

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**1499th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 19 December 1966,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 33:</i> <i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the Special Political Committee.</i>	1
<i>Agenda items 30, 89 and 91:</i> <i>International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (concluded)</i> <i>Conclusion of an international treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, the moon and other celestial bodies (concluded)</i> <i>Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the First Committee</i>	11
<i>Agenda items 31 and 93:</i> <i>The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded)</i> <i>Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the First Committee</i>	15
<i>Agenda item 96:</i> <i>Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the First Committee</i>	26
<i>Agenda item 26:</i> <i>Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued) . . .</i>	28
 <i>President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan).</i>	

AGENDA ITEM 33

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (concluded)

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/6603)

1. The PRESIDENT: As decided by the Assembly this morning, we shall now consider agenda item 33, concerning the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects.
2. Mr. GOÑI DEMARCHI (Argentina), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee (translated from Spanish): At this stage, there is no need for me to go into great detail on the Special Political Committee's report [A/6603] on item 33, "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations". I should however like to say that this is one of the most important items referred to the Special Political Committee for discussion.
3. During the discussion, many suggestions and proposals were made, as the report [A/6603] shows. Six draft resolutions and a number of amendments were formally submitted. Despite the divergence of views and positions, the number of draft resolutions is evidence of the great interest taken by delegations in this crucial question. Not all the documents I mentioned were put to the vote in the Committee.
4. As the outcome of its deliberations, the Special Political Committee adopted draft resolutions A, B and C in paragraph 25 of the Committee's report. It remains for me to present the draft resolutions on behalf of the Special Political Committee, and to recommend their adoption by the General Assembly.
5. The PRESIDENT: The Special Political Committee recommends three draft resolutions [A/6603, para. 25]. The Assembly has now received the following additional proposals under this item: a draft resolution submitted by several Members [A/L.515], and two amendments to draft resolution B recommended by the Special Committee, one proposed by the delegation of Cyprus [A/L.512] and the other proposed by the delegation of Jamaica [A/L.513].
6. I call on the representative of Algeria to introduce the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and several others.
7. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (translated from French): Recent experience has shown that it was not a vain effort to appeal to the wisdom and spirit of conciliation which have prevailed in this Assembly—in a fashion that has become almost traditional. Only by appealing to that spirit of conciliation was it possible to surmount the serious crisis that shook the nineteenth session.
8. A special committee to study the whole question of peace-keeping operations was set up at that time

[resolution 2006 (XIX)]. While not wishing to gloss over the difficulties encountered by that Committee, we feel bound to note that its work has, to a large extent, made it possible to clarify the situation. It had in fact, the merit of having been a meeting-ground for the different points of view during these past two years; it has become an indispensable tool in the search for a solution that requires both patience and ingenuity. On that solution will largely depend the future of our Organization, and this compels us to acknowledge that only in a forum in which both the great Powers and the different political families of the United Nations express themselves can a common denominator be found between positions that are apparently divergent.

9. Our debates in the Special Political Committee are the best illustration of that fact.

10. While we were entitled to expect that the discussions would help to bring the points of view closer together, their developments, unfortunately, demonstrated that it was not necessarily so; on the contrary, they merely brought to light serious differences of opinion.

11. The General Assembly is now called upon to take a decision on texts that emerged from that situation. Their adoption will certainly lead to a crystallization of positions, the direct consequence of which will be a return to the situation which existed during recent years. Thus, all the sustained efforts made in the last two years will be virtually destroyed. We are convinced that the General Assembly, whose major concern is the strengthening of that irreplaceable instrument of international peace and co-operation, more particularly, at the present moment in world history, will forestall any hasty action.

12. It was in the light of all those considerations that a number of countries, on whose behalf I have the honour to speak, felt that a draft resolution should be submitted for the Assembly's consideration [A/L.515]. In doing this, our only concern is to avoid hasty action of any kind which, in our opinion, could only be prejudicial to a real solution of the complex problem of peace-keeping operations.

13. In this connexion, we believe that certain views expressed in the Special Political Committee deserve a more thorough examination and therefore require more time. The draft resolution contains a proposal that was thought reasonable and likely to enable us to take stock of the situation. It provides for referring the Special Political Committee's report on the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects [A/6603] to the fifth special session of the General Assembly, which is to be held not later than 30 April 1967.

14. Furthermore, our draft resolution requests the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue, in the interval, the examination of the whole question of peace-keeping operations, and to report to the General Assembly at its fifth special session. That Committee must necessarily exert every possible effort to discover the basis for a solution of the complex problem of peace-keeping operations between now and the convening of the fifth special session of the General Assembly. This brief respite should

encourage us to redouble our efforts to find a solution which should soon be forthcoming.

15. As this is a draft resolution concerning the procedure to be followed regarding the report of the Special Political Committee, my delegation, and the other sponsors of the draft resolution which I have just introduced, would like to secure priority for the vote on this draft.

16. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): The delegation of Jamaica spoke for the group of non-aligned nations at our meeting on Saturday evening [1497th meeting] when it proposed the adjournment of the debate on this item and the postponement of the vote on the draft resolutions appearing in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/6603, para. 25]. Our purpose was to see whether, even at that late stage, it might be possible to reach agreement upon a draft resolution which could command the support not of a bare majority but of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Assembly.

17. Since then there have been discussions, but it appears that our aim has not been achieved. Agreement on a draft resolution capable of securing an impressive majority has not been obtained.

18. The delegation of Jamaica, on behalf of the group of non-aligned nations, takes note of the fact that a new draft resolution has just been introduced [A/L.515] the purpose of which is to refer the report of the Special Political Committee to the fifth special session of the General Assembly, to be held some time in April 1967. The delegation of Jamaica is not in a position to anticipate the results of the vote on this draft resolution. We are obliged, therefore, to take into account the possibility that the Assembly will vote on draft resolutions B and C in the report of the Special Political Committee. On the assumption that the Assembly will vote on these draft resolutions this afternoon, the delegation of Jamaica would like to propose an amendment to draft resolution B, namely to delete sub-paragraph (c) of operative paragraph 5. This amendment would remove the duplication and overlapping which appear in the present texts of draft resolutions B and C. The purpose of our amendment is not to register any disagreement with that sub-paragraph, but merely to remove the duplication which now exists. With the deletion of sub-paragraph (c), the way would be clear for those delegations wishing to support both draft resolution B and draft resolution C to do so without violating proper voting or other procedures in the Assembly.

19. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to appeal to all members to make their interventions as brief as possible. The item under discussion has been thoroughly discussed in the Special Political Committee. The new proposals before the Assembly are, I believe, quite clear to delegations. There is always the possibility of procedural questions arising, and my appeal relates particularly to procedural discussions. The rules of procedure will be applied if such questions do arise, but I appeal to members to refrain as far as possible from engaging in procedural discussions.

20. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): I do not wish to enter a lengthy procedural

discussion, as I feel it would be out of place at this time to do so, seeing that the situation is clear. I would, however, like to explain the position of my delegation on the question under discussion in the General Assembly.

21. On behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, I would like briefly to explain why, if the draft resolution submitted in document A/SPC/L.130/Rev.4, which appears now in the report of the Special Political Committee as resolution B [A/6603, para. 25], is put to the vote, my delegation will vote against it.

22. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always contended that the maintenance of international peace and security is the essential task of the United Nations. To this end, my country has given, and will continue to give, its support to any effort and any measure aimed at enabling the United Nations truly to play the role assigned to it under the Charter, so that it may become a more effective instrument for peace. That is a position of principle, deriving from the commitment which we assumed as a Member of this Organization.

23. It is also for the fundamental reason that we have always strenuously opposed, and will continue to oppose, certain Powers, first among them the United States of America, which are trying to convert the United Nations into an instrument for their imperialist and colonialist policies, the tragic consequences of which, particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America, are constantly being felt and are causing the peoples the most dreadful sufferings.

24. The effectiveness of our Organization is not weakened by constitutional defects, as some would have us believe; it is weakened, above all, by the policy of imperialist aggression and colonial oppression which certain powers continue to practise through their acts of interference in the domestic affairs of countries.

25. Those same Powers do all they can to oppose the legitimate aspirations of peoples to genuine national freedom and independence and assume officially one particular position, while, in practice, they act in a contrary fashion, which is opposed to the defence of the peoples' interests. Sometimes they are in favour of the peaceful settlement of problems and against the use of force—officially, of course; sometimes, they have no hesitation in employing the most brutal methods. But, in every case where they intervene, it is in order to defend their imperialist interests to the detriment of the peoples' aspirations for freedom and a better life.

26. There is no need to comment on the fact that the country whose policy is at the root of our Organization's present difficulties—I refer to the United States of America—and that behind the camouflage of a hypocritical concern for the effectiveness of the United Nations in the sphere of peace-keeping, is the same country whose Government is waging a barbarous war against a people whose only demand is to have the right of self-determination.

27. To strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations is, first and foremost, to oppose the policy of imperialist aggression and colonial oppression, to

fight resolutely for respect for, and implementation of, the purposes and principles of the Charter.

28. The delegations which are trying to undermine the foundations of the Charter (headed by the United States delegation) and also those which, for one reason or another, have shown themselves prepared to give their support to the Canadian text [A/6603, para. 6] should realize the heavy responsibility they are assuming.

29. The idea that the effectiveness of the United Nations could be strengthened by infringing its Charter must be rejected, for the tragedies of Korea and the Congo have dispelled all illusions on that point.

30. The General Assembly now has before it the report submitted by the Special Political Committee and a draft resolution dealing with so-called peace-keeping operations in all their aspects. This draft resolution has one main feature: without offering any solution to the problem under discussion within the framework of the Charter, it directs the future work of the United Nations on this subject onto a path that is inevitably leading to a new crisis for the Organization.

31. The draft resolution was submitted to the Special Political Committee by certain small countries which are not, however, involved in a policy which could lead to the destruction and disintegration of the United Nations. Yet this draft as a whole, and its various parts, represent a time-bomb laid at the very foundation of the United Nations structure.

32. Some speakers, in defending this draft resolution, have tried to represent it as well-balanced. That term "well-balanced" has not only, by this time, lost its original meaning but, in the light of certain developments within the Organization, is beginning to assume a completely opposite connotation.

33. Only a few days ago, it will be remembered, in an important body of the United Nations we were witnesses of a vote on another draft resolution which, according to certain Western Powers, was described as "balanced"; I refer to the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and adopted by the Security Council [resolution 232 (1966)] on the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the purpose of which was to prolong the colonial régime in that country. After that, they go so far as to describe as well-balanced a draft resolution such as the one which has been presented here.

34. If a draft resolution on the perpetuation of the apartheid régime and the colonial régime in Southern Rhodesia can be described as balanced, why not then use the description "balanced" for the draft resolution submitted by Canada and a number of other countries, a draft which will undermine the work of the United Nations. One may well ask.

35. According to the Charter, it is always the Security Council which deals with peace-keeping operations. That is a basic principle of the Charter and one of the best principles embodied in it. The Security Council has never imposed an intolerable financial burden on the small countries; it has never taken any decision that would have been detrimental to the interests of the peoples, particularly, those fighting

for their freedom, and those of the newly independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

36. If, in the past, wrong decisions have been taken, they were decisions taken, and operations carried out, in violation of the Charter and as a result of a decision of the General Assembly; that is to say, in the name of the so-called majority, but always, as the representative of France quite rightly pointed out the other day [1497th meeting], in the interest of a single country or group of countries.

37. In expressing its objections to the Canadian draft resolution, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria denounces any attempt to give to the General Assembly responsibilities which are of the exclusive province of the Security Council.

38. During the discussions in the Special Political Committee, the Bulgarian delegation stated its views [526th meeting] regarding the authorization, control, conduct and financing of future peace-keeping operations. Those views are based on the clear-cut division of powers between the Security Council and the General Assembly, and, primarily, on Article 11 (2) of the Charter, which provides:

"Any such question"—that is, one which relates to the maintenance of peace—"on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion."

39. Any decision which might contravene the provisions of the Charter, as is the case with the Canadian draft resolution, would be illegal. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, like other countries, incidentally, which have already stated their views, could never recognize such a decision, which would be contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

40. On the other hand, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is prepared to support any draft resolution which would be consistent with the Charter and likely to increase the effectiveness of the Organization in the sphere of maintaining peace, in conformity with the principles of the Charter. This applies to the draft resolution submitted by Jamaica, which appears in the report of the Special Political Committee in the form of draft resolution C [A/6603, para. 25].

41. It would be in the interest of our Organization to adopt a formula which would enable us, in an atmosphere of serenity, to go on seeking a solution that would strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining peace, while respecting the provisions of the Charter.

42. The Bulgarian delegation invites those delegations which sincerely believe it possible to achieve a better solution by disregarding the Charter, to reflect on the serious consequences of such an attitude. Like many other delegations, the Bulgarian delegation trusts that the United Nations will be able to overcome the difficulties it is now experiencing.

43. There can be no doubt that the future of our Organization depends to a large extent on the decision we shall adopt. That is why we think that the draft resolution just submitted by a number of countries, with Afghanistan at their head, [A/L.515], which would

refer the Special Political Committee's report on the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects to the fifth special session of the General Assembly to be held not later than 30 April 1967, deserves our support. We consider that that would be a wise decision on the part of the Assembly, because it would enable all delegations to make their position clear and weigh once more all the responsibilities that a delegation might have to shoulder by voting on draft resolutions which are not sufficiently prepared and which run counter to the United Nations Charter. Those are the reasons why we are going to support this draft resolution.

44. The PRESIDENT: With the consent of the representative of Guinea, who is next on my list, I shall call on the representative of Cyprus to introduce the amendment presented by his delegation.

45. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): On Saturday [1497th meeting], listening to the debate on this question of peace-keeping operations, I was very much impressed by what the representatives of the Soviet Union and France had said. They put forward the view that a crisis might result in the United Nations if what has become known as the Canadian draft resolution—that is draft resolution B now recommended by the Special Committee [A/6603, para. 25]—were to be adopted by the General Assembly because it contained what were called flagrant violations of the Charter and amendments to the Charter through a draft resolution which was in fact illegal as it was put forward. That was the view put forward by both the representative of France and the representative of the Soviet Union.

46. Looking at those statements we found that the really objectionable part of the draft resolution in question was paragraph 4, under which the General Assembly

"Invites Member States to communicate to the United Nations information concerning the kinds of military or civil forces or services which they might be in a position to provide, if they so decided, in response to a request to participate in a duly authorized United Nations peace-keeping operation".

47. I see that the representative of France has said that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution goes beyond the competence of the General Assembly when it invites—and I emphasize the word "invites"—Member States to make known to the United Nations and so on. Also, the representative of the Soviet Union says that a provision that States should communicate to the United Nations the types of personnel and equipment, as well as services which they might be in a position to provide in response to a request to participate is contrary to the Charter, and that that is quite clearly a prerogative of the Security Council.

48. I have not found any other specific mention in either statement with regard to this draft resolution. Hence, as the draft resolution in question was adopted by a sizable majority in the Special Political Committee, and probably would be adopted here, I therefore thought it my duty to bring to the notice of this Assembly that there could be an amendment to it which would make it compatible with the Charter in the view of everyone.

49. Therefore, I propose the following amendments [A/L.512]: that the invitation to the Member States, instead of being issued by the General Assembly, which is objected to by the Soviet Union, France and other Member States, should be issued by the Security Council in accordance with the statements I have referred to. To this end, the amendments propose that paragraph 4 should be deleted from the draft resolution and its provisions added in a different way under the recommendation to the Security Council, so that operative paragraph 5 would become operative paragraph 4 and would read as follows:

"Recommends to the Security Council:

"(a) That it authorize a study of the means of improving preparations . . .", and so on;

"(b) That it [that is, the Security Council] invite Member States to communicate—and I would say here, instead of "to the United Nations", "to the Security Council"—"information concerning the kinds of military or civil forces or services which they might be in a position to provide, if they so decided, in response to a request to participate in a duly authorized United Nations peace-keeping operation . . ."

I would stop at that point and delete the words "of a non-enforcement nature", replacing them by the words "by the Security Council".

50. I hope this revised amendment takes away all the objectionable parts from the draft resolution in question. I have looked through the draft resolution to see whether other parts of it violate the Charter, and I found that when it speaks of the General Assembly having

"the right to discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and the right to make recommendations on any such question",

this in accordance with the Charter, the only necessary addition being "in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter". I make that amendment verbally because, under the provisions of the Charter, this right of the General Assembly to make recommendations is subject to Article 12, which provides that if the Security Council is exercising its own functions in respect of the dispute in question, the General Assembly should not exercise those functions.

51. Therefore I suggest that sub-paragraph (b) of the third paragraph of the preamble should say at the end: "... in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter".

52. The following paragraph of the draft resolution provides this; therefore, it is within the provisions of the Charter. It states that:

"... if the Security Council is unable to adopt decisions, the General Assembly, which bears its share of responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security, may consider the matter in accordance with the Charter . . ."

This means subject to the provisions of Article 12 of the Charter.

53. Therefore, to summarize, I think that, if these amendments were made, the draft resolution—whatever the feelings towards it—at least, would not offend against the Charter in any way, either in its preamble or in its operative paragraphs.

54. Whether it is good otherwise or not is another matter, but the essential issue has been that it violates the Charter, and it is our interest, as Members of the United Nations, to see to it that no resolution is adopted which violates the Charter. I think the most effective way to prevent it from violating the Charter would be to amend the relevant paragraphs. There are other views about the way to deal with this matter, and we fully respect them, but I think the first step would be to alter the resolution so that there is no question of its violating the Charter.

55. If a resolution is to be sent to the Special Committee, it would certainly be more constructive if a better resolution were sent, one that did not violate the Charter, than if a resolution were to go to the Special Committee which violated the Charter or which was suspected of in any way violating the Charter.

56. Therefore, my amendments remain as submitted with the difference that instead of saying "communicate to the United Nations" we say "communicate to the Security Council", and we strike out the words "of a non-enforcement nature", so as not to have it binding in any way, and add there "United Nations peace-keeping operation duly authorized by the Security Council".

57. These are the amendments I would propose to paragraph 4 and the one amendment to the third preambular paragraph which would add the words "in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter" at the end of sub-paragraph (b).

58. I think that in this way the draft resolution would become quite different and the question of having adopted a resolution which violates the Charter would never arise. That is my interest in coming here—to prevent the possibility of a resolution violating the Charter or suspected of violating the Charter being adopted by the General Assembly.

59. Mr. T. O. DOS MU-JOHNSON (Liberia): When my delegation agreed to the adjournment of the vote on a draft resolution of which we are co-sponsors, we did so because we thought we should give another chance to the Committee of Thirty-three to study the item, as outlined in the so-called Canadian draft resolution [A/6603, para. 25, draft resolution B] which was approved by the Special Political Committee and which is now before this Assembly for ratification. I shall explain my vote on this draft resolution at a later stage in this intervention, and I shall now address myself to the so-called Jamaican resolution [*ibid.*, draft resolution C].

60. I must say that this draft resolution, like everything that has been done here touching on this issue, is so confusing to me that I really do not know where I am. I asked myself whether I was in the United Nations or at a political meeting somewhere back home.

61. The Jamaican draft resolution, in my opinion, ignores the basic issue with which this Assembly is concerned. In short, it puts the cart before the

horse. Our chief concern at this stage is peace-keeping financing, on which the draft resolution is absolutely silent. How can we marshal guns, armaments, ships, planes and troops without a budget. Its only contribution, as I see it, is to disenfranchise in perpetuity 117 Member States which are not permanent members of the Security Council—especially the African States, which have no permanent seat in the Security Council.

62. The Africans have no bargaining power in the Security Council. Any question affecting African interests can be thrown out of the Security Council because the African States cannot veto any question that comes before it. This Jamaican draft resolution is just a resolution for the permanent members of the Security Council to enable the power of the entire Organization to be kept in the hands of five States Members, and this is the bone of contention.

63. This draft resolution does not stipulate any deadline for reporting conclusions to the General Assembly. I would go further and say that if it is voted into law it would inhibit progressive action in any other direction for a long time, in view of the fact that States would have to ratify the decision which it provides for in its mention of Article 43 of the Charter to which operative paragraph 1 refers.

64. The draft resolution is in grave error in that it makes no recommendation for the disposition of the Committee of Thirty-three. If a Committee has been appointed before, one cannot just throw it out, and I think that any resolution which is introduced must make some mention of that Committee.

65. The third preambular paragraph of this draft resolution is contentious. It creates a problem where none exists in the Charter. If it is adopted, it will undermine the stability, the harmony, the dignity and the prestige of our Organization more than any action now before this Assembly, and thus widen the seeming disparity between the two important organs of the United Nations.

66. This draft resolution, with all deference to its sponsors and supporters, seeks also to minimize the status of the General Assembly and it thereby seeks to subordinate 117 Members of the United Nations to the whims and caprices of the five Members of the witenagemot. This is contrary to what the founding fathers of the United Nations contemplated and intended. In the circumstances, I implore the Members of this Assembly to vote against this draft resolution.

67. In supporting draft resolution B, we are conscious that it does not give us exactly what we desire under draft resolution A; but we are prepared to go along and give the Committee of Thirty-three another chance. In essence, it is a balanced draft resolution which does not interfere in any way, shape or form with the Security Council. It is within the competence and jurisdiction of the General Assembly to adopt this draft resolution. The Charter is quite clear on this score. The greatest contribution that the framers of our Charter made was to couch the Charter in such simple language that even an elementary school-boy can understand its wording. Draft resolution B adheres strictly and incontrovertibly to the Charter provisions regarding the functions and powers of the

General Assembly. Article 10 is clear beyond all shadow of a doubt on the validity of this draft resolution.

68. I should like to quote the relevant part of the Charter on this score; but as there seems to exist so much confusion as a result of fragmentary citations of the Charter perhaps it would be better for me to read sections in full. I shall quote for the Assembly the relevant paragraphs of the Charter that deal with the functions and powers of the General Assembly. I shall take the time to read them so that this may be clear to everyone. Article 10 of the Charter states:

"The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organ provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12,"

and what does Article 12 say? It says that when the Security Council is seized of an issue, when it is already discussing such an issue, the General Assembly cannot undertake to discuss it. That is the only time when the Assembly is prohibited from dealing with any question. I continue to quote from Article 10:

"may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council"

we can make recommendations to the Members, and not only to the Security Council as some of us are inclined to believe

"or to both on any such questions or matters".

69. Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Charter states:

"The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10."

Therefore, the General Assembly has the right to discuss any question that may come before it, and not only simple questions. On peace and security Article 11 states:

"1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security..."

The General Assembly may do that. We go further and come to the question of financing, which is the crux of this debate. Article 14 expressly states:

"Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations,"

70. The Charter is very clear about financing, which has been talked about so much. Article 17 states:

"1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the Organization.

"2. The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly"—not "by the Security Council," but "by the General Assembly".

"3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in Article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned."

71. I have laboured the point because we are told that we are not supposed to do anything in the General Assembly. We must go like the sheep of Panurge to the Security Council before we can do anything. But the Charter is quite clear on this. With regard to any question, even the Security Council is supposed to report, through the Secretary-General, to the General Assembly, and not the General Assembly to the Security Council. The issue is quite clear.

72. I shall not labour this point further, but permit me to say that when a great soul sacrifices himself for a humanitarian cause we, as human beings, invariably erect monuments to his memory. If we adopt this draft resolution, we shall be erecting a monument to one of the indefatigable workers of this Organization who laboured throughout his life for peace and progress in the United Nations and left behind his footprints on the sands of time. Every member of the Special Political Committee will recall that, for the adoption of this draft resolution, our late colleague, the most revered Ambassador Belaunde of Peru, performed his last act in the United Nations. For its adoption he made his last and most soul-stirring speech. He voted for it and went home and died.

73. Nothing will be more pleasing to me—and to him in his valley of ever-lasting peace—than the knowledge that his last sacrificial speech and his death have not been in vain. If for no other reason than to give him peace and satisfaction my delegation will vote for draft resolution B. I implore you to honour him by casting an affirmative vote. If adopted by the General Assembly, this draft resolution may come to be known and referred to with due deference as the "Belaunde resolution", in recognition of his unwearying concern for humanity and the probity and morality which were the hallmarks of his unforgettable personal and political life. It should be supported by all who knew him to allay the displeasure of all who see the role of the Security Council as inconsistent with the democratic powers of our Organization and thereby to strengthen immeasurably the Charter and the principles for which it stands.

74. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I would remind representatives that the Assembly has before it the recommendations of the Special Political Committee and one new draft resolution and two amendments presented to the plenary meeting. As far as the recommendations of the Special Political Committee are concerned, we are at the stage of explanations of vote. Of course representatives may make any observations they wish on the other proposals, but when they speak about the recommendations of the Committee I hope they will keep in mind that, in accordance with the decision of the Assembly, statements should be limited to explanations of vote.

75. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Particularly after the statement by the representative of Liberia, I have no

difficulty whatsoever, Mr. President, in following your injunction that at this stage there is no need to follow the trail leading to red herrings invoked by those who wish to postpone a decision on the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Special Political Committee. My remarks will be restricted to the new draft resolution [A/L.515].

76. A decision to give priority to this new draft resolution, in my judgement, would represent a substantive action by this Assembly. If such a decision is taken and if subsequently draft resolution A/L.515 is adopted, then draft resolutions B and C in the Special Political Committee's report will not come to a vote at this session. That means that the twenty-first session of the General Assembly will end without any substantive step forward in the field of peace-keeping. Since we believe, with our co-sponsors, that that would be regrettable, not only as regards the interests of enhancing the utility and ability of the United Nations in the field of peace-keeping but also as regards the repute of the General Assembly, we shall oppose the move for priority for draft resolution A/L.515.

77. Moreover, we believe that the motion for priority put forward by the sponsors of this draft resolution is not in accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which states:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the General Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted."

78. The proposals contained in draft resolutions B and C, which remain to be voted on, were introduced some time ago and were reintroduced by the Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee today before the introduction of the procedural motion contained in document A/L.515, which I believe is really a substantive alternative draft resolution. Therefore I urge that we vote against the latter and proceed to the vote on the report of the Committee as we should have done some time ago.

79. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): My delegation is a co-sponsor, with the delegations of Ireland and other countries, of a draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee, but, in agreement with the delegation of Ireland and other co-sponsors, we have asked that that draft should not be voted on in the Assembly. As proposal B, submitted by Canada and other countries, maintains the same general principles as those of the proposal by Ireland and eleven other countries, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution B recommended in the Special Political Committee's report and will oppose the request that priority be given to the eighteen-Power draft resolution submitted today [A/L.515].

80. My delegation believes that in essence we are discussing the powers of the General Assembly and its competence to deal with questions of peace. In this regard all the General Assembly resolutions adopted in previous years reaffirmed the Assembly's functions under the Charter, particularly Article 1, and today we cannot beat a retreat without damaging the Organization's prestige. We believe that the

General Assembly's primary mission is to ensure compliance with the United Nations Charter, the Preamble to which affirms that the Organization's main purpose is to maintain international peace and security.

81. For those reasons my delegation will vote in the manner I indicated.

82. Mr. NGUZA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (translated from French): In my statements in the Special Political Committee [526th and 545th meetings], I clearly indicated the reasons which inclined my delegation to vote in favour of the so-called Irish text [A/6603, para. 4], and also the text submitted by Canada and by other delegations [*ibid.*, para. 6]. As the Irish text has been withdrawn by its sponsors, we are now left with only the text submitted by the Canadian delegation.

83. I do not propose, then, to restate the reasons constituting our fundamental position on this subject. Both in the Committee and in the General Assembly, the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has always been in favour of the principle of consultation and of allowing delegations time for reflection.

84. In the Committee, two weeks were allowed for consultations to be carried on, and we know the results. In the General Assembly, we agreed last Saturday that a further period for reflection should be allowed to delegations. The result of those consultations has been the submission of a short draft resolution [A/L.515]. My delegation was never consulted, directly or indirectly, on the preparation of a draft. We are, therefore, very surprised to be confronted with a text said to be from the non-aligned countries. My delegation has grave doubts about the need to refer this question back again to the Committee of Thirty-three which, as we are aware, has done its best but, it must be admitted, has presented us with a record of failure.

85. The conditions which prevailed then and which are at the root of this state of affairs, do not seem, in the view of my delegation, to have changed and, consequently, it is still more convinced today than ever, after listening to the discussions that are going on at this late hour of the day, that it is useless to refer the question back.

86. Moreover, a session has been convened for April 1967 to discuss the question of South West Africa. We run the risk of finding ourselves then in the same situation as today and the same arguments might be raised for referring the question to the following session.

87. Finally, the argument that we should avoid resolutions imposed by any majority whatever does not convince my delegation and I am tempted to say that it shocks our delegation very deeply. How, then, could we vote? If we do not want to have the majority impose its will, I think that the Members of the Assembly will be inclined to believe with me that it is even more inadmissible for a minority, whatever it might be, to impose its will on the majority.

88. My delegation has always been in favour of the principle of negotiation but it believes that sufficient

time has been given delegations for that purpose. The Democratic Republic of the Congo will not, therefore, be able to support the new proposal to defer this question until later and, consequently, my delegation will not give its support to the motion for priority voting to be granted to this draft resolution. Our basic position remains the same; my delegation retains its entire freedom of action and will vote in favour of the Canadian draft resolution.

89. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly proceeds to vote on the various proposals, I should like to state that the normal order would be to vote on draft resolution A, then on draft resolution B, and finally on draft resolution C. Concerning draft resolution B, of course, the amendments should be voted upon first. A formal request has been made by the representative of Ireland that draft resolution A should not be put to a vote. If there is no objection to that proposal, I shall take it that it is accepted by the Assembly.

It was so decided.

90. The PRESIDENT: Now I should like to consult the General Assembly on the question of the priority which has been asked for draft resolution A/L.515 over the draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee. I have made an appeal to the Assembly, and would repeat that appeal. The question is very clear. Priority has been asked and priority has been opposed. I think it would be best to proceed without any procedural discussion to a vote on the question of priority.

91. A roll-call vote has been requested on the question of priority, but I would suggest that, as the Assembly has agreed in previous cases, it should agree now to a recorded vote. ^{1/}

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Beylorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Iraq,

^{1/} For the procedure for taking recorded votes, see 1495th meeting, paras. 31-32.

Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela.

The motion was adopted by 49 votes to 41, with 27 abstentions.

92. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision that has just been taken, we shall proceed to vote on draft resolution A/L.515. Before proceeding to this vote, however, the General Assembly may wish to have a statement on the financial implications.

93. I am advised that if the special session can accommodate this additional item without any extension of the duration originally envisaged, namely, three weeks, then no additional cost will be involved. For each week of extension of the session beyond three weeks, an additional expenditure of \$30,000 per week will be entailed.

94. I now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.515.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Cameroon, Ceylon, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Tunisia, Uganda.

The draft resolution was adopted by 56 votes to 36, with 25 abstentions.

95. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution C.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 19 votes to 7, with 91 abstentions.

96. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

97. Mr. MISHRA (India): I am sorry to take the floor at this stage, but evidently the purport of our draft resolution, which was presented by the representative of Algeria here, was not very clear. If the Assembly

has adopted, as it has now done, the draft resolution contained in document A/L.515, then the entire report of the Special Political Committee is to be referred to the special session. We cannot vote on one resolution, and withdraw another resolution, and not vote on a third resolution. Therefore, I would beg of you, Mr. President, to consider whether it was necessary to vote on draft resolution C as was done a little earlier.

98. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

99. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): While agreeing with the point made by the representative of India, since a vote has been taken on one of the draft resolutions in the report of the Special Political Committee, I would request a vote on draft resolution B to at least equalize the situation.

100. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jamaica on a point of order.

101. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): The Jamaica delegation wishes to speak to the point of order that has been raised by the representative of India. Jamaica's position in this matter is well known, but, unfortunately, Jamaica cannot lend its support to a procedure that is likely to go counter to what we regard as good order.

102. When the proposal made by the delegation of Algeria was put to the vote, we understood it to be a proposal that the whole report would be referred to the special session. The Jamaica delegation did not agree with it; we did not vote for it; we abstained. But we do understand the effect of the affirmative vote on the Algerian request for priority to be that the whole report will go to the special session of the Assembly. Therefore, we did not expect that there would have been a vote on draft resolution C at this stage.

103. This is Jamaica's understanding, and it seems to us that we would be going further in a direction which is undesirable if we voted not merely on draft resolution C but on draft resolution B. Jamaica would prefer to accept the decision of the Assembly, however, whatever our view of the decision might be, and not record the vote that has been taken on draft resolution C.

104. I do not know what the procedure is in this regard. If the vote has been taken, and it has to be recorded, that is the position. But Jamaica did not expect the vote to be taken once we had adopted the priority draft resolution and agreed to refer the whole report of the Special Political Committee to another session of the Assembly.

105. The PRESIDENT: If there is no other speaker—and I hope there is none—may I clarify the situation. As far as I remember—and, unfortunately, the verbatim record is not ready yet, although I have asked for it—the reference in the Algerian delegation's statement in introducing its draft resolution was only with regard to draft resolution B.

106. As the Assembly knows, that may be a point of clarification for the benefit of the understanding of the representative of India who said that the purpose was not clear. It was because of that that I did not put

draft resolution B to a vote after the adoption of the Algerian draft resolution, and did not put to the vote any of the amendments to it. After that, I declared that we could then proceed to vote on draft resolution C. At that time any Member could have raised the question that was raised after the vote had been taken. The mere fact that nineteen delegations voted in favour, and seven opposed it, while ninety-one abstained, means that there was no objection, on the part of any of the Members present and voting, to putting it to a vote. Therefore, it is a decision of the Assembly, taken by the Assembly.

107. I am in the hands of the Assembly. If I hear no objection, and since I have declared it adopted as a decision of the Assembly, I shall, as President, adhere to that declaration. But if there is any other suggestion, I shall be happy to consider it if it would meet with the consent of the Members of the Assembly.

108. I call on the representative of Guinea.

109. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): When the draft resolution, of which my delegation had the honour to be a sponsor [A/515], was introduced, there may have been some mistake in interpretation but the draft itself is clear: it provides for the report of the Special Political Committee to be referred to the Special Session.

110. That report must be taken as a whole, including all the draft resolutions contained in it.

111. My delegation, of course, accepts your explanation, Mr. President, but it draws the conclusion that the Assembly as a whole made a mistake by agreeing to have a vote taken on the draft resolution of Jamaica—draft resolution C of the Committee—which my delegation, incidentally, supported.

112. The situation is simple: I think that the Assembly should courageously recognize that it made a mistake and decide that no vote was taken on the Jamaican draft resolution. In short, the Assembly should state that the vote just taken was not a proper one and should act as though it had not been taken, so that the whole report of the Special Political Committee should be transmitted to the Committee of Thirty-three. I propose this as a formal motion.

113. The PRESIDENT: The suggestion made by the representative of Guinea comes under rule 83 of the rules of procedure. That rule reads as follows:

"When a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be immediately put to the vote."

114. Is there any representative who wishes to speak against the motion? There is none, and I now put the motion of the delegation of Guinea to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma,

Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, Congo (Democratic Republic), Costa Rica, Cuba, Ghana, Greece, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia.

The motion was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

115. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that as a result of the adoption of this motion the vote which was previously taken shall not appear in the records as a resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

116. I call on the representative of Mexico in explanation of vote.

117. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The General Assembly has adopted the draft resolution [A/L.515] submitted by the delegation of Algeria and seventeen other delegations, and my delegation voted in favour. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations is requested to continue reviewing the whole question of peace-keeping operations and to report to the General Assembly at its fifth special session.

118. My delegation considers that the guidelines for the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, of which my delegation is a member, should be as follows: first, it should examine in detail each of the resolutions approved by the Special Political Committee as very important contributions to the solution of one of the most urgent problems confronting the Organization; second, it should continue, in conformity with resolution 2053 A (XX), its comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, and in particular study: (a) the various methods of financing peace-keeping operations, with due attention to the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council, the developing countries' relatively limited capacity to contribute to the expenses of such operations, the need to give special consideration to the position of any Member State or Member States which are victims of aggression and of States which participate in events or actions leading to

peace-keeping operations; (b) to give special attention to the installations, services and personnel Member States might voluntarily contribute for a peace-keeping operation.

119. Similarly, the Special Committee should study a possible recommendation to the Security Council on means of improving peace-keeping operations as well as on an inquiry into the possibility of negotiating agreements with Member States under which armed forces, assistance and facilities would be made available to the Security Council, on its call, in accordance with Article 43 and Article 47, paragraph 2 of the Charter. These points will form part of the report the Special Committee is to submit to the General Assembly's fifth special session.

AGENDA ITEMS 30, 89 AND 91

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (concluded)

Conclusion of an international treaty on the principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, the moon and other celestial bodies (concluded)

Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies (concluded)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6621)

120. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): It is indeed fitting that the treaty on outer space should come before the General Assembly as the twenty-first session draws to a close, for this extraordinary document provides at the same time a momentous finale to the work of this session and a note of progress, co-operation and hope from which future sessions may derive inspiration and light.

121. On this historic occasion the United States would like to join the other nations that have acknowledged a special debt to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to the space and non-space Powers alike, without whose contributions this treaty would never have been possible. I should of course like to extend our thanks and appreciation to Mr. Waldheim and Mr. Lachs for their leadership in this great effort.

122. This is, in every sense of the word, a United Nations treaty, in which all Member nations can justly take great pride. It has been negotiated under the auspices of the Organization and is the fruit of its labours. The treaty furthers the aims of the Charter by greatly reducing the danger of international conflict and by promoting the prospects of international co-operation for the common interest in the newest realm of human activity.

123. This Treaty is an important step towards peace. It takes place in an historic progression: the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, the limited test ban Treaty of 1963, and now this treaty.

124. We hope and trust that this series of peace-building agreements will continue to grow. Nothing would make the United States happier than if a treaty against the proliferation of nuclear weapons should

soon be added as the fourth compact on this historic list. Thus, step by step we shall advance the rule of law into further areas of the relations between States.

125. It is with great satisfaction that the United States will vote for draft resolution II, in the report of the First Committee [A/6621, para. 19] which commends the treaty on outer space and expresses the hope for the widest possible adherence to this treaty, a hope we share in full measure and full confidence.

126. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation intends to vote for the draft resolution of the First Committee approving a "Treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies" [A/6621, para. 19, draft resolution II]. The draft treaty formulated in the United Nations Committee on Outer Space and its Legal Sub-Committee is the result of the collective efforts of several delegations [*ibid.*, draft resolution II, Annex].

127. The draft treaty under consideration represents the substantial result of the unremitting efforts which the Soviet Union, over a series of years, beginning with the launching in our country of the world's first space satellite, has devoted to the solution of the important legal problems with which the development of rocket technology, outer space exploration and navigation have confronted mankind.

128. In continuation of its consistent efforts to solve the juridical problems of outer space, the Soviet Union on 30 May 1966 proposed for consideration at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, as an important agenda item, the question of concluding a treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, the moon and other celestial bodies and submitted an appropriate draft treaty [A/6341].

129. We can today note that the broad, fundamental approach to a definition of the important juridical norms of outer space activities, which was the basis of the Soviet draft treaty, has won the support of the members of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space and has been embodied in the treaty.

130. We attach great importance to the fact that during the framing of the draft treaty the important Soviet proposal which prohibits the launching into orbit round the earth and into outer space of objects carrying nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction received the widest support and was reflected in the treaty.

131. Another very important provision of the treaty is the prohibition of the use of the moon and other celestial bodies for military purposes.

132. It should, however, be noted that, important as is the treaty on outer space, the fact must not for a moment be overlooked that the most important problems of disarmament, and, above all, of nuclear disarmament, still remain unresolved. For all its importance, the treaty on outer space cannot, of course, be regarded as a kind of substitute for those agreements, which should ensure the solution of the vitally important problems of disarmament and remove for-

ever the threat of nuclear war. These highly important problems must be resolved without delay.

133. In evaluating the treaty, we would like to stress the point that we regard the preparation of the treaty and its approval by the General Assembly as a victory for the peace-loving forces in the struggle against those who advocate using outer space for purposes of provocation and aggression.

134. In the light of the foregoing considerations, the Soviet delegation expresses the hope that the General Assembly will unanimously approve the world's first treaty on outer space.

135. The Soviet delegation will also vote for the draft resolution of the First Committee on the holding in September 1967 in Vienna of an international conference on the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space, and also for the draft resolution on the report of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space [*ibid.*, para. 19, draft resolution I and III]. For a number of years the Soviet Union has been advocating in United Nations organs the need to hold an international conference which would draw up a balance-sheet of outer space exploration for the first decade of the space era and outline the prospects for future work, including the prospects of making practical use of space science and technology for the requirements of the economic and cultural development of the developing countries. We trust that this draft resolution will be supported by the General Assembly.

136. Mr. VINCI (Italy): We believe that the year 1966 has been a very good year in the field of space research. While United States and Soviet astronauts were establishing new space records and making enormous contributions to human knowledge, we at the United Nations have been trying to keep up with the fast moving front-line spacemen by accelerating the pace of our second-line space activities.

137. The results have been rewarding. A decision has been reached to organize a United Nations sponsored conference on the practical applications deriving from space activities for the benefit of mankind. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has elaborated new proposals and ways to increase international co-operation in outer space activities. And, the most important achievement of all, the Legal Sub-Committee has produced the text of a treaty on outer space which has been unanimously accepted by the First Committee.

138. Almost five centuries ago, shortly after Columbus' first voyage across the Atlantic, two of the main Powers of those times dealt with the division of their spheres of influence in a Treaty that was officially concluded in Tordesillas in 1494. Only two years had elapsed since the discovery of the New World. That Treaty comes naturally to mind when one considers the treaty on outer space now before this world Assembly. For the first time in the history of mankind, all countries, and in the first instance the two world Powers of the day, are not searching for new territorial conquests or for the expansion of their sovereign rights. On the contrary, they aim only at scientific and technological conquests in the new continents of outer space, which become not the provinces of single Powers, but the province of mankind as a whole. For

the first time in the wake of our first space explorations, national, religious and ideological concepts are put aside, and in their place the ideas of peace and of the unity of all men, regardless of their religion, creed or colour, are solemnly affirmed.

139. Finally, this treaty has one exploitation only as its aim, that of giving to mankind all the possible benefits that can derive from the opening of a new immense frontier.

140. For these reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution I and draft resolution II contained in the report of the First Committee [A/6621, para. 19]. We urge the unanimous approval of those draft resolutions.

141. The United Nations, in paying a tribute to those who have made this achievement possible, in the first place the two major space Powers, can be proud at having inspired and sponsored the establishing of this milestone, which marks the translation into international law of new ideas adjusted to the reality of a rapidly shrinking world, where all countries are neighbours and have to live together as good friends and brothers.

142. However imperfect this treaty may be, it raises our hopes that its main provisions, especially those outlawing war in outer space and establishing the first example of control in the field of disarmament, will have far-reaching effects on earth and will, first of all, speed up the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

143. Finally, we are pleased that this twenty-first session of the General Assembly is coming to a close under your leadership, Mr. President, on this happy and bright note.

144. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): As the French delegation had the honour of speaking twice in the First Committee on the items relating to outer space [1491st and 1492nd meetings], I wish today to make only a few remarks which I believe are called for by our interesting discussions on Friday and Saturday last.

145. Regarding what may be called the Vienna Space Conference of 1967, the French delegation is gratified to find that draft resolution I [A/6621, para. 19] was adopted unanimously by the First Committee. It earnestly hopes that the Plenary Assembly will do the same and that the relevant Secretariat services will as soon as possible tackle the complex task of preparing for that gathering to which my country wishes every success.

146. Regarding the draft treaty annexed to draft resolution II [*ibid.*], my delegation listened with great attention to the thirty-odd speakers who gave their views on that subject the day before yesterday. As a co-sponsor of the original draft resolution [*ibid.*, para. 10], we were, of course very happy that it was adopted by acclamation. We were, however, also among those who, following our colleague, Mr. Manfred Lachs, pointed out that this treaty is only, as it were, the first chapter of the law of outer space on which much still remains to be done.

147. Without going back to the uncertainties or the defects of the treaty itself--many did so pertinently

on Saturday, more particularly, the representative of India—I would emphasize, with all the necessary clarity, the importance attached by my Government to having this text amplified and, on some essential points, clarified by further negotiations.

148. As we all know, it was at my delegation's request that in draft resolution II a provision, which we regard as essential, was introduced, in which the Committee on Outer Space is requested

"To begin... the study of questions relative to the definition of outer space and the utilization of outer space and celestial bodies".

149. The last words refer to a number of problems that we did not wish to enumerate. We are, however, happy with the addition proposed, with good intent, by our colleagues from Chile, Mexico and the United Arab Republic [*Ibid.*, para. 16] which, at the end of sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 4, specifies certain of those problems, namely, those involving the various consequences of space communications.

150. The Committee on Outer Space will next year report to us on the work done on these questions and also, of course, on the problems of assistance and liability. Far from regretting the delay, we believe the Committee, relieved of the necessity of having to work with undue haste, will be able to give consideration to the advances made in space science and technology and consider the legal implications of those advances as they occur.

151. It is in this spirit that my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution II, and the draft resolutions dealing with the other space questions.

152. The PRESIDENT: The representatives who had asked to make statements have now been heard. We now proceed to hear the speakers who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

153. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania): Although there is virtual unanimity on the question before us, my delegation nevertheless wants to bring in a note of discord. Two days ago the main Political Committee of this Assembly approved a draft resolution concerning a treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. It was asserted in the statements of many representatives, and controverted by none, that this resolution concerned a matter of great importance and that its adoption by this Assembly would be a historic event. It will therefore not be considered inappropriate by anyone if I take this opportunity to express the reasons why my delegation has certain reservations with regard to some of the provisions and with regard to the procedure that has been adopted in connexion with this matter.

154. No Government has a greater desire than my own to halt the manufacture, use and movement of nuclear weapons, nor do we yield to anyone in our hope that the progress of exploration in outer space will be peaceful and co-operative and will result in manifold benefits for all mankind. Our doubts and reservations, however, arise from certain moral, legal and political considerations surrounding certain procedures in the substantive aspects of the draft treaty annexed to draft resolution II.

155. My delegation shares what appears to be the predominant view, namely the need for an appropriate treaty governing the exploration and the use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. Every effort and achievement towards this end is commendable, and my delegation accordingly expresses its appreciation of the devotion of all whose contributions have culminated in the formulation of the draft treaty now before us. This draft treaty has great implications and is of far-reaching consequences. It therefore naturally follows that before any State can in any way commit itself to the contents thereof, it must be accorded ample time and opportunity to scrutinize the provisions of the treaty until it is convinced that, taking all pertinent factors into consideration, that State can approve, accede to or commend the treaty.

156. It will be recalled that the drafting of this treaty was completed only very recently, in fact after this session of the General Assembly had already started. It is probable that the completed draft of the treaty has not yet been seen by many of the Foreign Offices of the delegations represented here, let alone been approved by their Governments. Different States of course have different constitutional procedures for approving international agreements or for expressing that approval. As for my delegation, however, we find it difficult to commend a treaty, as we are asked to do in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which our Government has not had the opportunity to approve.

157. Several representatives have expressed a reservation regarding article IV of the draft treaty; other representatives have expressed a reservation and exposed the possible different interpretations and loop-holes regarding the other articles of the draft treaty. I shall not repeat or elaborate upon those reservations. It appears to my delegation that they are serious enough to warrant caution regarding the use of a word like "commend", which indicates approval after adequate study, rather than a non-committal phrase such as "takes note", which my delegation would have considered more appropriate in the circumstances. Surely, little would have been lost and much might have been gained in any ambiguity of language and certainty regarding the extent of obligations assumed if the co-sponsors of this draft resolution had deferred asking the General Assembly to commend the draft treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and the other celestial bodies, at least until the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had made greater progress in the study of the question relative to the definition of outer space and the utilization of outer space and the celestial bodies. As it is, however, the adoption of the present draft resolution by this Assembly may well have been an intended effect of a hollow victory, particularly with respect to the disarmament provision of article IV, because of the difficulty of ascertaining the extent of the limits regarding the prescribed behaviour.

158. There is a hint of a global legislative authority in certain articles of the draft treaty, notably articles I, II and XII. That legislative authority, whether or

not implicit in Articles 2, 10 and 11 of the United Nations Charter, can be morally based only on the principle of universality of membership of this Organization. As is well known, that principle has been sadly abused in this Assembly, the latest instance occurring just a few days ago at this very session. Certain delegations apparently believe that it is possible to apply that principle arbitrarily when it serves their purposes. It would apparently serve certain purposes if the principle of universality were observed with regard to signature of the draft treaty, according to article XIV of the treaty, where it is described as "open to all States".

159. However, how much stronger would have been the moral basis for assuming global legislative jurisdiction if all States or, at any rate, all those lawfully entitled to be represented, had been permitted to participate in this session of the General Assembly.

160. I have taken pains to explain the position of my delegation on this important draft resolution so that our motives and objectives will not be misunderstood. That our actions are not motivated by either apathy or eccentricity is, I think, manifest from our affirmative votes on the two other resolutions concerning outer space contained in the report of the First Committee [A/6621, para. 19].

161. At the same time, however, while respecting the noble purpose and the patient sincerity of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution concerning the draft treaty, the sincerely held principles of my own delegation make it difficult for us to approve the draft for the reasons which I have indicated.

162. It cannot be denied that even at first glance the draft treaty has some excellent provisions. Equally true, here and there one finds some inconsistencies, unexplained loop-holes, and missing links which strengthen the need for more time for scrutiny than had hitherto been granted to most delegations.

163. In the final analysis, my delegation has decided upon the vote it will cast upon this draft resolution by reference to its role as a non-aligned State. That role, in the humble opinion of my delegation, is to do all it can to mitigate the harsh effect and acute tension of the cold war. If the parties and the alignment in the cold war have changed or are changing, that does not necessarily make the task of the non-aligned States less urgent or imperative. On the contrary, it impels us towards the perspective which transcends the confines of United Nations participation and authorization.

164. The irony of the situation may permit us to celebrate here a triumph achieved on the ashes of principles and policies which would more effectively enable us to reach our goal of international peace, co-operation and progress. It would not be the wish of my delegation that this day of apparent triumph should be alloyed.

165. Taking into account what happened in the First Committee, my delegation has no intention of standing in the way of the Assembly. We hope, however, that the reservations which we have expressed will be reflected in the record of the proceedings of this meeting.

166. Mr. HAMEED (Ceylon): My delegation wishes to make a brief explanation of its vote on the draft resolution regarding the treaty before us because of the importance the decision which we are about to take will have on international peace and security.

167. We on our part are gratified and appreciative that the two major space Powers should have overcome their differences, thus indicating their awareness of the general expectation that a comprehensive, legal and political framework must be worked out to regulate activities in outer space.

168. We are satisfied with the positive tenor of the text of the draft treaty. The emphasis is most appropriately on the peaceful character which must be a fundamental element in any activity in outer space.

169. However, my delegation has a reservation as to the use of certain words in the treaty which may not greatly contribute to the general objective of the treaty. Here we note with satisfaction that the treaty, when it comes into force, will prohibit nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in outer space. But from the omission of the word "moon" in the first paragraph of article IV, we note with disappointment that they are not so prohibited on the moon.

170. Similarly, the second paragraph of article IV prohibits military manoeuvres and all other kinds of military activities on celestial bodies. Here, again, we note with disappointment that military activities are not prohibited in outer space and on the moon. My delegation phrased this query on a previous occasion and requested the co-sponsors of the draft resolution to explain the apparently imprecise use of these words in article IV alone. Having received no clarification, my delegation wishes to record its reservations on article IV and our hope that by implication it will not give a license for military activities in outer space and on the moon. In that case, the lofty objective of the treaty would be negated.

171. With that general understanding, which we would like clearly to put on record, my delegation supports this treaty with a deep conviction that it is a contribution to the pursuit of international peace and security, and any implication contrary to the lofty objective is not condoned by our positive vote.

172. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote, seriatim, on the three draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee [A/6621, para. 19].

173. Draft resolution I is entitled "United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space". The report of the Fifth Committee [A/6627] contains the financial implications which would result from the adoption of this draft resolution. In the absence of any request for a vote, may I consider draft resolution I as unanimously adopted by the General Assembly?

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

174. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies". The First Committee adopted this draft resolution unanimously.

May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

175. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III, entitled "Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space", was also adopted unanimously by the First Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly likewise adopts it unanimously?

Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.

176. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the Secretary-General who wishes to make a statement.

177. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have asked for the privilege of addressing the General Assembly today, because of the importance of this occasion and because of the significance the decisions you have just made will have for mankind as a whole and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

178. On this occasion, I should like to congratulate the Assembly on the success of its work relating to the peaceful uses of outer space. I trust that it is no less fruitful than that of the scientists and engineers who have continued to make extraordinary advances in the exploration of space itself.

179. I am sure that I speak for all Members and all peoples in expressing deep satisfaction at the progress that has been made towards an international treaty to govern the activities of States in space. I know too that people everywhere share my hope that the agreement will come into force without delay.

180. While I am gratified by the progress made so far, I note with regret that the door is not yet barred against military activities in space. The crux of the difficulty is that space activity is already part of the arms race, a fact which we have to reckon with until humanity reaches the stage of an agreement on full and complete disarmament. Space disarmament is but one segment of the broader, over-shadowing problem of world peace and disarmament with which the world has wrestled for so long with a growing awareness of the need but without sustained success. Eventually nations must surely realize that their genuine interests lie in peaceful rather than in military activities and that their activities in space should thus be peace-oriented.

181. No less gratifying is the decision of the General Assembly which endorsed the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space calling for an international conference to examine the practical benefits to be derived from space research and exploration on the basis of technical and scientific achievements and the extent to which "non-space countries", especially the developing countries, may enjoy these benefits as well as take part in international co-operation in space activities. The recommendation so adopted is commendable as a major step toward bridging the ever-widening gap between the space Powers and the non-space Powers, particularly the developing countries.

182. It is my sincere hope that the conference will only be a first step and not only will explain the practical benefits of space exploration, but will result

ultimately in joint practical ventures that will actually bring the benefits of space exploration to all nations, thus helping to alleviate some of the economic and social problems that beset mankind.

183. To this end, I assure you that the Secretariat will not spare any effort, for whatever be the implications of space exploration, it is in the application of practical benefits that the developing countries have their interest in space, and it is my strong conviction that the United Nations channels should accelerate the communication of such benefits to the developing countries.

184. It is my fervent hope that through the work you have just completed the United Nations will be able to ensure that the exploration and use of outer space shall be a growing point of co-operation rather than a new area of conflict and mistrust.

185. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I had the opportunity in the First Committee [1493rd meeting] to make a detailed statement on behalf of my delegation in respect of the treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. Therefore, I do not feel it necessary to make a further statement on this subject at this plenary meeting. I am, however, concerned that the harmonious discussion with respect to this treaty which took place on 17 December in the First Committee has not been circulated in the verbatim records to the members of the First Committee and of the General Assembly. We believe that the discussion of this treaty itself constituted history, and therefore I should like to ask that the Secretariat transmit to the various delegations the verbatim records of the discussion in the First Committee on this item. I regret having had to bring this matter up at this plenary meeting, but, as Members are aware, the First Committee has ended and I have no other recourse.

186. The PRESIDENT: I am quite sure that the Secretariat will do its best to accommodate the representative of Liberia in connexion with the suggestion she has made.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 AND 93

The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded)

Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6618 and Corr.1)

187. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has before it amendments submitted by several Members [A/L.514]. I call on the representative of Cuba to introduce these amendments.

188. Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): My delegation had occasion to state its position of principle regarding the so-called Korean question clearly in the First Committee. We empha-

sized our view that the discussions that have taken place over the years in this Organization are illegal and, moreover, follow an improper and useless pattern reflected in the yearly repetition of a procedure that prevents the parties directly concerned from participating in the discussion.

189. In accordance with that position, we co-sponsored the inclusion of item 93 in our agenda and a draft resolution on that item which was discussed in the First Committee. The draft resolution called for the immediate withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces now occupying South Korea, the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and an end to the discussion of these matters in our Organization.

190. Everyone knows what action the First Committee took on our proposal, which would have led to a real solution of the so-called Korean question. Notwithstanding this, the General Assembly will today again consider a draft resolution [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17] similar to those that it has examined over the past twenty years, with results whose efficacy is known to all delegations.

191. My delegation pressed once again in the Committee for an effort to find a practical, concrete solution which could have been found had the Committee been ready to discuss a second verbal proposal by my delegation. But that was not possible. With the same aim of trying at this session, before our deliberations are over, to find some effective solution to a problem that has been discussed in sterile debates for twenty years, ten delegations, including my own, have submitted a series of amendments [A/L.514] to the draft resolution put forward by the First Committee. The amendments, as all representatives can see, are drafted in broad and liberal terms in accordance with the views we have repeatedly expressed. We trust they will receive the support of a great many delegations.

192. Adoption of the amendments we propose would save us from ending the present session with the Korean question in the stalemate in which it has remained for twenty years. Although the amended text would not fully satisfy the principles we stated in the Committee, it would make a substantial contribution—the first constructive contribution by this Assembly towards a solution of the so-called Korean question.

193. In view of the late hour and the necessity of pressing forward with our work, I shall not go into detail concerning the changes we have proposed to some paragraphs of the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee. All delegations have before them copies of the amendments in all languages. I am sure that all understand the meaning of the amendments and will act accordingly.

194. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker I would make this appeal: in view of the very heavy agenda before us, it will be very much appreciated if statements are as brief as possible.

195. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): On the proposal of

the Soviet Union and of a number of other socialist countries [A/6394], the General Assembly has examined an important and urgent question: "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea." During the discussion of this question in the First Committee, attention was again drawn to the fact that the main reason for the continuing division of the Korean nation is outside interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people. The Soviet Union and the other countries which raised this question thought that its discussion would help to rectify the injustice committed against the Korean people—all foreign troops would, finally, be withdrawn from South Korea, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea would be dissolved and the so-called Korean question would be removed from the United Nations agenda.

196. It is regrettable that, because of the discriminatory attitude of the United States and certain of its allies—an attitude that is contrary to the United Nations Charter—no decision was taken at this session to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of problems relating to Korea. Such a situation is quite intolerable and altogether abnormal. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was not even given an opportunity to state its position on a problem which affects, primarily, vitally important interests of the whole Korean people. It is precisely in connexion with the state of affairs thus created that at the current session of the General Assembly a large group of States protested against the unjust and inconsistent policy of Washington on this question.

197. Naturally, the absence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could not but have a highly negative effect on the discussion of the Korean question at the session of the General Assembly. The United States and its allies again succeeded in carrying through in the First Committee a decision which contravenes the United Nations Charter and runs counter to the aspirations, and the will of the Korean people [A/6618, para. 17]. That decision was dictated by the imperialist policy of the United States, aimed at turning South Korea into an aggressive base of the United States in the Far East, a base which is being used against the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, including the just and heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people against the American interventionists.

198. We again consider it our duty to emphasize that there are absolutely no grounds or reasons whatever why the Pentagon should occupy South Korea. It is common knowledge that more than twenty years have passed since the end of the Second World War and thirteen since the conclusion of the armistice in Korea, which provided, inter alia, for ensuring a stable peace in Korea and for the need to withdraw all foreign troops from that country. There are no foreign troops, there is not a single foreign soldier, on the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. South Korea, however, is still occupied by the United States troops. The so-called United Nations

forces in South Korea are, in fact, United States occupation troops.

199. The restoration of the unity of the temporarily divided territory of Korea, the creation of a unified, independent and democratic Korea are a just aspiration of the Korean people, which, like any other people, has an inalienable right to determine its own destiny in conformity with the principle of the self-determination of peoples, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter and solemnly affirmed in a number of our Organization's decisions. And this, of course, is an internal affair of the Korean people, which must decide its own future freely, without any foreign intervention whatsoever from outside.

200. From this General Assembly rostrum we once again declare that the Soviet Union has great respect and sympathy for the whole heroic Korean people and resolutely supports the peaceful proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We venture to remind the Assembly also that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never acted against the purposes or the Charter of the United Nations or by its actions damaged the authority of the United Nations.

201. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has, in practice, by its actions and the constructive proposals it has frequently put forward, shown its goodwill and its anxiety to seek a positive solution of the Korean question that meets the desires of the heroic people of Korea.

202. Let us remember that, firstly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea firmly holds the view that the peaceful unification of Korea should proceed through the creation of a single all-Korean Government representing all sections of the population, as the result of the holding of free and democratic elections by the Korean people themselves in the north and the south of the country, without any outside interference and after United States armed forces and all other foreign troops are withdrawn from South Korea.

203. Secondly, it is also common knowledge that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has offered to organize a committee of a purely economic character, consisting of representatives of business circles, in order to conduct trade between the North and South, if the authorities of South Korea are unable to accept at least the creation of a confederation of North and South.

204. Thirdly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed the conclusion of an agreement of non-aggression and for the reduction of the armed forces of North and South Korea, respectively, to 100,000 men or less, after the withdrawal from South Korea of United States armed forces and all other foreign troops.

205. Fourthly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has come out, as we know, in favour of holding a joint conference of representatives of the political parties and voluntary organizations both in North and in South Korea, or a joint conference of South and North Korea, or any other

form of conference for the purpose of discussing the question of uniting the country.

206. Fifthly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has also declared that it is prepared and wishes to conduct negotiations with any representatives of South Korea who genuinely want national unity and the unification of the country, irrespective of their political views, creed or property status.

207. Lastly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea considers that a meeting could be convened of interested countries for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question, at which countries having a connexion with the Korean question would be represented.

208. All this is a weighty and clear manifestation of goodwill and of a desire to find a solution by peaceful means and the fact that United States diplomats have tried to stifle these peaceful proposals and distort reality and facts cannot but evoke condemnation.

209. It is obvious that the Seoul régime rejects all these proposals because they do not accord with the plans of the overseas Power which is striving to turn South Korea into a base for the struggle with the national-liberation movement.

210. The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to reiterate that it is the duty of all States Members of the United Nations to promote the speediest possible fulfilment of the aspirations of the Korean people and to preserve peace and security in the Far East and Asia. As we have pointed out, for this purpose it is necessary to withdraw in the shortest space of time all United States and other foreign troops with their weapons and equipment, which are occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag or in other form, dissolve immediately the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—that anachronism which has brought neither unification nor rehabilitation to the Korean people—and end the discussion in the United Nations of the so-called Korean question. These reasonable proposals, which meet the interests of the Korean people and the interests of the cause of peace, were contained in the draft resolution tabled by the Soviet Union and a number of other countries for the consideration of the First Committee [*ibid.*, para. 6b].

211. As circumstances are at present, we consider that the Assembly should, as a minimum, adopt at any rate the proposal put forward in the Cuban delegation's amendments to the draft contained in the First Committee's report [*ibid.*, para. 14]. That proposal is as sensible and positive as it is realistic and just. Surely the obvious fact should be borne in mind that the Korean question has been under discussion in the United Nations for twenty years now and that, nevertheless, no progress has been made in solving it. Surely it is clear that a suitable new way must be immediately found for solving the Korean question.

212. Such a new path, as we have already pointed out, is to be found in the proposal made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to hold, for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, a meeting of representatives of

the countries concerned, with the participation of representatives of South and North Korea and representatives of countries interested in the Korean question, appointed in equal numbers by the authorities of the south and north of Korea. At the same time, a decision should be taken to remove the Korean question from the agenda of the General Assembly and not discuss that question further.

213. We appeal to the Members of the United Nations to support that proposal.

214. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic wishes to take this opportunity to express its unequivocal opposition to the draft recommendation on the so-called Korean question contained in the report of the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1]. This recommendation is null and void of any legal substance. It contradicts the United Nations Charter, which expressly forbids intervening in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, according to Article 2, paragraph 7. Unfortunately, the United Nations has been interfering in the domestic affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for more than sixteen years, flouting the dignity and the rights of a foreign State.

215. This recommendation is null and void from a political point of view as well. It perpetuates the foreign military occupation of South Korea by the United States, using force against the territorial integrity and political independence of Korea and violating the provisions of the Charter and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty.

216. It is worth mentioning that official United States spokesmen have never hid en their true intentions regarding Korea. Most recently in the January 1967 issue of Foreign Affairs, McGeorge Bundy, foreign political adviser to two United States Presidents and builder of United States foreign policy, analysing the foreign policy of the United States, mentioned the Korean question as one with which the United States had painful experiences. He mentioned only United States interests on the other side of the Pacific ocean. He failed to mention any United Nations involvement in the Korean affair. This is the way in which the United States considers the fate and life of other countries.

217. The recommendation contained in the report is null and void from a procedural point of view also, since it has been adopted without the participation of one of the parties directly concerned—without an invitation being given to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It is significant that several non-aligned countries abstained from voting on the draft resolution on this question in the First Committee because the other party could not be heard, that being in violation of the elementary norms of legality and objectivity of any international or national forum. It is also worth recalling that, even before a decision was taken on the question of the invitation, the other side, the representatives of the South Korean authorities, had already ample opportunities to observe our proceedings. We should put an end to this shameful and illegal discrimination.

218. An entirely new start should be made. It is all the more needed since new attempts are being made to use the United Nations flag in another Asian country as well.

219. Fulfilling its shameful role, the South Korean governing clique has willingly sent tens of thousands of South Korean soldiers to South Viet-Nam to fight under the direct command of the United States against the national liberation movement of the Viet-Nameese people. In this role of Asian mercenaries used by the United States against the Viet-Nameese people, the South Korean troops made use of the United Nations flag, a fact which is widely known after the self-revealing article of the American newspaper Stars and Stripes of 17 October last. After being caught in flagrante, the South Korean authorities have been compelled to apologize; but their excuses cannot alter condemnation of this act, which is contrary to the Charter and the prestige of the United Nations and endangers the future role of the United Nations in Asia and the Far East.

220. In view of these considerations, my delegation is opposed to the recommendation of the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17]. We firmly believe that the course chosen by the draft resolution leads nowhere except to new crises and failures of the United Nations.

221. We appeal to all Member States to consider their positions very carefully and to help to get rid of this major stumbling block in the way of a better and more effective United Nations.

222. There are new means of solving this problem. The proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as contained in the memorandum of its Government [see A/6370] provides us with a realistic and honest approach. The only feasible way that the United Nations can contribute to the solution of this problem is: by encouraging the parties directly interested to negotiate; by helping to withdraw all foreign troops from South Korea; and by stopping interference in the domestic affairs of South Korea by dissolving the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

223. The recommendation represents discrimination against an independent and sovereign country. It means a crude violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, the Hungarian delegation wholeheartedly supports the amendments to this recommendation submitted by the representative of Cuba [A/L.514]. We believe that these amendments should be given serious consideration.

224. The Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that the Korean question should be solved by the Korean people themselves, who best understand the situation in that part of the world and who are acquainted with their own problems. We are aware that the United Nations is abused by the United States; hence, the Organization is unable to solve this question. We ought surely to respect the Korean people's right to self-determination. That is why my delegation agrees with the proposal to remove this item from our agenda because it represents one of the last remnants of the "cold war" in our Organization. This is the

only way to promote a solution of the Korean question and to enhance the authority of the United Nations.

225. For these reasons, the Hungarian delegation recommends the unanimous adoption of the amendments and the amended draft resolution.

226. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): The General Assembly is called upon to deal with the First Committee's report [A/6618 and Corr.1] on two aspects of the Korean question.

227. The item introduced by the Soviet Union and a number of other countries, including the Bulgarian delegation [A/6344], concerned the withdrawal of the United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. That is one of the questions dealt with in the report.

228. Secondly, we have before us the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/6312].

229. These two questions, which form the Korean question, were discussed very hastily in the First Committee and, above all, it must be emphasized, in the absence of one of the interested parties—one might say, the only party properly authorized by the Korean people, i.e. the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Khalaf (Iraq), Vice-President, took the Chair.

230. Despite the efforts made by a large number of delegations to bring the question of Korea back into the context of contemporary reality and be able to make a real contribution to the unification of Korea, certain countries—principally, the United States of America—have this year again managed to get a draft resolution [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17] adopted in the First Committee, which runs entirely counter to the aims set forth—at least, officially—in the very report submitted by that Committee and in the statements made by most of the delegations, i.e. the unification of Korea.

231. The unavowed purpose, but the one obstinately pursued by certain delegations since the discussion of the Korean question began, i.e. to achieve a negative result on this question, as in previous years, was quite obvious and still is. The fact is that, from the outset, certain Western delegations have shown themselves fiercely opposed and, by exerting powerful pressures, have succeeded in barring a delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from participating in the discussion held in the First Committee.

232. In such circumstances, it could hardly be expected that the First Committee would produce a realistic proposal on the question or be able to adopt a draft resolution likely to supply a framework for a decision on the Korean question.

233. Actually, the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report, on which the General Assembly is now asked to vote, is worded in exactly the same negative terms as the resolutions adopted on the question in previous years—decisions which offered no solution for the Korean question. In the past—for

this same draft has been submitted on several occasions—it proved, as you know, entirely inadequate as a contribution to solving the Korean question.

234. Although mention is made in the draft resolution now submitted by the Committee of the fact that Korea is still divided, that this division does not in any way correspond to the wishes of the Korean people, and that a Korea thus divided constitutes a source of tension which prevents the restoration of international peace and security in the area, it is, none the less, true that the provisions of the said draft are absolutely contrary to those affirmations and to the aims which should be pursued in the light, precisely, of those affirmations; they are also contrary to the wishes expressed and the statements made in the Committee by most of the delegations which want to contribute to the unification of Korea and to see that country really united.

235. The efforts made to arrive at a reasonable and realistic solution in the First Committee having failed, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is happy to welcome the efforts now made by the delegation of the Republic of Cuba to improve the inadequate draft resolution submitted in the Committee's report. The amendments offered by the delegation of Cuba [A/L.514] do tend to bring the United Nations discussions and decisions back on to a more realistic basis. By asking for recognition of the fact that, so far, the efforts of the United Nations during all the discussions have produced no result, they put the Korean question on a realistic basis.

236. Furthermore, by asking for the convening of a conference of the States interested in the solution of the Korean question, a conference which would be attended by North Korea and South Korea, the amendments place this question in a framework in which it might really find a solution. In these circumstances, it would really be possible to decide to remove the Korean question from the agenda of the United Nations. This would help to create a better climate for solving the important questions concerning peaceful co-existence and would make it unnecessary for the General Assembly to deal with questions which revive the cold war between the Members of the United Nations. That would also allow the Korean people to decide their own affairs themselves and determine their own future.

237. That is the best way of helping to solve the Korean question, and so we think that the amendments submitted by the Republic of Cuba should be adopted by all delegations.

238. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Owing to a misunderstanding, my delegation was not able to explain its vote in the First Committee on the question of Korea. With your permission, Mr. President, we wish to say very briefly now what we would have said in greater detail at the voting stage in Committee.

239. My delegation supports the draft resolution recommended by the Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1] because it reaffirms both the peaceful and constructive objectives of the United Nations in Korea and the fact that the United Nations, under the Charter, is fully and rightfully empowered to take collective action

to maintain peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes laid down in the Charter.

240. However, my delegation wishes to make an observation on the report submitted by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/6312]. We note that in this report one short paragraph of eight lines is devoted to the main purpose for which UNCURK was established: namely, the political question of establishing a unified, democratic and independent country. We recognize the difficulties of the political tasks of UNCURK, but we feel that more detailed mention of the efforts made by the Commission to achieve its main objectives would have been more useful.

241. The rest of the report—twenty-nine pages of it—is almost entirely devoted to matters of economic and social progress and goes into such details as listing the number of dignitaries visiting Korea.

242. In that connexion, we are particularly glad to note the growth rate of Korea at 8 per cent—among the highest in the world—and we commend the industry of the people of Korea and the efforts of UNCURK in promoting this remarkable achievement. We feel that the work of UNCURK in the economic and social field is deserving of greater commendation than it actually received in Committee; and, given the economic progress achieved in Korea, we wonder whether the stage has not now been reached when further reference to social and economic matters may be dispensed with in future reports. This would save considerable time and expense and would enable UNCURK to concentrate in its future reports on a full account of the initiatives undertaken by the Commission in attempting to promote unification and lasting peace.

243. We hope that these modest observations will be taken into account next year when perhaps we may even look forward to UNCURK informing us that its task of reconstructing and rehabilitating the once shattered economy has been successfully completed.

244. With these comments, and in the expectation that we shall learn of fresh approaches and imaginative initiatives on the political problem in the report which will be submitted for the consideration of the Assembly at the next session, we shall support the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17].

245. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): It would be deplorable indeed if the General Assembly, which at its current session has recorded a number of significant achievements in political, social and economic fields, failed to make any progress whatsoever on the Korean question. The item has appeared on the agenda of the United Nations for years. But, each time, political pressure brought to bear by those interested in maintaining the division of the unfortunate country stultified all attempts at moving the issue from dead centre.

246. As we have already pointed out in the First Committee [1488th meeting], the road towards unification is being obstructed by the presence of foreign troops and military bases in South Korea, as well as by the continued existence of a United Nations Com-

mission which, instead of promoting unification and helping in the rehabilitation of Korea, actually stands in the way of reaching those goals. It has become clear to all, even if it is not admitted by all, that as long as the Korean people are not given the possibility to deal directly with problems that only they themselves are entitled and able to settle, as long as there is outside interference, whatever its name or label, all talk about the reunification of Korea will be nothing but lip service.

247. We believe that it is high time to give up methods which have proved totally ineffective, if not harmful. It goes without saying that unification cannot be brought about overnight, but we must create conditions for talks about unification, and this is our duty. We do not see why, cui bono, representatives of both Koreas should be prevented from getting together to discuss vital matters related to the future of their country. There are, admittedly, different views on how the Korean settlement should be effected. But how can one remove or even reduce differences without negotiations between those primarily concerned?

248. A special conference of States interested in the Korean question may offer us such an opportunity. In any event, it would be a step out of the present stalemate, a step in the most proper direction. Not to move forward on this problem is actually tantamount to moving backwards, to deepening and perpetuating the division of Korea. Let us then put an end to annual exercises in futility on the Korean question and, instead, encourage direct contact between the parties. That is precisely the meaning of the amendments submitted today by my delegation, together with nine other sponsors [A/L.514]. The Polish delegation hopes that in its modified form the draft resolution will prove acceptable to the majority of the Assembly and we warmly recommend it for the approval of the General Assembly.

249. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): I refer to the so-called amendments presented in document A/L.514 on the Korean question.

250. In the view of my delegation, if such amendments were adopted they would have the effect of replacing in its entirety the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17]. The co-sponsors of the amendments [A/L.514] were among the delegations that tried in vain in the First Committee to push through a draft resolution which, inter alia, would have the Assembly decide "that the Korean question should not in future be discussed in the United Nations" [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 6 (b)]. This draft was rejected by the First Committee by a decisive vote of 61 to 21, with 25 abstentions.

251. A close examination of document A/L.514 will reveal that what are contained therein are not amendments, although they have been submitted in the guise of amendments. It is indeed a new proposal. How can they be called amendments when all the operative paragraphs in the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee have been deleted, thus leaving the draft resolution boneless and without its original substance?

252. Under the rules of procedure, we could ask for a priority vote on the recommendations of the First

Committee. However, in response to your appeal, Mr. President, and in the interest of facilitating the work of the Assembly, we would refrain at this stage of our deliberations from raising a question of procedure. Any manoeuvre to undo what the First Committee has done should be thwarted. Failure to do so would lead to a dangerous trend and would not be in accordance with orderly democratic procedure. Defeat, even if bitter, should be acknowledged.

253. My delegation hopes that the Assembly, in its infinite wisdom, will not fall prey to such a scheme but that it will decisively reject all the amendments contained in document A/L.514 and uphold the recommendations of the First Committee.

254. Mr. MATSUI (Japan): When the Korean question, items 31 and 93 of our agenda, was under consideration in the First Committee, the delegation of Cuba submitted a verbal proposal similar to those contained in document A/L.514. That proposal was not accepted by the First Committee. [See A/6618 and Corr.1, paras. 14 and 15.] Under the circumstances, the introduction of similar proposals at this late hour can be interpreted only as a last-ditch effort to nullify everything the United Nations has done and what it stands for with regard to the Korean question.

255. For these reasons and because my delegation believes that the United Nations has and continues to have an important role to play to bring about peacefully an independent and unified Korea, we strongly oppose an attempt such as the one now made in the amendments, submitted by ten Powers [A/L.514]. We hope that those proposals will be decisively rejected.

256. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has started to discuss the report of the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1] on items 93 and 31 relating to the so-called Korean question.

257. The delegation of Czechoslovakia has already had an opportunity of expressing its views on this question when it was being discussed in the First Committee.

258. The agenda of the present session of the General Assembly, we all know, included two items concerning the Korean problem. First of all, an item included in the agenda on the basis of proposal of the socialist countries for the withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/6394], and an item—which for many years past has been appearing illegally on the General Assembly's agenda—devoted to discussion of the report of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

259. The First Committee discussed two draft resolutions concerning this question. The draft resolution submitted by delegations of fourteen countries in document A/C.1/L.389 on the withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces from South Korea and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was, I

regret to say, rejected in the Committee under pressure from a number of States, principally, the United States of America [A/6618 and Corr.1, paras. 6 (b) and 13]. Thus, the General Assembly again does not have before it a recommendation of the First Committee that would enable it to take a decision on the Korean question which would best meet the hopes of the whole Korean people and would contribute to the cause of the peaceful unification of Korea by the Koreans themselves.

260. We are witnesses of the fact that, this year again, the General Assembly has before it a draft resolution adopted in the First Committee [ibid., para. 17], which not only cannot contribute to, but, on the contrary, will only impede, a decision of the Korean problem.

261. If the General Assembly approves this resolution, it will be a further unlawful step taken with regard to the Korean people. In the First Committee the delegation of Czechoslovakia opposed that resolution very strongly and voted against it.

262. We shall vote against the resolution also in the General Assembly, since we are deeply convinced that the adoption of such a resolution can only be detrimental to the cause of the unification of Korea and the final solution of the Korean question, which falls exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Koreans themselves in both parts of the country, and that any interference, including interference by the United Nations, is unlawful.

263. The delegation of Czechoslovakia takes the view that the only correct steps, which the United Nations could at the present time take in this question, is to remove the so-called Korean question finally from the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly and so cease interfering in the affairs of the Korean people. That is precisely the purpose of the amendment submitted by the delegations of ten socialist countries in document A/L.514.

264. The delegation of Czechoslovakia believes that the adoption of this amendment would eliminate interference in the affairs of Korea and would help to create conditions for solving the question of the unification of Korea by the Koreans themselves. Accordingly, our delegation, which is a sponsor of this amendment, calls upon the General Assembly to support it.

265. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): This Assembly has just witnessed a new phase of the strenuous effort at this session by the communist countries and a few others to put an end to the role and responsibilities of the United Nations in seeking a just settlement of the Korean problem.

266. The subject of Korea was given adequate attention in the First Committee, a debate in substance lasting nearly three days. Despite this, and despite the fact that the Committee has already rejected by a vote of 65 to 16, with 13 abstentions [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 15], a last-minute effort by the communist countries to introduce still another proposal after the substantive debate had been concluded and their first proposal rejected, we are now faced in the plenary with a plethora of amendments. These amend-

ments would pervert and entirely alter the sense of the draft resolution recommended for our adoption by the First Committee by the singularly impressive vote I have mentioned.

267. It is open to serious question whether the motives behind this new move, and more than those behind the previous activities of the communist countries in the Assembly's consideration of the Korean question, are related to any genuine desire to solve the Korean question and bring to an end the unwanted and unnatural division of Korea. Judging from the vitriolic attacks made upon the Republic of Korea—quite unjustified—not to mention the attacks made upon my Government and the United Nations itself—also unjustified—first in the Committee and now before the plenary session of the Assembly, one cannot help wondering if all these activities have not been motivated by a simple desire to make political points with the communist leaders of North Korea. Let me recall briefly the nature of these activities by the communist countries.

268. They sought first, in the General Committee and again in plenary, to have item 31, the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, removed from the Assembly's agenda. They asked [A/6394] for the inscription of an additional item on the agenda, entitled "Withdrawal of all United States and other forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". They also sought in the First Committee to interrupt the order of business unanimously agreed upon—an agreement to which they too were parties—in order to take up one of their proposals relating to the Korean question, an invitation to representatives of Korea to participate in the Assembly's debate on the Korean problem. That effort failed, though only at the price of an unnecessary waste of time and effort on the part of all members of the First Committee.

269. When the First Committee then turned its attention to the Korean question in the order accepted by the entire Committee, they submitted a draft resolution which would have called into question the legality of the Security Council's actions in 1950 in authorizing collective action to defeat North Korean aggression against the Republic of Korea; called for the withdrawal of the United Nations forces now stationed in Korea pursuant to those actions of the Security Council; dissolved the agent of this Assembly, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, for bringing about the United Nations objectives in Korea, namely, the establishment by peaceful means of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government; and finally, had the Assembly decide that the United Nations would not discuss the question of Korea in the future [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 6 (b)].

270. As my delegation noted in the First Committee, they urged upon this Assembly an approach to a vital and unsolved international problem which, stripped of all but the bare essentials, boils down to "Korea—off limits to the United Nations". We were gratified that this approach was again rejected—and properly rejected—by the First Committee, and by majorities which cannot fail to impress even those who have

strenuously urged this approach upon us. Our gratitude stems from the overwhelming recognition by Member States that those who would have the United Nations abdicate its role and responsibilities in Korea are wrong, simply wrong, and that the course they have urged would not only be unworthy of this Organization, but would also offer no promise whatever for the unification of Korea in peace and freedom and for the restoration of international peace and security in that area.

271. At this late date, we are now witnessing another effort, another diversionary movement, to prevent the Assembly from adopting the draft resolution so overwhelmingly adopted by the First Committee, and from expressing its clear will with regard to the best means for this Organization to promote a just solution to the Korean problem and to continue exercising its role and responsibilities in Korea. Very simply put, we are again faced with the same proposal we encountered in the First Committee, in the guise of amendments to the draft resolution already recommended for our approval by the First Committee—a proposal in these amendments which would have this Assembly decide that the Korean question shall be removed from the agenda and not even discussed in the United Nations—presumably all organs of the United Nations—"in the future". It is a proposal which would thus have the Organization turn its back on the Korean problem and do nothing to further the very right and very just objective to which this Organization has committed itself in Korea: the establishment, by peaceful means, of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. We do not believe this approach is any more responsible, or any more responsive to the will of Members, now in plenary, than it was throughout the debate in the First Committee.

272. We urge therefore that this effort also be resisted. We urge that the Assembly turn aside this obviously diversionary movement. We oppose the amendments proposed by the representatives of the ten communist countries and urge all those who supported the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee to do the same here tonight. The Assembly, after rejecting these proposals put in at the last moment, should in our view then take up and adopt the draft resolution which has already been recommended by the First Committee by a vote of 66 to 19. This is the clear will of the majority, a will which should be respected and recorded in the plenary Assembly, without the waste of time which we are now encountering, unnecessarily, at this late hour in our deliberations.

273. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (translated from French): During the discussions that took place in the First Committee on the Korean question, the delegation of Romania [1488th meeting] discussed in detail the true nature of this question and stated its views on the ways of solving this dispute. At that time we emphasized that the so-called Korean question was really a question of restoring the national unity of a divided country. Consequently, the problem falls within the domestic jurisdiction of the Korean people. It should be solved by the latter in the exercise of its inalienable and inherent rights to self-determination, without any outside interference.

274. The lengthy discussions which have been held in the United Nations on the Korean question have not only been of no use at all in solving this problem but have made its solution even more difficult; they have confirmed the impossibility of applying to the question of the unification of Korea a solution forged outside the country without the participation of the parties directly concerned.

275. In order to extricate the Korean question from the stalemate in which it has been for almost twenty years, Romania joined thirteen other States in submitting a draft resolution [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 6 (b)], by which the General Assembly was asked to decide to withdraw all the foreign troops occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, to dissolve the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and to stop discussing the Korean question in the United Nations.

276. The adoption of that draft resolution would, in our opinion, have made it possible to place the Korean question in its true context, leave the Korean people to decide their future freely and thus open the way to a solution of this dispute. By such methods the United Nations would have been able to make a worth-while contribution to the settlement of this major national problem of the Korean people. We regret that the Political Committee did not succeed, once again, in adopting a realistic attitude towards the proposals made in that draft resolution. It preferred to continue the same effort which, so far, instead of bringing us closer to the objectives we claim to be pursuing in this Organization, is really leading us further away.

277. The amendments submitted to the General Assembly by the delegations of ten countries, including Romania [A/L.514], are the expression of a sincere desire not to let another opportunity pass without having made the slightest contribution to the solution of the Korean question.

278. The proposals contained in those amendments could not be simpler. We ask the Assembly to decide to remove the so-called Korean question from its agenda and not to discuss it further. The United Nations would thus give the Korean people an opportunity of deciding its own affairs itself, in conformity with its national will and aspirations. The adoption of those amendments would be a wise act on the part of the General Assembly and an encouragement to negotiations between the two parts of Korea, so that they could themselves seek ways and means of finding a solution to the problem of Korean unification. Such a decision would be all the more valuable since it would come at a moment quite favourable for negotiations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea.

279. As you are aware, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in its memorandum of 21 July last [A/6370], reaffirmed its readiness to negotiate with any South Korean personalities sincerely desirous of national unity and the unification of the country. It also supported the convening of a conference for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question at which the interested countries would be represented. Such a conference, which

would be attended by representatives of North Korea and South Korea and representatives of countries nominated in equal number by the North and South Korean authorities respectively would be asked to study the means of arriving at a durable peace in Korea and achieving its peaceful unification.

280. For all the reasons I have just mentioned, I would like to appeal to my colleagues to support the amendments in document A/L.514.

Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) resumed the Chair.

281. Mr. MOUANZA (Congo (Brazzaville)) (translated from French): The General Assembly has before it a United States draft resolution which offers no solution for settling the Korean problem. This question indeed has been the subject of futile discussion for twenty years past in the United Nations and it becomes more and more obvious that the chances of solving it are dwindling.

282. This very year, the idea of a dialogue, suggested by certain countries which believe in the effectiveness of a dialogue, was discarded for the simple reason that certain Powers—the United States, in particular—have made South Korea into their private "game reserve" and do not wish to encourage contact between the peoples of the two Koreas—contact which would certainly result in all the Koreans evicting their exploiters.

283. I shall be very brief. As I have said, the United States is the owner of South Korea and still holds our Organization in its grip—maybe, for a long time to come. It cannot admit that the question of Korea should be taken away from the United Nations. It will go to all lengths, as you have just seen, to see that this question is always kept on the agenda and heaven only knows if it will ever accept the amendments submitted by Cuba [A/L.514]. It would, therefore, be a waste of time to go on discussing this question here.

284. For the reasons I have just given, my delegation will not support the United States draft resolution and it recommends all the Members of the Assembly to support the amendments tabled by the Cuban delegation which, we feel, are likely to be effective in solving the Korean question immediately.

285. For the reasons I have just stated, my delegation cannot in any case countenance the manoeuvres of those who want to keep South Korea in a state of perpetual slavery and use it as a permanent military base for subjugating others. Accordingly, I recommend all Members of the Assembly to support the amendments submitted by the delegation of Cuba.

286. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to vote, and in accordance with the rules of procedure I shall first put to the vote the amendments contained in document A/L.514. A recorded vote has been requested on all the amendments and on the draft resolution as a whole.

287. I now put to the vote the first amendment, to delete the words after "report" and replace them by the words "contained in document A/6312".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

The first amendment was rejected by 62 votes to 20, with 34 abstentions.

288. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the second amendment which seeks to delete the existing second preambular paragraph and replace it by the following new paragraph:

"Bearing in mind that, although the Korean question has been under discussion for the past twenty years, no progress has been made towards its solution,".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya,

Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

The second amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 22, with 34 abstentions.

289. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the third amendment, which seeks to delete the existing fourth preambular paragraph and replace it by the following new paragraph:

"Recognizing the necessity of seeking without delay a new and appropriate method of solving the Korean question, since it is an urgent question which can no longer be left in abeyance,".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bulgaria,^{2/}Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

The third amendment was rejected by 61 votes to 20, with 35 abstentions.

290. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the fourth amendment, which would delete the words in the fifth preambular paragraph after "Korea" and replace them by the following: "by the Korean people themselves, without foreign interference of any kind".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

^{2/} The delegation of Bulgaria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the amendment.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burma, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

The fourth amendment was rejected by 62 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions.

291. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the fifth amendment, which seeks to add the following new preambular paragraph:

"Recognizing that, in the light of the current situation, the appropriate method of settling the Korean question is a meeting of the interested States, with the participation of the representatives of South and North Korea and the representatives of such States interested in the Korean question as shall be named in equal numbers by the authorities of South and North Korea respectively."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

The fifth amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 21, with 35 abstentions.

292. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put to the vote the sixth amendment which proposes to delete operative paragraphs 1-4 and replace them by the following single paragraph:

"Decides to remove the Korean question from the agenda and not to discuss it in the United Nations in the future."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Cyprus, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

The sixth amendment was rejected by 66 votes to 21, with 30 abstentions.

293. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee [A/6618 and Corr.1, para. 17].

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to 19, with 32 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 96

Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (concluded)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6598)

294. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

295. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): On the proposal of the Soviet Union [A/6397] the General Assembly is considering, as an urgent and important question, the item "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty", adopted by the Assembly last year. The Soviet Union raised this question because of all the developments of the international situation, which continues to grow more acute precisely because of the criminal acts of armed intervention and other forms of interference in the internal affairs of States and peoples on the part of the imperialist Powers and, above all, of the United States of America.

296. The duty of the United Nations and of its Members is precisely to make every possible effort strictly to implement one of the cardinal principles of the United Nations Charter—a principle that has been enshrined anew in the well-known Declaration adopted last year—the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

297. The discussion that took place in the First Committee, by its broad and comprehensive nature and by the active part taken in it by numerous delegations has shown how important and timely was the consideration of the question we had raised.

298. The majority of the representatives who took part in the debate unambiguously condemned the continuing intervention in the internal affairs of States and peoples by some Western Powers. The discussion again strongly confirmed the fact that the most blatant intervention in the internal affairs of States and peoples, the most flagrant violation of the Declaration on non-intervention is the ever-increasing aggressive intervention of the United States in Viet-Nam.

299. American troops have arrived in the country of Viet-Nam as invaders, as throttlers of the freedom and independence of the Viet-Nameese people. Washington's war against the people of Viet-Nam is the most cynical manifestation of the aggressive policy of United States imperialism and is a mockery of international law and of the generally accepted standards of human morality and humanity. Those crimes will entail the gravest international responsibility.

300. Even today, during the General Assembly's session, and after the United States representative raised his hand to vote for the draft resolution calling for strict observance of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States, the Pentagon continues to commit new serious crimes in Viet-Nam, grossly violating that Declaration. A few days ago Hanoi, the capital of a sovereign, socialist State, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, was bombed. American airborne pirates struck at the residential districts of Hanoi, destroying houses and killing the peaceful inhabitants.

301. But the just struggle of the Viet-Nameese people is enjoying more and more support from all who hold peace dear and who stand up for justice, freedom and the independence of peoples. The Soviet Government and the whole Soviet people have resolutely condemned the fresh acts of aggression by the United States against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. True to its international duty, the Soviet Union stands firmly and consistently on the side of the fraternal socialist State, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. It has been providing, and will in future provide, all possible support to the heroic struggle of the Viet-Nameese people against the criminal aggression of United States imperialism.

302. Washington must end aggression and stop violating the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States. It is only for the Viet-Nameese people, and for it alone, to decide questions concerning Viet-Nam.

303. As a result of its consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on non-intervention, the First Committee adopted almost unanimously the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union, with the amendments introduced by a large group of States from Africa, Asia, and Latin America [A/6598, paras. 5-10]. The text of this draft resolution is now submitted for approval by the plenary Assembly.

304. In the draft resolution submitted, the General Assembly condemns all forms of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, urges the immediate cessation of armed intervention and calls upon all States to carry out faithfully their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Declaration on non-intervention.

305. The Soviet delegation considers that the draft resolution indicates the measures which must be taken at the present juncture to strengthen peace and protect the rights of States and peoples subjected to intervention in their domestic affairs.

306. We are gratified to see that the initiative of the Soviet Union has been understood and supported

by the Members of the United Nations and that the basic provisions of the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union for the Assembly's consideration have been supported by the overwhelming majority of delegations.

307. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation once again makes an appeal for strict compliance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States. In doing so, we would like to emphasize that the peoples of the world will judge of our loyalty to the Declaration on non-intervention, not by words or statements but by the real deeds of States and by how they implement its provisions in practice.

308. The Soviet delegation hopes that the consideration of the status of the implementation of this Declaration by the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, and the resolution which we will adopt, will help to eradicate from international life one of the principal sources of tension in the world—intervention in the domestic affairs of States, and above all, armed intervention, which nowadays represents the chief threat to the cause of the peace, freedom and independence of States and peoples, especially of the small peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

309. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): I wish to briefly explain the vote my delegation will cast on this draft resolution [A/6598, para. 10].

310. We shall vote for the draft resolution, but not for the reasons given by the Soviet representative who has tried to create the impression that with this draft resolution we are going to condemn the actions provoked by the situation in Viet-Nam.

311. My delegation does not share the Soviet representative's views. We shall vote for the draft resolution but we shall do so because the Committee which examined it approved by a large majority the amendments submitted by Costa Rica and other Latin American delegations [*ibid.*, para. 7] condemning the subversive activities inspired by the so-called Tricontinental Conference of Havana,^{3/} which sought to overthrow the democratic order of the Latin American nations by procedures of indirect intervention, such as the organization of guerrillas, support for terrorist activities, propaganda and other methods of what might be called psychological warfare.

312. My delegation will vote for the draft resolution precisely because it condemns activities of this kind.

313. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States delegation was pleased to vote in favour of the draft resolution on non-intervention which was adopted by the First Committee on 12 December [A/6598, para. 4]. The draft resolution, as a result of appropriate amendments introduced by our Latin American colleagues [*ibid.*, para. 7], properly calls attention to the dangers to peace which arise from acts of subversion, terrorism and other indirect forms of intervention. The draft resolution focuses on the latter forms of intervention and therefore

carries forward the General Assembly's view, as expressed in the 1965 Declaration on non-intervention, that no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State or otherwise interfere in civil strife in another State. Thus it puts the spotlight of world attention, world consideration and world condemnation on such subversive activities as those of the Havana Tricontinental Conference and the plans of its permanent organizations.

314. The draft resolution adopted by the Committee—and it will be adopted, I hope, by the General Assembly—applies to the authorities in Hanoi and Peking as well to United Nations Members. It also applies to the Soviet Union, whose Ambassador addressed us a few minutes ago. Again we heard a recitation of statements about the Viet-Nameese conflict which have become very familiar to the Members of this Assembly, but again I must raise a very essential question. That question is a simple one: what good are words when, as Mr. Fedorenko said, deeds and not words are called for? What better deed could there be at the present time than to have those responsible and those with the authority—the co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference—reconvene that Conference, which we accept as a basis for a settlement in Viet-Nam?

315. This very day a statement was made from the Kremlin calling upon the United States to observe unswervingly the Geneva Agreements of 1954, and I have quoted it. This very day the United States delivered to the Secretary-General a letter relating to this important subject, which we have asked to be distributed as a Security Council document, in which we reaffirm our objective:

"Our objective remains the end of all fighting, of all hostilities and of all violence in Viet-Nam—and an honourable and lasting settlement there, for which, as we have repeatedly said, the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 would be a satisfactory basis."^{4/}

316. I suspect that differences cannot be resolved by debate alone. Differences can be resolved only by contacts, discussions or negotiations, and a heavy responsibility rests upon leading Members of this Organization to initiate those discussions, negotiations and conferences which can lead to an honourable settlement. That is the type of welcome intervention which the Charter contemplates in the interest of world peace and security.

317. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): My delegation will vote for the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee [A/6598, para. 10] just as we voted for the draft in the Committee. I must however repeat here my delegation's reservations regarding the draft resolution, which are those we expressed a year ago when the General Assembly adopted resolution 2131 (XX). We said then, and we repeat today, that the adoption of documents of this type, which repeat principles of

^{3/} First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, Havana, 3 to 14 January 1966.

^{4/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December, 1966, document S/7641.

law that are very dear to many peoples, particularly the small and weak peoples, is not sufficient to guarantee the effective application of the principles in the practice of real life. So long as United States imperialism persists in its policies of aggression, interference and exploitation, such documents are likely to become worthless scraps of paper.

318. The facts of real life, the events that have been and still are taking place while we discuss and adopt these principles in the First Committee and the General Assembly need not be recapitulated to convince us of the truth of this assertion. The bombing of Hanoi, for example, the criminal slaughter of the civilian population of the capital of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is carrying United States imperialism's policy of intervention, subversion and aggression to a point that would have seemed incredible a year ago when we adopted resolution 2131 (XX).

319. Yet these events have taken place, and are still taking place while the United States representative, with his beatific smile, tells us that he supports the resolution and will push the green button in a few moments.

320. We repeat what we said a year ago, that the independence and sovereignty of peoples can be effectively safeguarded, not by documents of this kind but by the heroic, dedicated and resolute fight these peoples are waging in every corner of the earth against imperialism. That struggle will not stop. It will culminate in the overthrow of United States imperialism. This will happen despite all the efforts made here by the imperialists and their lackeys to falsify these principles and turn them into weapons for exploitation, oppression and intervention directed against the peoples.

321. I shall say no more about the distortion of these principles because we said enough in the First Committee. On two occasions, we dealt with the subject in the First Committee and a few days ago, my Government gave a round answer to the attitude of many Latin American delegations in a letter to the Secretary-General.

322. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of the right of reply.

323. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We have just heard the statement of the United States representative in connexion with the question under discussion—the Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States. What the United States representative has said from this rostrum is merely a repetition of what has been said by him many times before, including also statements made during discussion of the same question in the First Committee.

324. The United States representative talked of what should be done and what States should do and that question was addressed to us—the Soviet delegation. Allow me in this connexion to reply to the United States representative: what is necessary is to put an

end to the barbarity that is going on before our eyes—put an end to the piratical raids on an independent State, put an end to mockery against independence and sovereignty and to trampling over the Charter of our Organization and the Declaration which we are again discussing and are bound to fulfil. And that should be done, above all, by the United States of America, which has grossly violated the decisions of the Geneva Conference to which the United States representative has referred. It was precisely the United States which, two days after the signing of the Geneva Agreements, began violating them. In Viet-Nam there was not a single American soldier, not a single adviser, no American weapons. And what is happening now?

325. An army of interventionists almost half a million strong is flooding over that unhappy country; reprisals continue to be carried out before the eyes of the whole world, and we are asked what is to be done!

326. The United States representative talked about responsibility. His words contained a reproach levelled at others. But who, if not the United States, bears the entire burden, the entire responsibility for that intervention, for the aggression and the reprisals against the people? Who provided grounds for, and conferred a benediction on, that aggression and bloodshed? The Viet-Nameese people, and they alone, have the right to decide their future. No one was ever given the right to intervene and to torture that country. Stop the barbarities, stop the bombings, withdraw the troops, get out of Viet-Nam and leave it to the people of Viet-Nam themselves to decide their own destiny, like all other peoples.

327. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in the First Committee's report [A/6598, para. 10].

The draft resolution was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 26

Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued)*

328. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 2 of resolution 2153 B (XXI) of 17 November 1966, the General Assembly requested

"... the President of the General Assembly immediately to set up a preparatory committee, widely representative of the non-nuclear-weapon States, to make appropriate arrangements for convening the conference and to consider the question of the association of nuclear States with the work of the conference and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session."

329. In that connexion, representatives will find in the records of the First Committee a statement made by the representative of Pakistan [1442nd meeting] as to the understanding and interpretation of the word

*Resumed from the 1469th meeting.

"immediately". I have engaged in consultations on this matter, and I shall be able to designate the members of the Committee as soon as possible and inform the Members of the Assembly.

330. I wish to thank representatives for their co-operation and patience.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.