

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1592nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 25 October 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation.</i>	
<i>Report of the Special Political Committee. . .</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Agenda item 39:</i>	
<i>United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Industrial Development Board.</i>	
<i>Report of the Second Committee (part I) . . .</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Adoption of the agenda</i>	
<i>Fourth report of the General Committee. . .</i>	<i>2</i>

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 36

Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/6869)

Mr. Kamil (Indonesia), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

1. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: Although the Committee's discussion of this question was remarkably brief, having taken place in the course of only one meeting, the debate and representative sponsorship of the draft resolution illustrated a rare unanimity of view on a matter of the utmost importance for all humanity. The draft resolution which the Special Political Committee adopted unanimously was sponsored in the Committee by Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Japan, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Thailand and the United Arab Republic.

2. I have the pleasure now of recommending to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.

3. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee in paragraph 6 of the report was adopted unanimously, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 2258 (XXII)].

AGENDA ITEM 39

United Nations Industrial Development Organization:
report of the Industrial Development Board

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PART I)
(A/6874)

Mr. Chadha (India), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

4. Mr. CHADHA (India), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: The Committee's report [A/6874] relates to the question of the forthcoming International Symposium on Industrial Development, to be organized by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. The Committee took up consideration of this question as a matter of priority in the light of the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council at its forty-third session that the General Assembly consider, early at its twenty-second session, such additional information as the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization would provide concerning the state of preparations for the Symposium. That information was provided in the Executive Director's note [A/6808], which, along with chapter VI of the report of the Industrial Development Board [A/6715/Rev.1], formed the basis of the discussions in the Committee.

5. During the course of the debate in the Committee, members stressed the importance of the Symposium, which would provide an excellent opportunity for an exchange of views on the problems of industrial development and on international co-operation in providing solutions for those problems. There was general agreement on the need for ensuring the success of the Symposium, which will be the first major venture of the newly-established United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

6. A number of delegations, whose views are reflected in paragraphs 5 to 11 of the Committee's report, expressed some reservations with regard to their participation in the Symposium if held at Athens, for reasons explained in those paragraphs. However, as pointed out in paragraph 13 of the Committee's report, several representatives, reflecting the viewpoint of a majority of developing countries, while expressing their opposition in principle, as well as for practical reasons, to any change in the venue of the Symposium at this stage, considered it of the utmost importance for its success that it should be held with the fullest possible representation of the industrialized countries. They therefore urged the countries which had expressed reservations to attend the Symposium as scheduled.

7. At the conclusion of the debate, the Committee took note of the relevant chapter of the report of the Industrial Development Board and the note by the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization on the International Symposium on Industrial Development. The Committee has accordingly recommended in paragraph 14 of its report that the General Assembly take note of these documents.

8. With those few remarks, I submit the report of the Second Committee to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Second Committee (part I).

9. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since no proposal has been submitted, statements will be limited to explanations of vote in accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure. Before putting the Second Committee's recommendation to the vote, I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union for an explanation of vote.

10. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation's position on the item dealing with the International Symposium on Industrial Development has been stated in detail in the Second Committee.

11. At this time the Soviet delegation wishes to reaffirm its position and to repeat that it is strongly in favour of holding the International Symposium on Industrial Development in another place.

12. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In the absence of any formal objection, may I take it that the General Assembly adopts the recommendation of the Second Committee in paragraph 14 of the Committee's report [A/6874]?

The recommendation was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda*

FOURTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/6840/Add.3)

13. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly is now called upon to examine the fourth report of the General Committee [A/6840/Add.3], which recommends the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-second regular session of the Assembly of the following new item:

"Question of diplomatic privileges and immunities:

"(a) Measures tending to implement the privileges and immunities of representatives of Member States to the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations and to conferences convened by the United Nations and the privileges and immunities of the staff and of the Organization itself, as well as the obligations of States concerning the protection of diplomatic personnel and property;

"(b) Reaffirmation of an important immunity of representatives of Member States to the principal and subsidiary organs of the United

Nations and to conferences convened by the United Nations."

14. May I remind Members of the Assembly that under rule 23 of the rules of procedure, three speakers may speak in favour of and three against the inclusion of an item in the agenda. Since there is no formal objection, may I take it that the Assembly decides to include the item in the agenda of the twenty-second session?

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We come now to the General Committee's recommendation that the item should be referred to the Sixth Committee. Is there any objection to this recommendation? Since there is none, I take it that the Assembly adopts the General Committee's recommendation.

It was so decided.

16. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Guinea has asked to explain his vote. I call upon the representative of Guinea.

17. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): Mr. President, I would have liked very much to have been among the first of the representatives at this twenty-second session to express to you the satisfaction felt by our peoples, our Governments and ourselves at your election to the enviable, yet awe-inspiring office of President of the General Assembly.

18. I was unable to do so for reasons known to you all. I was the victim of an arbitrary act unprecedented in diplomatic history. For ninety-two days I was held prisoner, together with my Foreign Minister and a senior international civil servant of Guinean nationality and his family, for reasons dictated solely by the hatred of one man, Mr. Felix Houphouët-Boigny, President of the Ivory Coast and his accomplices, his Government and his party, against another man, President Ahmed Sekou Touré, against a régime, the revolutionary régime of Guinea, and against a people, the people of Guinea, the people of 28 September 1958, the very same people who, by categorically and irrevocably saying "No" to colonialist oppression, by preferring poverty in freedom to riches in slavery, helped to a large extent to set free a number of fraternal African peoples, including the people of the Ivory Coast, and to affirm that peoples long oppressed, humiliated and exploited were determined to achieve dignity, happiness and peace.

19. Since it is never too late to make amends, let me now, at this late stage in the session, proclaim that your historic election is a source of pride and comfort to my delegation because it rehabilitates and ennobles the United Nations because it redresses a twenty-year old wrong committed against the socialist countries, and finally because you represent Romania, with all the qualities which characterize your nation and your State, which maintains with the nation and State of Guinea many ties of friendship and co-operation for the building of a world and societies which are more just, more humane, more fruitful, more prosperous, more contented and more peace-loving. Please accept, therefore, Mr. President, our sincere and hearty congratulations on your election to the high office which you are already filling with all the mastery, skill and impartiality that could be desired.

*Resumed from the 1583rd meeting.

20. There are some questions which involve principles so vital in relations between States, in the conduct of international life, in short, in the pursuit and attainment of co-operation and peace among nations, that every Member of the United Nations must speak out on them, not because of its political sympathies, its alliances, or the pressures to which it may be subjected, but solely because of the value of the principles at stake. Fervent and scrupulous respect for those principles is in the interest of each and every sovereign State throughout the world, just as their violation is contrary to the obvious interests of each and every State.

21. The enjoyment of diplomatic "privileges and immunities" by representatives of the Members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization, set forth in Article 105 of the Charter and in three conventions, is one of these principles. Its violation by any State, no matter which, large or small, rich or poor, strong or weak, free or neo-colonial, democratic or fascist, African, Asian, Latin American, European, Australian or any other, must be regarded with the utmost gravity by all States throughout the world and above all by the United Nations, particularly when the violation is committed against diplomats carrying out a United Nations mission or against senior officials of this Organization or one of its specialized agencies.

22. Last June, shortly after the armed conflict which brought bloodshed to the Middle East, the Secretary-General, at the request of the Soviet Union, convened a special session of the General Assembly to discuss ways and means of restoring peace to that tormented quarter of the globe. Like many other leaders from many Member States, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Representative of Guinea took part in the work of that session, at the invitation of the United Nations. Returning to their country, on a regular KLM flight, unfortunately diverted to Abidjan, they were arbitrarily and illegally arrested and detained as hostages, for three months, together with other Guineans, including an international civil servant, his wife and his children, the youngest of which are eight and nine years old.

23. The reasons invoked at that time by the Government of the Ivory Coast have aroused the indignation of all Member States, with the exception of a few "yes-men" who will one day regret their zeal in this painful affair. The delegation of Guinea will return at greater length and in more detail to the whole affair when it comes up for discussion in the appropriate organ of the United Nations, in this case, the Sixth Committee. In the meantime, it notes with satisfaction that the General Committee of the United Nations has recommended the inclusion of the item in its present wording. Far from objecting to this wording, we fully support it, especially as it gives expression to the Secretary-General's timely initiative. He has understood that we must defend at all costs one of the fundamental principles governing international relations.

24. For the benefit of those who say or who are led to believe that contracts are now being made between Guinea and the Ivory Coast with a view to the final settlement of the dispute between them, I must make it quite clear that these statements are tendentious manoeuvres in no way corresponding to the truth. I

should also make it quite clear that the release of the Ivory Coast detainees was a completely sovereign act on the part of the Republic of Guinea and not the result of any agreement between the Ivory Coast and Guinea or any intervention by the Organization of African Unity. The Ivory Coast regarded this sovereign act by Guinea as the shameful ransom which it demanded and therefore freed its hostages. The dispute between the Ivory Coast and Guinea is not on the agenda of this session. On the other hand, the item which has just been placed on the agenda concerns the dispute between the Ivory Coast and the United Nations, that is to say, all the Member States of the United Nations. The problems that exist between Guinea and the Ivory Coast remain for the time being within the competence and sovereignty of those two countries. Even assuming that the dispute between the two countries were settled and that the Ivory Coast and Guinea became the best friends in the world, even if they became a single country, the unspeakable violation committed by the Government of Mr. Houphouët-Boigny against the United Nations and a number of international conventions would nevertheless still constitute a grave and dangerous precedent for all States. That is why the United Nations must be able to take the necessary steps to prevent the recurrence of such acts of piracy, barbarism, savagery, aggression, terrorism and contempt for the United Nations and international law. If it fails to do so, it will have sacrificed the foundation stone of international relations, namely, the diplomatic privileges and immunities without which no contact is possible between sovereign States, whether friends or enemies.

25. As a result of the Organization's efforts, the leaders of the Ivory Coast should know that in the United Nations friendship must only be invoked in sincerity and with respect for the laws and practices designed to defend just causes and principles, and not in order to impose an era of blackmail, kidnapping, the taking of hostages, the demanding of ransom, aggression, in short an era in which the most firmly established principles and practices of international order are deliberately violated.

26. I am sure that, if a choice is to be made between the legitimate and unanimous interests of all Member States and of the United Nations itself, and the selfish and criminal interest of the Ivory Coast leaders, the delegations present at this Assembly will not hesitate for an instant, when the time comes, to shoulder their responsibilities by so acting that the debate on this matter will culminate in the adoption of a forthright resolution that will prevent the recurrence of such acts. Member States have already demonstrated their far-sightedness and impartiality by placing this item on the agenda despite the opposition and the machinations of the delegation of the Ivory Coast. We shall continue to have confidence in them.

27. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the Ivory Coast has asked to explain his vote. I call on him.

28. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): After listening to the representative of Guinea, I am not sure whether I should explain my vote or exercise my right of reply. I understand very well why the representative of Guinea should have

spoken in this way, so acrimoniously. In my country, we have a saying: "When you have punished someone and they cry, you can't stop them crying". Naturally, I regret that the representative of Guinea should have been the victim of the vagaries, the irregularities, the changing whims of his Government, but what can I do? It is a sovereign Government and the representative of Guinea can only complain to his Government. We have nothing to do with it.

29. The reasons for the tension that existed between the Ivory Coast and Guinea, which culminated in the detention in the Ivory Coast of the Guinean delegate and his compatriots, are well known. If the frustration of the people of the Ivory Coast reached such a pitch that their Government was obliged to react in this way, it is because we in the Ivory Coast have humane principles which we respect.

30. First of all, in the Ivory Coast we do not kill people, whatever the motive; no condemned person has ever been executed in the Ivory Coast, and I repeat, whatever the motive. The last persons given the death sentence were released from prison after two years. They have returned to civil life, recovered all their property and become full citizens again. In the Ivory Coast, we do not imprison aliens, and certainly not on political grounds. All the aliens who were implicated in the recent plot to assassinate the President of the Ivory Coast were expelled. Only the Ivory Coast nationals were tried and sentenced.

31. We should have liked this African Humanist spirit to reign everywhere. In Guinea, however, they do kill people — in hundreds. In Guinea, they imprison people arbitrarily. For example, a leading figure from the Ivory Coast was thrown into jail, without a trial, kept there for two years, subjected to atrocious suffering, tortured even by electric shock, beyond the bounds of the most barbaric imaginings. Only under German nazism were such things known. It is unimaginable that an African Government should use such methods, above all when that Government's delegate presides over a committee on apartheid. It is shameful. This leading figure from the Ivory Coast, who was kept in prison for two years without a trial, is a friend of mine. I volunteered to go and help him as a lawyer but I have never had an opportunity to do so because he has never appeared before a court. He has been arbitrarily kept in prison for two years.

32. Nine months ago, a trawler flying the Ivory Coast flag, with twenty-two persons aboard — two Frenchmen, Ghanaians, Mallians, Togolese and Nigerian, and a single national of the Ivory Coast, a boy of seventeen — was seized and taken to the port of Conakry. The crew were imprisoned for nine months, again without a trial. Four days after their arrest, this Government, which claims to be anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist, gave the two Frenchmen tickets to enable them to return home and released them. However, they refused to go, thus demonstrating their solidarity with the crew they had hired, for the two Frenchmen were the owners of the trawler. The Guineans then threw their twenty African brothers into a sordid cell, kept them without proper food or any means of washing themselves for nine months. Is this how you behave in Guinea? It is a disgrace.

33. It was in these circumstances that Mr. Marof Achkar and his compatriots came to the Ivory Coast. I am glad to hear it said that their aircraft was diverted, because the argument which had been put forward here was that it was bad weather, a case of force majeure, which made them land in our country. Now I learn that the aircraft was diverted. They landed in the Ivory Coast. And after these capricious gentlemen, who are not sure what they are saying, had declared that the Ivory Coast was an enemy territory, after this, they swaggered across our territory without even taking the precaution of respecting our police regulations. Ours is just as much a sovereign State as yours. We arrested them. We detained them, and such is the humanity of our President that he housed them in the presidential estate, in a presidential villa. They were my neighbours in this presidential estate in which there are four villas, the fourth of which I occupy.

34. All this time, our people were languishing in gloomy cells. The day on which they were released, the day on which I went to meet the leading figure from the Ivory Coast, when his plane landed, he was unrecognizable. People burst out crying, and some of them shouted at me, saying "Is that what you call reciprocity? Look how they have come back to us!" We regret only one thing in the Ivory Coast, that we did not subject you to the same threatment as you meted out to our citizens. Be warned!

35. It is true that there are laws, but there are also higher laws. There are higher laws which explain treaties and allow their interpretation. Those higher laws are called human rights. Those who trample with impunity on human rights cannot avail themselves of what they call bourgeois privileges. Fine resolutions have been passed against privileges, because human rights have been flouted. The Conventions that have been invoked are the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations,^{1/} dating from 1946 — twenty-one years ago — and the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations,^{2/} of six years ago. The Ivory Coast signed those Conventions and it means to respect them. We are perfectly well aware of, and we apply, the principle pacta sunt servanda. But this principle demands that the Conventions should be in force. Now Guinea has not signed these Conventions, on the pretext no doubt that they are the product of bourgeois law: because they are socialists, because that allowed Guinea to sack the embassies of other countries, allowed it, with impunity, to place the Ambassador of the United States under house arrest, to sack the embassy of Ghana, to imprison the Ambassador of Ghana for three months, to confiscate, even while I am speaking to you, the property of the Ghanaian embassy, on the grounds that the government which Ghana has chosen for itself does not please Guinea. Without having adhered to these Conventions, the Government of Guinea would like to profit from its inconsistency, while the Ivory Coast would be condemned for having adhered to them. This we cannot accept. We call first upon Guinea to adhere to them, and then we will be partners.

^{1/} United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. I, 1946, No. 4, p. 15.

^{2/} See United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, Official Records, vol. II (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.X.1), p. 82.

36. I am sorry I have been forced to reply in this way. I thought that the question would be referred to the Sixth Committee and that we should have an opportunity to tackle the substance of the problem. So far we have dealt only with the procedure. It is regrettable that our colleague from Guinea should have compelled us to consider the problem from that angle.

37. I should like simply to point out that the Ivory Coast has not engaged in any manoeuvre to prevent the discussion of this matter. When I landed at Kinshasa airport, on my way to the Assembly of the Organization of African Unity, I said that the Ivory Coast was ready to discuss the substance of the matter. Our chiefs of State in their wisdom did not allow the item to be included in the agenda of the Organization of African Unity because they thought it was a matter likely to divide Africans and that consequently some other means of settlement should be found. Our attitude was dictated solely by the desire not to divide Africans. But we made it clear to anyone who would listen that we were ready to discuss the problem. We are still ready to do so, even now, if you so decide.

38. We think the General Committee has acted wisely, for in fact, if complaints are to be made, we must not consider only section 11 of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities. There are all these ambassadors who are insulted all over the world, all these embassies that are sacked; because a Government says something displeasing, embassies are attacked and ambassadors are maltreated. This is the question which should preoccupy the Secretariat, not merely section 11. The General Committee has done well to include the whole problem in the agenda and we are ready to discuss it as a whole.

39. We are also ready to discuss the item proposed by the Secretariat regarding the reaffirmation of an important immunity. However, I have the impression that the Sixth Committee is going to find itself in a difficult legal position. In point of fact, in the Ivory Coast, we first contested the right of the Guineans to invoke these Conventions on the grounds that they have not adhered to them. There is thus a legal contestation. We also said that they had entered our territory without a visa. Consequently, there is a legal contestation of section 11 (d) of the relevant Convention.

40. According to section 30, the Secretariat was required to refer the question to the International Court of Justice for an interpretation of the points we contested. This section specifies that the Court's decision is binding on the parties. Thus, if the Court had decided that the Guineans were rightfully invoking the Convention, we should have been bound. But the question has not been considered. When the Sixth Committee has made its reaffirmation, things will be no further advanced. First, from the legal point of view, this reaffirmation poses a question: is it a successive Convention, which is to replace the first? Would the reaffirmation be an amendment to section 11, thus requiring ratification and adherence? All this is a legal question which the Sixth Committee will perhaps take up, and we leave it to that Committee to do so.

41. Once again, I regret that I was forced to intervene in this way, but I think that our colleague from Guinea wanted the debate to take place on this level. I reserve the right to speak again if he considers that what he

said was not complete, and if I myself consider that I should add anything further to what I have just said. We shall thus be able, both of us, to resume our dialogue and to complete our respective interventions.

42. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Guinea, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

43. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): In the statement which I had the honour of making earlier, I made it clear that the Guinean delegation will have occasion in the Sixth Committee to present in detail the Ivory Coast dossier, the dossier of Mr. Houphouët-Boigny, and to expose the crimes committed by Mr. Houphouët-Boigny against Guinea and against the Ivory Coast itself. I did not wish to examine in detail the reasons advanced by the Ivory Coast to justify its unspeakable behaviour. In fact, the fabrications and falsehoods of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ivory Coast are really devoid of all intelligence. They are too absurd for me to waste the Assembly's time at this point. Once again, I must point out that the item now on the agenda is not one that has been proposed by Guinea. Guinea has not requested the inclusion of any item in the agenda of this session; if it had done so, the item would have been worded quite differently.

44. In other words, the problem which has been created by the illegal and arbitrary act of the Ivory Coast puts the Ivory Coast in the position of having violated certain United Nations principles. We maintain that the highest authority of our Organization was quite right in having this item included so as to provide an opportunity of reminding States of their obligations in cases similar to that in which the Guinean delegation found itself. However, we have just heard two lies that are a little too grotesque for me not to be tempted to reply to them right away. First of all, I refer to the so-called detention for three months of the former Ghanaian Ambassador to Guinea and the placing under house arrest of the United States Ambassador to Guinea. I am surprised that the representative of the Ivory Coast should appoint himself the spokesman for the United States and Ghana. The delegations of those two countries are present in the hall and know the circumstances which prevailed at the time of those incidents, which followed the arrest of the Guinean delegation in Ghana. They also know how the incidents were settled with the intervention of the Secretary-General. I cannot say as much for the matter at present before us.

45. There is another untruth which is quite staggering. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ivory Coast proclaims everywhere that the Guinean delegation went wandering about Abidjan without the authorization of the Government of the Ivory Coast. We thought that the Government of the Ivory Coast was a responsible Government in control of its territory. Can one imagine for an instant that a delegation or an individual could enter Ivory Coast territory, from the airport at Abidjan, without the authorization of the Ivory Coast Government? In case the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ivory Coast is unaware of it, I will tell you what happened at Abidjan airport once the Guinean delegation was forced to leave the KLM plane. Unfortunately, I repeat it was diverted to Abidjan, which does not mean

that there was not bad weather or some other instance of force majeure. We shall revert to this problem of the diversion of the aircraft. In any event, the aircraft was diverted, because its destination was Conakry; it omitted the two stops at Conakry and Monrovia and landed at Abidjan. There we were, therefore, at the airport of Abidjan at two o'clock in the morning. Obviously, the plane, which serves a very important West African route, was carrying not only the Guineans in question but a number of other passengers.

46. All the passengers without exception complied with the formalities. The lies told by the Ivory Coast Minister of Foreign Affairs will not change that. What were these formalities? The police and the gendarmérie, who are always present at Abidjan airport, asked all passengers to hand over their passports. The passports were retained. The airline was then authorized to transport all the passengers to the hotel. About five hours later, we were taken back to the airport, where our passports were returned to us and our embarkation cards were given out. Armed with these documents, we were waiting in the transit lounge, when the soldiery of the Ivory Coast arrived to arrest us and march us off to detention in a presidential villa, as just described by the representative of the Ivory Coast. He does not understand that in a case of this kind it is not the place of detention that counts but the loss of freedom. He does not know what freedom is; he has never been able to understand freedom. Perhaps that is why his Government has abdicated all its responsibilities.

47. I repeat what I said in my previous statement. We are satisfied that this item has been included in the agenda of the Sixth Committee. We shall take advantage of the debate in the Sixth Committee to put forward our legal arguments and, if necessary, disclose to the whole world the inside story of this affair, including all the machinations of the Ivory Coast directed not only against Guinea but against a number of other African countries. And we will give the Ivory Coast, which never kills anyone — one wonders what has become of Mr. Ernest Boka the former Minister of Justice — and which never arrests anyone, a list of all the crimes that its Government has committed.

48. For the time being, I shall content myself with refuting these two outrageous falsehoods, and await the opportunity afforded by the Sixth Committee: the

leader of the Guinean delegation and other Guinean representatives will there give the whole world a full and detailed account and all the latest developments in this affair. The anger of the Ivory Coast Foreign Minister, and the diatribes—whether here or to the Press—directed against Guinea or against the Secretariat will alter nothing. The Ivory Coast will have to swallow this bitter pill so that it can learn its lesson and realize in future that international relations are based upon principles which it is in all our interests to respect.

49. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of the Ivory Coast, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

50. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): I shall be very brief, for it is my impression that my Guinean colleague and I do not speak the same language and that we are engaged in a dialogue of the deaf. He scatters his insults everywhere.

51. You know the reasons for Guinea's present isolation. It is a country wracked by poverty. Unfortunately, this has repercussions on neighbouring countries because its nationals are leaving it in tens of thousands to come to us, which gives us a problem. Its diplomacy, which at the rostrum of the Organization of African Unity I called diplomacy by insult, has isolated Guinea and will continue to do so.

52. We thought, after the Congress of the Parti démocratique de Guinée where they finally stated and acknowledged for themselves that henceforward they would try to be on good terms with their neighbours whatever their régime, that they had finally buried what I call diplomacy by insult. I have the impression, however, perhaps because our colleague was detained in the Ivory Coast and was unable to attend the Congress, that he is not familiar with the new course that has been adopted.

53. I do not wish to labour the point. Mr. Achkar speaks a language which shows that he has understood nothing of the legal argument which I presented, which is not surprising. We all know how he got his position here. I shall say no more, but in the Ivory Coast an ambassador would not be appointed in such circumstances.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.