



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

EXEMPLAIRES D'ARCHIVES  
FILE COPY

A/40/PV.31  
10 October 1985

ENGLISH

à retourner / Return to Distribution C. 111

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 10 October 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIES (Spain)  
later: Mr. GAUCI (Vice-President) (Malta)

- General debate [9] (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon)  
Mr. Trigona (Malta)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MBOUMOUA (Cameroon): The Cameroon delegation fully shares, Sir, in the congratulations and feeling of satisfaction expressed on your election to the high office of President of the General Assembly. Your nation was in the vanguard of the historic exploration of the ocean spaces that opened new avenues of communication between peoples and nations. It is thus appropriate that a son of the Spanish nation should preside over a commemorative session of the General Assembly at which we must further explore new channels of communication among States and peoples in the process of addressing the grave issues of the time. We have no doubt that your diplomatic skills and the wisdom you have already displayed will enable our deliberations to be both productive and successful.

It is with pride that we recall the successful term of office of our brother and your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia. We congratulate him and thank him for a job well done.

I wish to pay a glowing tribute to the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his continued dedication, especially to the cause of the young nations of the African region in their struggle for freedom from various deprivations.

We should like also to associate our delegation with the condolences and expressions of solidarity already conveyed to the Government and people of Mexico in connection with the extensive disaster that recently befell that great nation. The reaction of Members of this Organization in embarking on an international relief effort is indicative of the scope of our collective potential as a body when there is the political will.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

Other disasters, resulting from storms, have occurred in recent weeks along the Atlantic coast of the North American continent. Our condolences go to the Governments and peoples that were the victims. It is our hope that research will be undertaken on a global scale to find preventive and remedial solutions to these predictable invasions from the Earth's atmosphere.

We have come to this commemorative session inspired by the mood of the time for change, determined to join with other delegations in undertaking a sober review of 40 years of experience by this universal Organization. It is our hope that this historic session will live up to the expectations of an anxious world in which men, women and children endure unending suffering in conditions of war, strife, hunger, disease and depressing deprivation.

The cry of peoples everywhere is for resolutions that are productive of change towards a new and better world. We must consciously create such conditions in international relations as demonstrate a firm determination on the part of States to ensure equal rights and the self-determination of peoples; to avoid intervention in the internal affairs of States; to co-operate with one another systematically to ease or eradicate the malaise of those condemned to face economic and social underdevelopment; to strengthen the capacity of all nations, great and small, to grow and foster the well-being of their populations; to ensure the orderly development of the natural resources that give sustenance to man and his well-being on this planet; and to provide an appropriate response to all threats, both natural and man-made, to human survival.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

We are convinced that all this is attainable if we all inject the political will into our labours here. We enjoy the common fellowship of collective aspirations enshrined in the one Charter to which we all, the peoples of the United Nations, subscribe.

Permit me now to state my nation's views on specific issues that we consider must be addressed by this commemorative fortieth session of the General Assembly.  
(spoke in French)

Forty years after the establishment of our Organization it must be admitted that, on balance, an assessment of the Organization's activities is not very heartening; indeed, even though some attribute the fact that there is still no generalized conflagration to United Nations action, it is none the less true that that is not the unanimous view. However, the fact that the Organization has withstood the test of time is in itself a positive element. The difficulties of all kinds which the Organization has experienced are related as much to its world dimension and universal mission as to an inevitable series of growing pains.

If the United Nations, reflecting the composition of the world at that time, at the beginning had less than one third of its present membership, it can congratulate itself on the fact that today it includes nearly 160 nations, which are called upon to co-operate on political, economic, social and cultural levels. But, rather than its growth and diversity, it is the lack of the political will of States that has prevented it from functioning with all the effectiveness which nations rightly expect of it, particularly in the areas of collective security and economic co-operation.

While it is true that four decades do not represent a significant period in the life of an organization such as ours, it is no less true that for the

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

individual, who is at the centre of United Nations concerns, 40 years is an important period which justifies consideration of the ground covered in the light of the problems which challenge mankind as a whole. This is particularly true when one considers the least developed peoples and countries.

I am thinking of the countries of the third world in which are concentrated the areas of tension and where the average life expectancy barely exceeds the present age of our Organization. I am thinking, too, of the enslaved peoples and the victims of apartheid, racism, aggression and all forms of discrimination. Lastly, I am thinking of the peoples who, living on the fringes of technological progress, know only disease, hunger and poverty. I believe that it is more urgent than ever before to put the work of our Organization back within the context of the original aims and objectives of the founding fathers.

Cameroon greatly appreciates the positive contribution which the Organization has made in several important areas.

As regards political matters, decolonization is one of the sectors in which the Organization has done remarkable work. In the space of a generation the United Nations has actively helped to ensure the independence of more than two thirds of its Members.

At a time when Cameroon is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its accession to independence and admission to the United Nations, we reiterate our willingness to contribute to the process of decolonization, which must be completed.

The case of southern Africa has always been a subject of deep concern to my Government. First of all, with regard to Namibia, we must express our great indignation at the inability of the international community fully to shoulder its

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

responsibilities in connection with that international Territory, which is under the direct authority of the United Nations, despite the consensus achieved almost a decade ago on Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This situation is explained by the customary bad faith of the racist Pretoria régime and its countless delaying tactics. It is also explained by the existence of powerful accomplices with a wide variety of interests that strengthen South Africa's positions and exacerbated, it must be admitted, by a certain resignation on the part of our Organization, of which the inability of the Security Council to ensure the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) is the most striking manifestation.

As we have often said - most recently before this body last June - the consequences of the permanent challenge to the Organization and the international community by South Africa are extremely harmful. These include the erosion of the credibility and the prestige of the United Nations and the danger of the generation and extension of local conflicts, entailing a serious threat to international peace and security, and even to the very survival of mankind in view of the South African racists' nuclear capability.

Apartheid, a system of dehumanization, has also become a system of terror, torture and aggression. The declaration of a state of emergency was one more opportunity to treat the black peoples with brutality and even to massacre them with revolting cruelty and cynicism. This aggressive behaviour has also been seen in the attacks against neighbouring countries, the military invasion of the People's Republic of Angola, the support for armed bands hostile to the legal authorities - all with a view to destabilizing these régimes, which refuse to be satellites.

The world can no longer tolerate the ill-considered actions of the fascist Pretoria clique. It is encouraging to see the trend towards increasing awareness

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

of all this, which has acquired a new dynamism both in southern Africa and among the traditional allies and friends of the apartheid country. There must be no further delay. Only firm action can lead to the completion of the decolonization process in southern Africa with the least possible delay and bring about the democratization of the social and political institutions in that region.

Cameroon, for its part, reiterates its support for the Secretary-General in his efforts to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), with the independence plan for Namibia. Cameroon categorically rejects the so-called interim government installed at Windhoek by South Africa on 17 June 1985, as well as any idea of linkage between the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and the independence of Namibia. As a member of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Cameroon also reiterates its support for the liberation movements of Azania, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which it is a member and which is the only legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence.

It is more necessary now than ever before to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to compel South Africa to co-operate in finding a definitive solution to the problems of southern Africa and Namibia. This is the primary responsibility of the members of the Security Council, particularly those that so far have tended to misuse the special powers entrusted to them under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, to enable that collective body to make progress without further delay along this path.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

As for the other African problems of great concern at present, we wish in particular to draw attention here to the question of the Western Sahara and the situation in Chad, a neighbour of Cameroon.

With regard to the Western Sahara, it would be useful for the United Nations to pool their efforts with the very commendable efforts of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in order to proceed to the implementation of the relevant resolutions on this question, in particular with regard to holding a referendum on self-determination in the territory.

With regard to the situation in Chad, which we are following carefully, we stress once again the need for all in that country to rise above all the differences which separate them in order definitively to seal the unity, independence, sovereignty and progress of Chad in a common destiny.

Peace is whole and indivisible. Another turbulent area that has retained the attention of the international community for several decades is the Middle East. Indeed, this region has become a veritable powder keg, while at the same time becoming an arena for all kinds of rivalry.

This situation has been examined on many occasions within this Organization and the facts are well known. Withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights and the possibility for all the countries and peoples of the region to live in peace and security within secure and recognized boundaries constitute, in our opinion, the elements of a just and lasting solution. But one cannot silence another truth, namely, that the solution of the problems in the Middle East, which are already complicated by foreign influence and interference, also depends on clarification of often ambiguous positions of the various Arab countries on this delicate question which threatens international peace and security.



(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

With regard to the Iran-Iraq conflict, or the Lebanese problem, the situations of conflict in this region, as elsewhere in the world, whether in South-East Asia or Central America, can be solved satisfactorily only by abiding, in the search for their solutions, strictly by the cardinal principles of the Charter, which include, inter alia, the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for territorial integrity and national sovereignty, and the right of each people freely to choose its own future.

On many occasions we have been obliged to stress the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in connection with the maintenance of international peace and security, and in particular disarmament. In fact, the attainment of the objectives of peace, security, disarmament and development will remain elusive if, as can be seen from the international climate, the attitude of States, and in particular the most powerful States, is still characterized by confrontation, coercion, suspicion and the obsession to accumulate weapons of mass destruction. One could even expect the worst if, in connection with security, the interests of one State or group of States are given special treatment to the detriment of the more general interests of the entire international community.

In other words, focusing the Organization's attention and strengthening its role in the area of disarmament is urgent, even vital. Unfortunately, the partial disarmament agreements or arms control agreements concluded thus far have remained far below their objectives with regard to the reduction of nuclear arsenals, both quantitatively and qualitatively. By the same token, the limitations resulting from negotiations on anti-ballistic missile treaties, and even SALT I and SALT II, have not yet provided mankind with greater stability. The least one can say about all these agreements, the goal of which was to stimulate disarmament, is that they have fallen short of the results hoped for. Hence one can understand not only the

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

persistence of the conventional and nuclear-arms race but in particular the strengthening of the ability of States to manufacture and stockpile weapons of mass destruction which continue to represent the greatest danger facing mankind.

This race, which is being pursued dangerously to the detriment of the socio-economic development and security of the majority of States, particularly the small- and medium-sized Powers, is being extended more and more to outer space.

At present discussions in the Conference on Disarmament have not produced any appreciable results that might strengthen prospects for a world of stability and security. In particular, I should like to refer to the lack of significant progress on such important subjects as the treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests, the international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prevention of the arms race in outer space. Instead, there is a dizzying spiral of military expenditures which have reached the figure of \$1,000 billion a year and the emergence of new strategic military doctrines that are so dangerous as to reach the point of accepting the absurd concept of localized nuclear war. Similarly, the 1985 session of the Disarmament Commission ended without any tangible conclusions.

For its part, Cameroon submitted to that body this year a series of concrete proposals aimed at promoting disarmament. Cameroon emphasized, inter alia, the need for the United Nations to have a sound, rational political process for ongoing deliberations and negotiations which would make it possible to identify measures to promote peace, security, disarmament and development. Such a process requires the universalization of efforts within the United Nations, with a view to nuclear disarmament, first of all. In other areas, and in particular in connection with conventional weapons, my country is also proposing a variety of approaches at the bilateral, subregional and regional levels.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

This requires, with regard to the Secretariat of the United Nations, rationalized structures and programmes and activities to strengthen its effectiveness and co-ordination, while eliminating waste and duplication, thus facilitating discussions and negotiations between States and the implementation of miscellaneous decisions and agreements on disarmament. We are encouraged by the welcome given to these proposals by the international community, and we hope that they will make a contribution to the formulation of decisions aimed at action.

In fact, the world thus far has lived in a state of balance of terror. Ironically, this balance has become a cause of great concern, as can be seen now that the proliferation of nuclear weapons in both quantity and quality has become almost uncontrollable, despite the system established by the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We should like to stress, in particular, the nuclear threat inherent at present in the racist régime of South Africa. Despite the fact that the country has not acceded to that Treaty, and the fact that it does not observe either the safeguard measures prescribed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or United Nations decisions to promote international peace and security, some members of the Assembly continue to collaborate in the strengthening of South Africa's nuclear capability. This collaboration, which continues to grow, is a flagrant violation of the historic Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted in 1964 by the Heads of State or Government of the member countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was supported by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and by the United Nations.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

This collaboration continues despite the repeated requests of this Assembly to South Africa to refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons, and although the military ambitions of Pretoria are evident in numerous acts of aggression and destabilization against independent neighbouring African countries which are now threatened by the use of such weapons. Continuing efforts, especially by the five nuclear Powers which are also permanent members of the Security Council, must be made to prevent South Africa from strengthening its nuclear capability. Without an undertaking to that effect, there is a danger that all the measures taken thus far to promote the denuclearization of Africa will be nullified.

Observance of the international commitment to the system prescribed by the Non-Proliferation Treaty is vitally important, as was stressed once again at the recent Geneva Conference by the States Parties to that Treaty, in promoting a general climate of peace and security. Cameroon believes that the decisions taken by the Conference should be rapidly translated into action so as to slow down the nuclear-arms race and thus give new impetus to disarmament.

In this nuclear age, when mankind is continually under threat of total destruction if there is a generalized conflict, we can no longer allow ourselves to continue to enclose security within narrow limits or to minimize the imperative need for our collective security.

It is encouraging in this connection that a ministerial regional Conference of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was held this year in Togo at Lomé, with broad participation at a high level on the topic of "Security, disarmament and development". That Conference adopted a Declaration on security, disarmament and development in Africa and a programme of action for peace, security and co-operation in Africa, which were recently endorsed by the Ministerial Meeting of Non-Aligned Countries. The convening of that Conference, the first of its kind in

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

Africa, and the adoption of the Declaration and Programme of Action, clearly show the determination of Africa to be in the vanguard in the quest for peace. My delegation supports the Declaration and the Programme of Action of that important meeting and calls for the support of the international community with a view to its speedy implementation.

Cameroon also supports the steps now being taken to arrange an international conference on disarmament and development. The first session of the Preparatory Committee was recently held here in New York.

What we need urgently is an active search for non-nuclear, non-military security measures, but in so doing we must also actively seek to promote conventional disarmament in the multilateral context of the United Nations and in accordance with the guidelines, the specific rules and the principles contained in the Final Document which was adopted at the first special session of our Assembly, devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, and which was confirmed during the session held in 1982 on the same subject.

Like the profound disagreement which persists in the area of disarmament, the critical international economic and social situation is a cause of grave concern about the future of mankind. In the past 40 years, trade between nations has increased because of the growing interdependence resulting from the progress of science and technology, in particular in the area of communications.

Thanks to the mechanisms of the United Nations system, which have given appreciable support to the efforts made by Governments, the conditions of life in a large number of countries have been improved, particularly in the developing countries, in the fields of health, education, agriculture and so on. However, it remains true that international trade is still characterized by marked imbalances and flagrant injustice, which have led to a great gulf between nations and growing dependence for the developing countries.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

The efforts of those countries to create a more just and equitable international economic order have always been frustrated by the selfishness and the lack of political will of the rich countries.

In fact the attitude of those countries can be held responsible for the mediocre results of the third United Nations Development Strategy, the sidetracking of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted in 1974 by our Assembly, the impasse in the global negotiations, the delay in implementing the agreement to establish a common fund for basic commodities, and the delaying tactics used to put off the convening of an international conference on currency, financing and development.

Although there has been some modest and uneven growth in the industrial countries, growth in the developing countries has been practically non-existent and has had no effect. So we can affirm that while the threat to the world economy is serious, in the developing countries there is a real economic crisis. The threat is characterized, inter alia, by the gradual disintegration of the trade system, uncertainty and instability in the international financial and monetary system, the persistent problem of the external debt, the stagnation in public aid to development and the critical economic situation at present in Africa south of the Sahara.

With regard to Africa, which has the largest number of the least developed countries, we welcome the adoption by the Assembly last year of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. This represents the clearly defined political framework within which the international community intends to deal with the crisis in Africa. Since its adoption, a slight improvement has gradually taken place in some parts of the region, thanks to international assistance. However,

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

the emergency needs are far from being met. In addition, the short-term and long-term needs have still not received all the international attention requested in the Declaration.

The African countries are aware, and have always recognized, that the solution of their problems rests primarily with themselves. In this spirit they have made commendable efforts to integrate their needs into their national development policies and programmes. The Lagos Plan of Action adopted in 1980 and brought up to date at the twentieth summit meeting of the OAU in 1984 in Addis Ababa, should be viewed as an effort directed to the integrated development of Africa, in view of the acute crisis being experienced by the continent.

However, it is also clear that the African countries cannot confront this serious crisis alone, without the assistance of the international community. Such assistance requires a continuing commitment, if the principles of the Declaration are to be translated into practical action.

In this context, Cameroon supports the proposal for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to the economic crisis in Africa.

This year once again, our Organization has played an active role in the implementation of the system provided for in the new Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

The past two sessions of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, held at Kingston and at Geneva, have made encouraging progress. They were characterized by efforts to draw up rules of procedure for the Assembly of the Authority, by the determination of members of the Commission to pave the way for the effective creation of the Enterprise as the Authority's organ responsible for the exploitation of the sea-bed through the examination of problems which could affect the land-based producer developing States as a result of the exploitation of the sea-bed and, lastly, by the preparation of the rules of procedure for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.

Unfortunately, despite general support for the development of a peaceful system governing the exploitation of the sea-bed, the search for machinery which would make the Enterprise operational and viable remains unsuccessful. In addition, the implementation of resolution II on the rights and obligations of pioneer investors prior to the entry into force of the Convention has been blocked until this problem of overlapping zones is resolved between the parties concerned.

At the same time the developed countries, whose financial and technological resources are needed for the proper exploitation of the sea-bed, continue to engage in blackmail by demanding that the Commission should grant them a mining régime which is favourable to them, but which would run counter to the relevant provisions of the Convention. We strongly condemn this action, just as we joined with the Group of 77 in deploring the recent decision by one State to grant licences to a few of its consortiums for the exploration and exploitation of certain sectors of the zone in violation of the provisions of the Convention and related resolutions.

However, it is encouraging to note that an overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations have signed the Convention, and that a growing number



(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

of them, including Cameroon, have ratified it. This trend reveals the growing recognition of the right of all States, rich or poor, weak or powerful, to benefit from the judicious exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed through an equitable legal régime whose nature is of crucial importance for international peace and security. For this reason, my delegation firmly supports the unambiguous implementation of the Convention and of its related resolutions.

Such implementation must promote the joint management of the common heritage of mankind so as to improve social and human conditions throughout a world that is constantly being buffeted by international events.

With regard to human rights, Cameroon's accession to most of the main international instruments in this field and its participation in the work of the Commission on Human Rights are evidence of its active commitment to the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms. This commitment will be maintained.

As for social and humanitarian problems, it is encouraging to note a convergence of views on the value of programmes devoted to this subject in the United Nations. In this connection it would be desirable for the international community to continue its support of activities aimed at promoting the well-being of refugees, children, young people, the disabled, the elderly, women and migrant workers.

Although the interdependence of nations is today broadly accepted, States do not always seem willing to assume all the implications of this principle as regards the establishment of specific machinery designed to improve the management of the common destiny of mankind. At present the United Nations is confronting a large number of difficulties and is the subject of such vehement criticism that some no longer hesitate to question the very future of the Organization in view of what would appear to be a regrettable decline of multilateralism.

(Mr. Mboumoua, Cameroon)

Whatever form such criticism takes, it in fact reflects people's concern about the control of decision-making machinery and indeed about the leadership of the Organization. However, a careful reading of the Charter, the development of the nature of the world and collective wisdom should enable us to rise above momentary difficulties despite the criticism levelled at our Organization.

It would therefore be desirable for the Organization constantly to adapt its structures with a view to the democratization of international relations, so as to ensure the increasingly dynamic and equitable participation of all members of the international community in the conduct of world affairs. The fate of each and every one of us depends on it.

During each of our sessions we uphold the interests of our respective States, and in taking up such positions we frequently give the impression that we expect everything from the United Nations. Has not the time come, during this historic session of its fortieth anniversary, to ask ourselves what we can do for the Organization to increase its effectiveness and dynamism and thereby to strengthen the role it plays for the benefit and well-being of mankind? The will to do so is required, and I should like to believe that we are capable of meeting this need.

Mr. TRIGONA (Malta): Mr. President, it is a particular pleasure for me to extend to you my congratulations on your election to the Presidency of the fortieth session of the General Assembly. Your long and distinguished record of service for your country - a Mediterranean country - in the United Nations has been justly rewarded on the occasion of this special anniversary.

Perhaps one of the most significant aspects of these fortieth anniversary celebrations concerns the evaluation of how much the United Nations has contributed to the substitution of the principle of sovereign equality and mutual respect among States for the law of the jungle which erstwhile had prevailed, culminating in the horror of two World Wars.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

Unfortunately, a number of misgivings must accompany this evaluation. Among the more positive factors, however, is undoubtedly the role which the world Organization has encouraged even small and island developing States to play in the conduct of international relations.

Malta is one of these small States which has derived significant benefits from its participation in the United Nations. Our fledgling parliamentary democracy, striving to establish a solid internal balance between individual freedom and collective compassion in the framework of a mixed economy and pursuing in its foreign relations a status of neutrality based on the principles of non-alignment has found in the United Nations both the understanding as well as the support which have enabled it to persevere in its chosen path even in moments of difficulty and opposition.

We have also found that, in spite of the constraints imposed by our limited resources, we have been able to contribute directly to the work and objectives of the United Nations.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

Soon after we joined the Organization, we started playing a prominent role in the law of the sea negotiations. Over the past 15 years we have served on most of the major organs of the system, namely, the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); the Council of the International Maritime Organization (IMO); the Economic and Social Council; the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation (ILO); the Executive Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); the Industrial Development Board of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), together with our current membership on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

We have also had the privilege of serving twice as Vice-President of the United Nations General Assembly, in 1970 and again this year. Our role as Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People since its inception in 1975 has, we believe, provided a valuable contribution to the search for a just and lasting solution of the Middle East question. We are keen on continuing to play this role.

By far our most challenging and rewarding experience in the United Nations has certainly been the opportunity we had in 1983 and in 1984 to serve a term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. This membership permitted us to project with greater clarity and purpose our wholehearted commitment to the methods of peace in the relations among States.

The United Nations forum has therefore enabled us, and others like us, to underline the point that the pursuit of an independent foreign policy is as much a vital and indispensable element of sovereignty for a small State as it is for larger and mightier States. At the same time however - and this has been brought

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

out in a recent Commonwealth study on the subject - small States face the challenge of a particular vulnerability which often exposes many of their foreign policy decisions and actions to intensive scrutiny and unjustified suspicion by larger States.

Malta has had to face this reality ever since, in 1971, under a socialist administration, it started taking those policy decisions in the political, economic, social and other fields which were called for in the pursuit of its sovereignty and national development. We have had to deal not only with openly expressed disapproval but even with outright hostility in respect of such actions as the internal reforms of our health, education and social welfare systems, and our foreign policy openings towards new countries in our region and beyond. The essential objectives in pursuit of which these foreign policy actions were taken, namely, our desire to transform Malta into a neutral and non-aligned State in the Mediterranean, acting as a focal point for regional peace, stability and co-operation, were deliberately misinterpreted and distorted.

Fourteen years ago many eyebrows were raised when the newly elected socialist Government of Malta took the first, and most legitimate step, in assertion of an independent foreign policy by opening relations with the People's Republic of China. It took many years for this step to be recognized for what it really was: an extension of Malta's range of partners and by no means a replacement of one set of partners by another.

During these years the invaluable assistance of the Chinese people to Malta, in major infrastructural projects, in the setting up of joint industrial ventures, and in technical assistance, has in itself reflected the positive and progressive nature of this partnership. At the same time China's interest in and support of Malta's efforts to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace has been of

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

such a nature as to confirm the important contribution which such partnerships can make towards regional and international stability and co-operation.

Far from justifying any initial misgivings, Malta's political opening towards China has therefore translated itself into friendship between peoples, allowing direct contact as a model partnership for mutual economic co-operation and for regional stability, which it is our objective to apply in our future relationships with other States.\*

Malta faced a similar experience in the process of establishing relations with the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe. Deeply embedded misconceptions about the range of policy options permissible to small States for a long time swayed opinion in Western Europe that Malta's opening to the East was an outright replacement, and not simply a legitimate extension, of existing partnerships. The incongruity of not permitting a small island State to adopt the same range of options as other, and larger, States, was hardly ever acknowledged. The Western press, which a few years ago made such a fuss about the opening of a Soviet Embassy in Malta, never for a moment stopped to reflect that a United States Embassy had already been in Malta for many years and that close diplomatic co-operation with the Soviet Union was a fact of life in all Western European States.

How much this was also the case for Malta can today be gauged from the mutually beneficial economic co-operation which has resulted, not without hard work, from our relations with the Soviet Union. This includes the use of our

---

\* Mr. Gauci (Malta), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

Merchant Navy servicing facilities and the signing of a trade agreement, the centre-piece of which, the order for the construction of eight timber carriers in Malta, is the envy of shipyards throughout our region.

The same objectives which have prompted us to seek the openings with China and with the Soviet Union continue to inspire us to develop our economic co-operation with the United States of America. Malta considers that one of the best guarantees which can be given of the positive contribution which its status of neutrality makes towards Mediterranean stability lies in the genuine interest with which it pursues its economic relationships with the major Powers. We remain deeply conscious of the fact that, while each individual relationship must also be a function of the specific economic interests and potential of our respective partners, the common political element which binds them all together is the endeavour to consolidate our status of neutrality as a factor of stability in our immediate neighbourhood.

Perhaps most reflective of the irrational prejudice which inspires attitudes towards the action of small States are certain reactions and interpretations concerning our relations with our close neighbour Libya. An active partnership with its closest neighbours is an indispensable factor in the security and well-being of any peace-loving State, more especially so, in the case of a State which, like Malta, has placed primary importance on a policy of neutrality and openness to all.

Libya has traditionally been Malta's most rewarding trading partner in the developing world. Thanks to our policy of close co-operation with Libya, this partnership has expanded into many other sectors, with resultant benefits to Malta's economic development, especially at a time of unemployment and economic disarray in many industrialized countries, which could not but have their negative

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

effects also on us. At the same time there has been abundant evidence available to show that no side in this partnership had any illusions at any time about the maintenance of Malta's sovereignty and independence of action.

This emerged most clearly in connection with the differences which arose between the two sides on the division of the continental shelf. Both sides acted energetically to safeguard what they perceived as their legitimate interests in the matter. Without any assistance from any third party Malta maintained its position and eventually the matter was referred to the International Court of Justice which, earlier this year, proposed a solution which now offers a good basis for a negotiated settlement. The necessary stability and predictability are therefore now assured for interested corporations to enter into mutually beneficial arrangements with the Maltese Government for the exploration and exploitation of petroleum resources in our sea-bed.

Malta's jealous guardianship of its sovereignty and independence of action, also called for, during the 1970s and early 1980s, a revision of existing relations with many traditional partners in Western Europe. Here again the entrenched prejudice against the freedom of choice available to small States distorted the perception of the nature of the measures which we were undertaking and thus retarded the achievement of the objectives which we were seeking.



(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

I have had occasion to speak in this Assembly about the various problems we faced at one time or another with many of our long-standing partners, including Britain, the European Economic Community, Italy and Japan. I am gratified to have to put on record today that many of these difficulties are now behind us and that our determined effort to establish open, fair and mutually beneficial relations with as wide a range of partners as possible is also prevailing in this regard.

For some years Malta's relations with Britain were soured by the fact that our ex-colonial ruler refused to assume what we considered to be its responsibilities in clearing our waters of bombs and wrecks left there as a result of its earlier presence in Malta. This year, however, a settlement of this outstanding problem was reached. In a five-month operation between April and August personnel from the British Royal Navy worked together with Maltese divers to remove over 40 major pieces of ordnance and various wrecks from the sea-bed in our Grand Harbour in order to permit the fullest use of the grain-loading and other infrastructural facilities we have recently built there. What was a limited problem in a broad sense but a serious obstacle in terms of our economic development has, therefore, now been satisfactorily resolved, thereby opening the way for us to resume mutually beneficial relations not only with Britain itself but also with other parts of the English-speaking world.

Malta's relations with Italy are largely a function of the geographical proximity of our two countries and our long historical and cultural association. While Italy was one of the first countries to recognize and express support for Malta's status of neutrality, there came a time when we considered that these formal expressions of support were not finding application in practice. A huge and mounting trade imbalance between us and Italy, to our disadvantage, could not, if unredressed, form the basis of a mutually satisfying partnership. A new basis for

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

agreement has now been reached. Italy has as a first step taken a commitment to find ways of offering us assistance in our infrastructural development, mainly in our water supply system and our road network, and this should help in re-establishing the close ties of co-operation our two countries previously enjoyed.

Indeed in this very hall only a few days ago the Italian Foreign Minister, Mr. Andreotti, acknowledged this positive development in the relationship between our two countries when stating that Italy intends "to develop these relations with full respect for the Maltese Government's position of neutrality and non-alignment, which Italy considers as a very positive element" (A/40/PV.8, p. 49). We welcome this statement in the justifiable expectation that it will find an expeditious and comprehensive implementation.

With the European Economic Community as a whole Malta's relations over the past 15 years have been uneven. It took years of tough negotiations for us to persuade the European Economic Community, in 1976, to revise and enlarge a restricted and lop-sided association agreement which it had foisted upon us in 1970 at a time when it was still taken for granted that Malta lay unquestioningly within Western Europe's sphere of influence.

When the first Financial Protocol between Malta and the European Economic Community expired in 1983 it took another long and difficult process of negotiation to persuade the Community to come up with a new offer responding to Malta's particular situation as a small and neutral State in the Mediterranean. This has now been achieved, and the Community's recently announced financial offer lays a good foundation for discussions to proceed on the forging of a special relationship between Malta and the European Economic Community under which co-operation in trade, investment and the flow of technology will be ensured.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

We welcome this development also because it appears to form a part of the European Economic Community's new commitment to adopt a more responsive attitude towards the need to establish equitable relationships with Mediterranean developing countries. At their meeting in Malta last September the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries underlined this need while stressing their determination to play their own part in developing programmes of co-operation with the European Economic Community.

Malta considers that there is a tremendous potential still to be explored in that direction. This includes not only the closer economic and commercial links between aligned and non-aligned countries in the Mediterranean but also the links between the European Economic Community and countries in other regions which can be encouraged through closer co-operation at the Mediterranean level.

It is significant, at this point, to note the contrast between the slow manner in which industrialized countries usually respond to the needs of developing countries with the much more readily forthcoming attitude displayed by resource-endowed developing countries which are themselves in a position to provide assistance. In this context, Malta wishes to express its deep appreciation to the oil-producing countries of the Gulf, particularly Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, for the promptness, understanding and generosity which have characterized and still characterize their relations with us.

In other instances progress is only the result of slow and patient effort. This has been the case in connection with our commercial relations with Japan, where after years of deadlock a Maltese private and official delegation has just concluded a visit to Tokyo for discussions on ways and means in which the large trade imbalance we have with that country could be compensated through a programme of economic and other co-operation between our two countries.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

Similarly, with the Vatican, following a difficult period, this year has marked a significant improvement. In April an agreement was finalized whereby the Catholic Church in Malta consented to the implementation over a period of three years of the objective of free secondary education for all. This is the prelude to the conclusion of a comprehensive concordat which will place relations between Church and State in Malta on a sound and clear footing.

In this as in other instances, the prejudice that inspires attitudes towards the actions of small States has been painfully apparent. While the international press had a lot to say, much of it a distortion of facts and involving confusion between distinct aspects of internal and foreign policies, when Church and State in Malta were not yet in agreement over the issues of free secondary education for all, little if any publicity has been given since to the fact that all difficulties have now been amicably settled. It is only through such a forum as that provided by the United Nations that we can make our voice heard in explanation of the legitimacy and success of the actions we have undertaken.

I should now like to turn to another aspect of the United Nations role over the past 40 years which is of particular relevance to small States like Malta. This concerns what could be termed the habit of collective responsibility on issues of international concern which the Organization has helped to foster over the years.

The pursuit of this objective has not been easy. Concurrent with the emergence of the United Nations in the second half of the 1940s there also emerged the reality of a bipolarized world dependent upon the interests and dictates of the two super-Powers and the military alliances they established. Over the past 40 years the habits of multilateralism have, therefore, had to contend with the imperatives of super-Power hegemony. A breathing space was offered in the years of détente in the sixties and early seventies which permitted the consolidation of

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

various multilateral processes within the United Nations itself, especially the emergence of groupings like the Group of 77 and the Non-Aligned Movement, as well as the first attempts towards regional co-operation for peace and stability.

The recent resurgence of super-Power competition has not succeeded in eroding the earlier developments. These still permit even a small State like Malta to take up its legitimate role in the collective responsibility for security and co-operation.

It is evident that we have taken the most energetic action in this context directly in our own region of Europe and the Mediterranean. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which opened in Helsinki in 1973, provided us with an excellent opportunity to work with our neutral and non-aligned partners in Europe in the search for security and co-operation on our continent. In collaboration with the neutral and non-aligned States of Europe we have not only played an increasing role in the process of European security-building; we have also succeeded in entrenching the principle that there can be no peace and co-operation on the European mainland in the absence of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

We are now seeking to give this principle a concrete application, on the one hand, through an effective confidence and security-building measures régime for the Mediterranean to be agreed on in the contest of the ongoing Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe and, on the other hand, Malta has also taken a leading role in galvanizing the leading non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean to formulate their own programme of action for peace in their own region. The first major step in this programme was the appeal launched at the Mediterranean Non-Aligned Meeting of Foreign Ministers last year, urging aligned States of the region to ensure that foreign military facilities on their territories not be permitted to be used against the interests of non-aligned States.

Slowly but steadily, Malta is therefore participating in a process that will eventually lead to a fruitful partnership of actions and initiatives between the neutral and non-aligned States of Europe, on the one hand, and of the Mediterranean, on the other, in transforming their region into a zone of peace and co-operation.

The General Assembly has in recent years contributed towards this process through the adoption of consensus resolutions on the Mediterranean where the objectives for Mediterranean co-operation are clearly spelled out. We hope that this Assembly will again this year act in support of our regional initiatives for peace.

Problems are undoubtedly not in short supply which test and challenge the determination of States to work towards stability and co-operation in their respective regions. In the Mediterranean itself the problems of Cyprus and of the Middle East pose the most formidable challenges to our collective endeavours.

Malta looks upon the problem of Cyprus with particular concern because of the bonds of friendship and sympathy which geographical proximity and various national similarities instil in our two peoples. We are conscious of the deep commitment

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

of the United Nations Secretary-General personally to work out a solution to the problem. We offer him our fullest co-operation and support. Invariably, a resolution of the Cyprus problem must deal with three related aspects: the withdrawal of foreign troops from the island; the maintenance of its unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned status; and the conclusion of arrangements which meet the security and economic concerns of both communities on the island.

In the Middle East, Malta has repeatedly spelled out what it considers to be the essential issues and the methods by which they are to be resolved. We support the right of the Palestinian people under the sole leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to a homeland of their own. We call for Israel's withdrawal from all territories occupied after the June 1967 war. We plead that the process of national reconciliation in Lebanon be allowed to unfold through peaceful methods. We urge that all States in the region be permitted to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

For these objectives to be achieved we urge Israel to abandon its ill-fated dependence on the use of force and we call upon all interested parties to engage in a process of consultation and negotiation eventually culminating in a peace conference, as envisaged in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. In this context we support the initiative launched last February by King Hussein and Chairman Arafat as providing a good basis for progress. We welcome the expressions of support which have recently emerged from various quarters in support of this initiative.

We also reiterate the call for Western European States to play a more direct and energetic role in the search for a Middle East settlement. It will be recalled that the United Nations seminar on Palestine, which was held in Malta in April 1982, clearly identified the role that Western European States can and should play in the Middle East question. Action in this direction has so far been sporadic and

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

half-hearted. The time is long overdue for more effective initiatives to be undertaken. Arab-Israeli confrontation cannot go on forever. Like the history of intra-European confrontation, now settled for 40 years, the Arab-Israeli confrontation calls for greater understanding.

At this point I have to refer to last week's bombing by Israel of the Palestinian camp near Tunis. By undertaking this extremely misguided action, which Malta has already joined in unequivocally condemning, Israel has deliberately sought to do irremediable harm to the nascent peace process in the Middle East. Israel's action has also injected into the Mediterranean a new factor of tension and instability which, as we have seen over the past few days, must inevitably have very serious and dangerous repercussions.

No Mediterranean State, be it a member of an armed alliance, or neutral or non-aligned, can tolerate for one single moment the assumption by another regional State of a self-imposed policing role in the region. We will forcefully resist this development and we will take all necessary measures, in consultation with our neighbours, to avoid its recurrence.

Outside the Mediterranean the issues that call for urgent and effective collective action for peace are many and complex. In southern Africa the long awaited crisis brought about by the injustices of apartheid is fast approaching. The call for forceful sanctions against the white minority régime of South Africa is no longer debatable in principle. The question is only on the precise nature of the sanctions to be undertaken and on the measures to be devised to provide assistance to those States which will bear the brunt of the effort on sanctions. Malta extends its full support to these efforts.

In the war between Iran and Iraq, the tragedy and suffering coming in the wake of this lingering conflict have not yet prevailed upon the contestants to find a peaceful resolution of their differences. We can only lend support to all efforts



(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

directed towards both contestants while at the same time seeking to avoid the introduction of extraneous elements and new factors of tension into this conflict.

In Afghanistan and Kampuchea the presence of foreign military forces continues to call for our strong expression of concern and condemnation. We sincerely hope that the regional initiatives for a resolution of these two problems will be given the opportunity to prevail. In Central America, as it did during its membership on the Security Council Malta continues to support the Contadora initiative as providing the only solid basis for a lasting resolution of the complex problems of the region.

Each year the Maltese delegation in this Assembly regularly gives expression to its hope for the launching of a process of reunification in Korea. This year perhaps more than in previous years, we have reason to believe that the prospects for an eventual solution are encouraging. The developments which have taken place over the last months on humanitarian matters are indeed very limited, but they constitute a first step, which is always the most difficult. We urge that this first step be consolidated through other initiatives in the near future so that an irreversible cumulative process for reconciliation can be established. We are ready to offer all possible assistance in this regard.

In our consideration of the successes and failures of our world Organization over the last four decades, two broad sets of issues assume particular relevance: those related to disarmament and those related to economic and social development.

Disarmament has been extensively debated in these halls, unfortunately with little noticeable effect. The world is undeniably a more dangerous place today than it was 40 years ago. The United Nations has played its role over the past 40 years to ensure the avoidance of a new global conflict of catastrophic proportions.

However, we feel that future generations are entitled to inherit something better than a world daily dangling over the precipice of nuclear extinction.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

Existing efforts towards disarmament must therefore be supplemented by new and more energetic initiatives. At the non-aligned Foreign Ministers meeting held in Luanda last month, Malta supported the idea of a contact group of non-aligned leaders to initiate a process of consultations with nuclear Powers on disarmament questions. We hope that this Assembly will endorse and lend support to this idea.

(Mr. Trigona, Malta)

An element of particular disappointment and dismay at this fortieth anniversary celebration relates to the continuing failure by the international community to bring about the much needed reform in international economic relations. Fundamental inequities and injustices prevail which today find manifestation in the intolerable debt burden of many developing countries, in chronic unemployment world wide, and in continuing poverty, malnutrition, ill-health, misery, poor education and lack of basic services among the vast majority of mankind.

Those instances of collective endeavour where a sense of global partnership prevails - such as in the case of drought-stricken Africa, or earthquake-stricken Mexico - constitute only the fitful and rare instances pointing to a potential which lies essentially untapped. What is needed are more effective mechanisms to promote a genuine and permanent global partnership for development whether at regional level or the level of other groupings - for example, the Commonwealth. This partnership must be able to take account of both the structural problems of industrialized economies, where unemployment has become endemic, and the basic needs of developing societies, where the very structures for economic progress are yet to be put in place. The mechanisms governing the global flow of finance, trade and technology must therefore be such as to deal effectively and simultaneously with the ills of recession as much as with the plight of poverty.

It is in this context that the United Nations system, with its global membership and its terms of reference which cover the whole spectrum of human activities, has a tremendous role to play - a role related both to the creation of awareness and to the provision of structures for effective co-operation.

A renewed dedication by the United Nations to this endeavour would perhaps constitute the most appropriate manner of celebrating this fortieth anniversary.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Since this is the first time that I have spoken here, I should like to express to Ambassador de Piniés our satisfaction at seeing him preside over the work of this session of the General Assembly, at which Heads of State, heads of delegation and kings have taken part to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. We are sure that, thanks to his experience and wisdom, he will successfully conduct the proceedings at this session, at which the Assembly will seek solutions to the many problems facing the international community, whether political, social or economic.

I have asked to be allowed to speak today to reply to what was said by a representative in the General Assembly yesterday afternoon, Wednesday, in the course of which, as he normally does, he distorted the facts and attacked my country.

The spokesmen of Habré have persistently and repeatedly made false charges, fabricated allegations against my country and slandered it, in order to divert the attention of the international community from the truth of the problem of Chad and the events which have occurred there so that they can monopolize power, impose their will on the people and take control of Chad's destiny.

The truth about the problem of Chad, as we have so often made clear, is that this is not a new problem. It began in 1965, when a civil war broke out which is still going on. The fight in Chad became one among the different antagonist

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

factions, based on tribal conflicts , the bid for domination on the part of some, and incitement by certain outside Powers which have been fanning the flames of strife.

Since the beginning of the civil war in Chad, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has been bending every effort to bring about national reconciliation among the different factions and restore peace to Chad, in view of the historic spiritual, cultural and geographical links between us and the brother people of Chad and our common struggle against colonialism.

The two peoples fought side by side at the time of the invasion of Libya by Italy and the invasion of Chad by France at the beginning of this century. Thousands of Libyans found refuge in Chad during the Libyan liberation struggle and thousands of citizens of Chad live and work in our country as brothers. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya was the first State which tried to bring about national reconciliation in Chad and to put an end to the tragedy that had afflicted the people of Chad since the beginning of the 1960s. A conference for national reconciliation was held in Sebha and then Benghazi in February-March 1978. My country's efforts led to mutual recognition between the National Liberation Front of Chad and the Chad Government then in power.

My country has participated in all African efforts designed to bring about national reconciliation in Chad, particularly the Nigeria Conference which led to the Lagos Agreement and the establishment of a Transitional Government of National Union (GUNT), in which all Chad factions took part, under the presidency of Goukouni Oueddei, a Government recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

The functions of Government were assumed by GUNT in order to bring about peace in Chad and the normalization of the situation, but Hissein Habré's desire to rule and his bloodthirstiness led to a revolt against legitimate authority, undermined all efforts to restore peace and stability in Chad, and violated all the agreements concluded among the various antagonistic factions. That development came about through the efforts of certain foreign forces, in violation of the Lagos Agreement. This disruption also thwarted both the attempt of the President of Ethiopia to hold a conference of national reconciliation in Addis Ababa and the proposal of the Congolese President to hold a conference of reconciliation at Brazzaville.

That is the truth about the problem of Chad, and that is the truth about my country's efforts. The allegations of the representative of Habré are devoid of any foundation whatsoever.

The region he claims to be occupied by Libya is in fact under the domination of GUNT, under the presidency of Oueddei. My country has no forces in Chad and occupies none of Chad's territory. That is a fact we have had to repeat over and over again.

Finally, I should like to reaffirm that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is anxious to safeguard the unity and independence of Chad.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

My country will also safeguard the unity and territorial integrity of that country as it appears on the map annexed to the report of Mr. Adrian Belth, United Nations Commissioner in Libya, contained in the report of the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

I should also like to reaffirm that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is a neighbour of Chad and is ready, as it has been in the past, to take part in all efforts within the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to establish peace and security in Chad.

Mr. ADOUM (Chad) (interpretation from French): The arrogant and fallacious argument presented by the representative of Libya surprises no one in this Hall because it is the usual one which is known to all. Indeed, as members of the Assembly will have noticed, the statement of the representative of Libya in exercise of the right of reply, is nothing but a tissue of lies. This is not the first time that the Libyan delegation has indulged here in rhetorical exercises designed to camouflage its country's aggression against and occupation of my country.

The Libyan representative tried once again to cover up the activities of the terrorist and expansionist régime of Tripoli in my country. The Libyan representative would do better, in my view, to recognize the schizophrenic conduct of the régime he claims to represent here. The representative of Libya claims to know the problems of Chad better than the Chadians and recalled various historical events pertaining to Chad. The tragedy mentioned by the representative of Libya will only end, in my view, when Libya puts an end to its interference and presence in Chad.

In his statement to the General Assembly the representative of Libya said:

"The problem of Chad is still outstanding, despite the many resolutions of the Organization of African Unity on this subject." (A/40/PV.20, p. 37)

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

I wonder if the representative of Libya has ever asked himself why what he calls the Chad problem persists? It persists because Libya wants it to persist, and here I have to call things by their proper names and say that it is really a Chado-Libyan problem. There is a problem in Chad only because there has been aggression against and occupation by Libya of Chad. There is a problem in Chad only because of Libya's constant interference in the affairs of Chad. We therefore call on Libya to put an end to its illegal presence, its manoeuvres and interference in Chad, and it will be seen that the problem mentioned by the Libyan representative will disappear of itself.

The aggression against and occupation of my country have no need to be demonstrated here. Irrefutable proof has so often been provided to the whole international community. I would invite representatives to consult the archives of the Security Council in this connection.

In deference to this Assembly, I do not want to enter into polemics nor tax the patience of the members of the Assembly. In conclusion, I would just like to make a few observations. What the Libyan representative cannot deny is the massive presence in the northern part of Chad of Libyan troops in flagrant violation of the Agreement signed on 17 September 1984 with France for the mutual and simultaneous withdrawal of their respective troops. What the Libyan representative cannot deny is the strengthening and reinforcement of Libyan positions in the north of Chad by the establishment of a gigantic administrative and logistic infrastructure. Another thing that the Libyan representative cannot deny is the acceleration of the process of "Libyanization" which led to a clash on 4 September last with Chadians in the occupied zone where they had previously been kept in a feudal state by Libya.



(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

Hence Libya cannot boast of being absent from Chad or having nothing to do with the wrongs suffered by Chad. Everyone knows that Qhadaffi's Libya is, in fact, present in Chad, and is by no means allowing the people of Chad to live in peace. The people of Chad, however, simply want to live on good terms with all their neighbours, including Libya, within its territory of 1.284 million square kilometres.

Qhadaffi's Libya continues to defy international institutions and rules with impunity. It is high time for the international community, in the name of peace, justice and liberty, to make Libya see reason.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I apologize for having asked to speak once again, but I will be very brief. What I intend to say now is that the previous speaker, through lies and allegations, is trying to establish a non-existent legitimacy, a legitimacy that was not accorded to their régime by the Chadian people. The previous speaker referred in his statement to things that do not exist and indulged in lies that have absolutely no foundation. We have no troops in Chad. We are not occupying any part of Chad, as he claimed; a number of experts were simply being made available to assist the Government of Cukuni Oueddei, in accordance with the terms of an Agreement with that Government - an agreement which is registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations. It was possible to send troops to Chad, in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, but to provide for the security of Chad is not foreign intervention. We did not do that. The lack of a solution to the problem of Chad is due to the obstacles raised by the Njamena group.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) had asked the Government of brotherly Congo to hold a meeting of all Chadian factions with a view to bringing about national reconciliation. We support these efforts. I will quote here what Dr. Ali Treiki said at a press conference on 3 October in this Organization:

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

(spoke in English)

... that the Chadian problem had not yet been solved. The Government of the Congo had been asked by the OAU to convene a meeting between all the different Chadian factions aimed at national reconciliation. Libya has supported those efforts. The Libyan and French withdrawal from the country and the Libyan Government's contact with the French had prevented a military confrontation between the two factions in Chad."

(continued in Arabic)

I hope this gives enough clarification and replies to what the previous speaker said.

Mr. ADOUM (Chad) (interpretation from French): I apologize for speaking again, but I do feel it is necessary.

I should like to reply to a number of points. With regard to legitimacy, I should like merely to make the representative of Libya understand that the Government of Chad is not here to request any kind of legitimacy from the representative of Libya.

My first comment is along the same lines. I should like to ask a question of the representative of Libya: Can he tell me how Colonel Qadaffi came to power?

Speaking of security, I do not think that Chad can be secure until Libya has withdrawn from Chad.

He mentioned reconciliation. We remain concerned about this. We have replied "yes" to every meeting on the reconciliation and unity of Chad, and we shall continue our efforts to this end.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.