, however, the recommendation of the General Committee, adopted by the General Assembly at its 4th plenary meeting, on 22 September 1978, to the effect that the General Assembly "should, whenever it deems it appropriate, dispense with the time-consuming balloting procedure in the case of uncontested elections to subsidiary organs" [A/33/250, para. 15]. Furthermore, I should like to recall that at the thirtieth, thirty-first and thirty-second sessions, except for one group, that procedure was waived for the election of members of the Governing Council of UNEP.

178. In order to save the time of the Assembly, I would suggest that members agree to dispense with the secret ballot once again in the present election if the number of candidates endorsed by a particular regional group corresponds to the number of seats to be filled in that group. In such cases those candidates would be declared elected. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly decides to proceed to the election on that basis.

It was so decided.

179. The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce that the Chairmen of the regional groups have informed me of the following candidatures—five from Africa: Botswana, Burundi, Guinea, Malawi, Uganda; four from Asia: India, Iraq, Kuwait, Thailand; two from Eastern Europe: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic; four from Latin America: Mexico, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay; and four from Western European and other States: Australia, Italy, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

180. Since the number of candidates from Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America correspond to the number of seats to be filled in those groups, I declare those candidates elected members of the Governing Council of UNEP for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1979, and I congratulate those States. With regard to the six seats from Africa, there are only five candidates. I declare those five candidates also elected members of the Governing Council of UNEP for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1979 and I also congratulate those States. I have been informed by the Chairman of the African group of States [see para. 154 above] that the remaining candidate will be announced later.

Australia, Botswana, Burundi, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Iraq, Italy, Kuwait, Malawi, Mexico, Panama, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1979 (decision 33/323).¹³

¹³ See also the 91st meeting, para. 43.

AGENDA ITEM 20**Election of twelve members of the World Food Council**

181. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the candidates proposed by the Economic and Social Council [see A/33/3/Add.1, chap. VIII] to fill the vacancies occurring on the expiration of the terms of 12 members of the World Food Council. The 12 retiring members are: Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Mauritania, Mexico, Rwanda, Somalia, Thailand, the United States of America and Yugoslavia.

182. The following 12 States have been nominated by the Economic and Social Council—from African States: Botswana, Ethiopia, Liberia; from Asian States: India, Iraq, Thailand; from Latin American States: Colombia, Mexico; from Socialist States of Eastern Europe: Yugoslavia; from Western European and other States: Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to declare them elected members of the World Food Council for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1979.

Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Yugoslavia were elected members of the World Food Council for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1979 (decision 33/314).

183. The PRESIDENT: I should like to congratulate those States which have just been elected members of the World Food Council.

AGENDA ITEM 22**Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination**

184. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has before it, in document A/33/236/Rev.1, a note by the Secretary-General regarding the recommendations of the candidates proposed by the Economic and Social Council to fill the

vacancies occurring on the expiration of the terms of office of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The seven retiring members are: Belgium, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Denmark, Pakistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

185. The following States have been nominated by the Economic and Social Council: Belgium, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly declares them elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1979.

Belgium, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia were elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1979 (decision 33/315).

186. The PRESIDENT: I should like to congratulate those States which have just been elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

AGENDA ITEM 23**Election of members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries**

187. The PRESIDENT: Since it has not been possible to reach an agreement regarding the geographical distribution of the membership of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, and since no candidate has been put forward by the regional groups, I suggest that the Assembly decide to defer this election to its thirty-fourth session. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the wish of the General Assembly.

It was so decided (decision 33/316).

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.