

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/PV.1499
19 December 1966

ENGLISH

Twenty-First Session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND
NINETY-NINTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 19 December 1966, at 3.00 p.m.

President:

Mr. PAZHWAQ

(Afghanistan)

later:

Mr. KHALAF

(Iraq)

(Vice-President)

1. Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Political Committee [33]
(continued)
2. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space; 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; Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies [30, 89 and 91]
3. The Korean 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: report of the First Committee [31 and 93]

Status of the /...

This record contains original speeches and interpretations. The final text, containing translations, will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in triplicate, within three working days, to the Chief, Conference and Meetings Control, Office of Conference Services, Room 1104, incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 20 DECEMBER 1966,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 27 DECEMBER 1966.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

6-70361

4. 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: report of the First Committee [96] (continued)
5. Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued) [26]

AGENDA ITEM 33

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/6603) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As decided by the Assembly this morning, we shall now consider the report (A.6603) of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 33, concerning the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects.

Mr. Goñi Demarchi (Argentina), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/6603), and then spoke as follows:

Mr. GOÑI DEMARCHI (Argentina), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee (interpretation from Spanish): At this stage in our debates, it is unnecessary for me to go into great detail on the report dealing with item 33: comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Political Committee; report of the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations.

However, I should like to say that this is one of the most important of the items that the General Assembly referred to the Special Political Committee for discussion. In the course of the discussion, a number of suggestions and proposals were made, as may be seen in the report (A/6603).

Six draft resolutions and a number of amendments were formally submitted. Despite the fact that the points of view and positions were divergent, the number of draft resolutions attests to the importance that delegations attach to this crucial question. However, not all the documents I have mentioned were voted upon in the Special Political Committee. As a final result of the deliberations, the Special Political Committee adopted three draft resolutions which are contained in paragraph 24 of the report of that Committee.

(Mr. Gofí Demarchi, Argentina)

However, it was not insisted upon that the first of those draft resolutions should be put to the vote.

It remains for me only to submit the draft resolutions on behalf of the Special Political Committee, and to recommend their adoption by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: The Special Political Committee recommends three draft resolutions in paragraph 24 of its report (A/6603). The Assembly has now received the following additional proposals under this item: a draft resolution submitted by several Members which is being distributed as document A/L.515; and two amendments to draft resolution B recommended by the Special Committee, one proposed by the delegation of Cyprus in document A/L.512 and the other proposed by the delegation of Jamaica in document A/L.513.

I call on the representative of Algeria to introduce the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and several others.

Mr. BCUATTURA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Recent experience has shown that it was not fruitless to appeal to wisdom and the spirit of conciliation which have prevailed in this Assembly, and that has been done in a quasi-traditional manner. The grave crisis that shook the nineteenth session of the General Assembly could not have been overcome had it not been for that spirit of conciliation.

A Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations was established at that time. Without glossing over the difficulties encountered by that Committee, we must nevertheless note that its work has, to a large extent, allowed us to clarify the situation. Indeed, it had the merit of being a meeting ground for the different points of view during these two past years; it has become an indispensable tool in seeking a solution that requires both patience and ingenuity. On that solution will depend, to a great extent, the future of our Organization, which compels us to admit 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 the apparently divergent positions.

(Mr. Bouattoura, Algeria)

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

While we had the right to expect that the discussions would contribute to bringing the different points of view together, the way in which they developed unfortunately demonstrated to us that this was not necessarily so; on the contrary, the debate brought to light serious differences of opinion.

The General Assembly is now called upon to take a decision on the texts that resulted from that atmosphere. Their adoption will obviously crystallize positions whose direct consequence will be a return to the situation that existed in the last few years. Thus, all the prodigious efforts made during the last two years will be almost destroyed. We are convinced that the General Assembly, whose major concern is the strengthening of that irreplaceable instrument of international peace and co-operation, particularly at the present moment in world history, will prevent any hasty action.

It was in the light of all those considerations that a group of countries, on behalf of which I have the honour to speak, felt that we should submit a draft resolution for consideration by the General Assembly. In doing this, our only concern is to avoid any hasty act which, in our opinion, would be prejudicial to a real solution of the complex problem of peace-keeping operations.

Therefore, we believe that certain views expressed in the Special Political Committee warrant a more careful examination and that, to do so, more time is required. Our draft resolution contains a reasonable proposal which would allow us to clarify the situation. It provides for referring the report of the Special Political Committee 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, which is to be held not later than 30 April 1967.

Furthermore, our draft resolution requests the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations to continue during this period to examine 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 arrive at 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.

Since this is a draft resolution which deals with the procedure which should be followed with respect to the report of the Special Political Committee, my delegation, along with the other sponsors of the draft resolution that I have just submitted, hopes that it will be given priority in the voting.

The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution in document A/L.515 has just been introduced on behalf of the sponsors by the representative of Algeria. As I mentioned before, there are also two sets of amendments before the Assembly, contained in documents A/L.512 and A/L.513.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): The delegation of Jamaica spoke for the group of non-aligned nations at our meeting on Saturday evening 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. 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.

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.

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 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 resolution B and draft resolution 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.

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.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): I do not wish to go into lengthy discussions of procedure since I feel it would be out of place at this time to do so, in view of the fact that the situation is perfectly clear on the present subject. I would, however, like to explain the position of my delegation on the matter now under the General Assembly's discussion.

On behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, I wish briefly to explain why, if it is put to the vote, our delegation will vote against the draft resolution submitted in document A/SPC/L.130/Rev.4 and appearing in the report of the Special Political Committee as recommendation B.

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

It is also for the fundamental reason that we have always vigorously opposed and continue to oppose certain Powers, first among them the United States of America, which seek 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 evident and result in the worst sufferings for the peoples of those countries.

The effectiveness of our Organization is not diminished by constitutional defects, as some would have us believe; it is weakened, above all, by the policy of imperialist aggression and colonial oppression that certain Powers continue to practice through their acts of interference in the internal affairs of other States.

Those same Powers, using all means at their disposal, oppose the legitimate aspirations of peoples to genuine freedom and national independence and officially take one position while at the same time acting in contrary fashion, from a position opposing the defence of the interests of those peoples. On the one hand, they say they are for the peaceful settlement of problems and against the use of

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

force -- officially, of course; on the other hand, they do not hesitate to employ the most brutal means. But in any case, whenever they intervene it is for the purpose of defending their own imperialist interests to the detriment of the aspirations of peoples to freedom and a better life.

There is no need to comment on the fact that the country whose policy is at the root of the present difficulties of our Organization -- I refer to the United States of America -- behind the camouflage of a hypocritical concern over the effectiveness of the United Nations in the field of peace-keeping, is the same country whose Government is carrying on a barbarous war against a people whose only aspiration is for self-determination.

To increase the effectiveness of the United Nations is above all to oppose the policy of imperialist aggression and colonial oppression, to fight resolutely for respect for the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and their implementation.

Those delegations that are seeking to undermine the foundations of the Charter -- and above all the delegation of the United States and those others which, for one reason or another, have indicated that they are ready to give their support to the Canadian text -- should bring themselves to realize the grave responsibility they are taking upon themselves.

The idea that the effectiveness of the United Nations can be strengthened by infringing the Charter of the Organization must be rejected, for the tragedies of Korea and the Congo have dissipated all illusions in that regard.

The General Assembly is now called upon to deal with the report submitted by the Special Political Committee, and with a draft resolution dealing with the so-called peace-keeping operations in all their aspects. This draft resolution has one main feature: without offering any solution to the problem we are discussing within the framework of the Charter it nevertheless points the future work of the United Nations in this matter along a path leading inevitably to a new crisis for the Organization.

The draft resolution was submitted to the Special Political Committee by certain small countries that are not, however, involved in a policy that would lead to the destruction and disintegration of the United Nations. But the draft resolution as a whole and its component parts represent a time-bomb placed at the very foundation of the United Nations.

Certain speakers, in defending this draft, have tried to represent it as "well-balanced". That term, "well-balanced", not only has by this time lost

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

its original meaning, but even, in the light of certain developments within the Organization, has begun to take on a completely opposite significance.

Only a few days ago, it will be remembered, in an important body of the United Nations we were all witnesses to a vote on another resolution which, according to certain Western Powers, could also be described as "balanced"; I refer to the resolution presented by Great Britain and adopted by the Security Council on the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the aim of which was to prolong the existence of the colonial régime in that country. And having seen what happened there, can anyone still use the term "well-balanced" to describe a draft resolution like the one now presented here?

If a draft resolution for the perpetuation of the apartheid régime and the colonial régime in Southern Rhodesia can be presented as a well-balanced draft, why not, then, describe as "well-balanced" the draft resolution submitted by Canada and certain other countries, a draft which is going to undermine all the work of the United Nations? One wonders why not.

According to the Charter, it is the Security Council alone that may deal with operations for the maintenance of peace. That is one of the basic principles of the Charter and one of the best of the principles in that document. But the Security Council has never imposed an intolerable burden on the small countries, has never taken a single decision detrimental to the interests of the various peoples, particularly those struggling for their freedom and those of the newly independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

If in the past unjust decisions have been taken, they were taken, and the subsequent operations were carried out, in violation of the Charter and following decisions of the General Assembly; that is to say, they were taken in the name of a so-called majority, but always, as the Ambassador of France correctly indicated the other day, in the interest of a single country or group of countries.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

In expressing its opposition to the Canadian draft resolution, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria must denounce any attempt at placing responsibilities on the General Assembly which are within the exclusive purview of the Security Council.

In the course of the debate, the Bulgarian delegation has made known its point of view on the question of the authorization, control, conduct and financing of future peace-keeping operations. That position is based on the clear-cut division of competence as between the Security Council and the General Assembly, and we base ourselves primarily on Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which provides that:

"Any such question" -- that is, one which touches on international peace and security -- "on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion."

All decisions which might be in contradiction with provisions of the Charter as is the case of the Canadian draft, would be illegal. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, like other countries have which already stated their positions, could never recognize such a decision, which would be contrary to the stipulations of the Charter.

On the other hand, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is ready to support any draft resolution which would be in keeping with the Charter and of such nature as to increase the effectiveness of our Organization in the maintenance of peace, pursuant to the principles of the Charter. This applies to the draft resolution submitted by Jamaica, which appears in the report of the Special Political Committee under recommendation C.

It would be in the interest of our Organization to adopt a formula which would permit us, in an atmosphere of calm and quiet, to seek a solution capable of strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining peace, while still respecting the terms of the Charter.

The Bulgarian delegation invites those delegations which truly think they can arrive at a better solution by violating the Charter to weigh carefully the consequences of such a stand. The Bulgarian delegation, like many others, expresses the hope that the United Nations will be able to overcome the difficulties presently besetting it.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

There is no doubt that, to a large extent, the future of our Organization will depend on the decision we shall adopt. That is why we believe that the draft resolution (A/L.515) just submitted by a certain number of countries, including Afghanistan, which would refer the report of the Special Political Committee 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, is one which deserves our support. We consider that that would be a wise decision on the part of the Assembly since it would allow all delegations to specify their positions and once again weigh all the responsibilities that they would have to shoulder by voting on draft resolutions that were not sufficiently prepared and which ran counter to the Charter of the United Nations.

It is for those reasons that we shall vote in favour of this draft resolution.

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.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): On Saturday, 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) -- 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.

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".

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.

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 sizeable 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.

Therefore, I propose the amendments contained in document A/L.512, which provide as follows: 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".

I hope this 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.

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".

The following paragraph 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..." (A/6603, page 16)

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

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.

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.

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 violates the Charter or which was suspected of in any way violating the Charter.

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".

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 (b).

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.

The PRESIDENT: For the information of those representatives who were not here when I made an appeal for briefer statements at this stage, I should like to repeat my appeal. The reason for it is so obvious to everyone of us here that I hope I shall not have to take the time of the Assembly again by reminding the representatives.

Mr. T.O. Dosumu 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 re-study the item, as outlined in the so-called resolution of Canada and its co-sponsors, 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.

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.

The Canadian 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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

In supporting draft resolution B in this report, 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. 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."

(Mr. Johnson, Liberia)

Article 11, paragraph 4 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."

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."

(Mr. Johnson, Liberia)

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.

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.

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.

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.

Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): After the statement by the representative of Liberia especially, 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 introduced in document A/L.515.

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.

Moreover, we believe that the motion for priority put forward by the sponsor 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."

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.

Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Costa Rica is a co-sponsor, with the delegations of Ireland and other countries, of the 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 be not voted on at the present session of the Assembly. In view of the fact that proposal B submitted by Canada and other countries maintains the same general principles as those of the proposal of Ireland and eleven other countries, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution B recommended by the Special Political Committee and we shall oppose priority being granted to the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly today.

The delegation of Costa Rica believes that basically we are arguing here about the powers of the General Assembly and its competence to deal with questions relating to the maintenance of peace. In this regard the General Assembly has already adopted resolutions in previous years reaffirming the functions which the Assembly was called on to exercise under the Charter, particularly Article 1, and today we cannot retrogress without damaging the prestige of our Organization. We believe that the General Assembly, as its primary mission, is called upon to ensure compliance with the United Nations Charter, which in its Preamble affirms that the main object of the Organization is the maintenance of international peace and security.

For those reasons the delegation of Costa Rica will vote in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. NGUZA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (interpretation from French): During my intervention in the Special Political Committee I clearly indicated the reasons which led my delegation to vote in favour of the so-called Irish text and also of the text submitted by the Canadian and other delegations. The Irish text having been withdrawn by its authors, we have before us only the text submitted by the Canadian delegation.

I do not wish to dwell on the reasons justifying our basic position on this matter. Both in the Committee and in the General Assembly, my delegation has always upheld the principle of consultation and it has been in favour of allowing time for delegations to ponder. In the Committee two weeks were allowed for consultations, and we know the results. In the General Assembly we agreed on Saturday that more time should be given to delegations for reflection. The result of the consultations has been the submission of the short draft resolution contained in document A/L.515. My delegation has never been consulted directly or indirectly on the preparation of that draft resolution. Accordingly we are most surprised to be confronted with a text said to be from the non-aligned countries. My delegation has serious doubts about the need to refer this question again to the Special Committee of thirty-three nations, which in the past has done its best but has presented us, it must be admitted, with a record of failure.

The conditions which prevailed then and which explain the state of affairs do not seem to have changed, in the view of my delegation, and consequently we are more convinced than ever after listening to the debate that is taking place at this late hour.

Moreover, a session is being convened in April 1967 to discuss the question of South West Africa. We run the risk of facing then the same situation as that confronting us today, and the same arguments might then be used to refer the question to the following session.

(Mr. Nguza, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

Finally, the argument that we should avoid resolutions opposed by the majority does not seem convincing to my delegation; Indeed we are rather shocked by such an argument. How, then, could we vote? If we do not wish the majority to impose its will, I think that the Assembly will be inclined to believe with me that it would be even more inadmissible for a minority, whatever it might be, to impose its will on a majority.

My delegation has always been in favour of the principle of negotiation, but we believe that sufficient time has been allocated to delegations for that purpose. Therefore, we shall not be in a position to support the new draft resolution postponing the examination of this question; nor we can we support the motion for priority to be given to this draft resolution. Our fundamental position remains the same; we shall vote in favour of the Canadian draft resolution.

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.

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.

(The President)

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. The recorded vote will be explained by the Under-Secretary.

Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs):

If the General Assembly agrees, we can have a recorded vote instead of a roll-call vote, with no disadvantage as far as the recording of the vote of each delegation is concerned. It will be recalled that, under rule 89 of the rules of procedure, it is mandatory to call in the usual way the names of delegations, which answer and at the same time press the appropriate buttons on their desks. The alternative procedure of a recorded vote can result in a considerable saving of time without any disadvantage. When the President asks those in favour, those opposed and those abstaining to signify, delegations will press the appropriate buttons. The result of the voting will appear immediately on the boards and the automatic printer will then produce the tally sheet. After the President has announced the result of the vote, copies of the tally sheet can be made available to all delegations. Further, in accordance with rule 89, the votes of all delegations will appear in the verbatim and other official records in the English alphabetical order of the names of Member States.

I should add that I shall wait for the votes of all delegations to be recorded, and shall check on this particular point, before the voting mechanism is locked.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, the Assembly will proceed to vote by recorded vote on the motion for priority.

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

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

XhxcXcxscdxnkc

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with that decision of the General Assembly, 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.

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.

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 Islands, 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.

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.

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

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 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.

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

(The President)

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.

I call on the representative of Guinea.

Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (interpretation from French): When the draft resolution contained in document A/L.515, of which my delegation is a co-sponsor was introduced, there may have been an error in interpretation. But the draft itself is clear. That draft decides to refer the report of the Special Political Committee to the special session.

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

Naturally, my delegation accepts your explanation, Mr. President, but it draws the conclusion that the Assembly as a whole made an error by accepting a vote on the draft resolution submitted by Jamaica, which my delegation supported.

The situation is simple: I believe that the General Assembly should have the courage to recognize that it made an error, and it should decide that a vote did not take place on the Jamaican proposal. In short, the Assembly should state that the vote just carried out was not a normal one, and it should act as though that vote had not taken place and the whole of the report of the Committee should be transmitted to the Committee of Thirty-Three. I make this as a formal motion.

The PRESIDENT: The suggestion made by the representative of Guinea comes under rule 33 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."
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 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 Islands, 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.

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 record as a resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

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

Mr. CUEVAS CANCELO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has approved the draft resolution contained in document A/L.515, which was introduced by the delegation of Algeria; my delegation supported that resolution. Therefore, 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.

My delegation considers that the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, of which my delegation is a member, must be guided along the following lines:

First, to examine in detail each of the resolutions approved by the Special Political Committee as a very important contribution to help in the solution of one of the most urgent problems confronting the Organization.

Second, to continue, in conformity with resolution 2053 A (XX), the complete consideration and comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, and in particular to study: (1) the apportionment among the Members of the Organization of the expenses of peace-keeping operations, giving due attention to the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council, to the relatively limited capacity to pay of the countries whose economies are in the process of development, to contribute to defraying the expenses of such operations, to the need to give special attention to the situation of any Member State or any Member States which are victims of aggression and to those countries which in any other way participate in the actions of the United Nations in peace-keeping operations; (2) to pay special attention to the installation, services and personnel which the Member States will contribute voluntarily in a peace-keeping operation.

In the same way, the Special Committee also has to study a possible recommendation to the Security Council on the ways to improve the peace-keeping operations, on the basis of the investigation of the possibilities of signing agreements with Member States in order to place at the disposal of the Security Council, when the latter requests it, armed forces, assistance and facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Article 43 and in keeping with paragraph 2 of Article 47 of the Charter, and all these points will form part of the report that the Special Committee will submit to the fifth special session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEMS 30, 39 AND 91

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE; 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; TREATY GOVERNING THE EXPLORATION AND USE OF OUTER SPACE, INCLUDING THE MOON AND OTHER CELESTIAL BODIES: (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6621);
- (b) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/6627)

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.

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 contribution 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.

This is, in every sense of the word, a United Nations treaty, in which all Member nations can justly take great pride.

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

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.

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.

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.

It is with great satisfaction that the United States will vote for draft resolution II, 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.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution of the First Committee approving a Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. This Treaty, which was worked on in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and in the Legal Sub-Committee, is the fruit of the collective efforts of many delegations. It represents the substantial effort made by the Soviet Union over many years, beginning with the launching of the first space satellite in our country. In undertaking efforts designed to solve the serious problems confronting humanity by the exploration of outer space and in following its consistent efforts to solve the juridical problems posed by outer space, the Soviet Union submitted, as an important item of the agenda of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, the question of concluding a treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the field of the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and submitted a draft treaty under this item.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

We note that the broad approach to the definition of the various juridical norms of outer space activities, which was the basis of the Soviet draft treaty, was approved by a wide margin of agreement in the Committee. We attach great importance to the fact that there was a wide margin of agreement on the important Soviet proposal which prohibits the launching into orbit around the earth of any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. One of the most important provisions is the prohibition of the use of celestial bodies for warlike purposes.

We should note, however, that despite the important significance of the agreement on the treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, we cannot forget for one moment the fact that the extremely important problem of disarmament and, in the first place, of nuclear disarmaments remain unresolved. The Treaty governing the exploration and use of outer space, with all its importance, cannot, of course, be regarded as a substitute for agreements on the vital questions of disarmament and on removing the threat of nuclear war. These most important problems must be resolved immediately.

In referring to this Treaty, we should like to emphasize that we regard it as a victory of the peace-loving nations against those that would like to use outer space for military purposes. The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that the General Assembly will unanimously adopt the first world Treaty on the exploration and use of outer space.

The Soviet delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution I, which calls for the holding of a United Nations Conference on the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space in Vienna in September 1967. The Soviet Union has for many years favoured the holding of such an international conference, which would draw the balance sheet of the results of the exploration of outer space, and plan prospectives of future work, including possibilities of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. We express the hope that this draft resolution will also be supported by the General Assembly.

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.

(Mr. Vinci, Italy)

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.

Almost five centuries ago, shortly after Columbus' first voyage across the Atlantic, two of the main Powers of thosetimes 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.

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.

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). We urge the unanimous approval of those draft resolutions.

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 established 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.

(Mr. Vinci. Italy)

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.

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.

Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation having had the honour of speaking twice in the First Committee on the items relating to outer space, I wish today to make only a few remarks which I believe are called for in the light of our interesting discussions on Friday and Saturday of last week.

Concerning what we may call the Vienna Space Conference of 1967, the French delegation is gratified that resolution A/C.1/L.393 was adopted unanimously by the First Committee. We earnestly hope that the plenary assembly will do the same and that the pertinent Secretariat services will as soon as possible take up the complex task of preparing for that Conference, to which my country wishes the greatest success.

With regard to the draft treaty annexed to resolution A/C.1/L.396 my delegation listened with great attention to the thirty-odd speakers who spoke on this subject the day before yesterday. Since we are a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in question, we were naturally very happy to see it adopted by acclamation. We were, however, among those who, following our colleague Mr. Manfred Lachs, pointed out that this treaty is only the first chapter of the law of outer space, on which a great deal still remains to be done.

Without going back to the uncertainties or the deficiencies in the treaty itself -- many did so, and quite pertinently, last Saturday, particularly the representative of India -- I would emphasize, with all the necessary clarity, the importance which my Government attaches to having this text completed and, on certain essential points, clarified by further negotiation.

As is common knowledge that it was at the request of my delegation that, in draft resolution A/C.1/L.396 a provision which in our view is 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". (A/6621, p.11)

The last words refer to a certain number of problems that we have not wished to enumerate. However, we are happy at the addition proposed in due time by our colleagues from Chile, Mexico and the United Arab Republic, which, at the end of sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 4, specifies certain of these problems, namely those involving the various consequences of space communications.

(Mr. Seydoux, France)

The Committee on outer space will next year report to us on the work done along these lines and, of course, on the problems of assistance and liability. Far from regretting that delay, we believe that the Committee, relieved of the necessity of having to work with undue haste, will be able to take into account advances made in space science and technique and consider the legal implications of such progress as it occurs.

It is in the light of all this that my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.396 as well as those dealing with other space questions.

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.

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 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.

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 contained in document A/6621, annexed to draft resolution II.

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.

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 being 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 my Government has not had the opportunity to approve.

Several representatives have expressed a reservation regarding article 4 of the draft treaty; other representatives have expressed a reservation and exposed the possible different interpretation and the loop-hole 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 resolution by this Assembly may well have been an intended effect of a hollow victory, particularly with respect to the disarmament provision of article 4, because of the difficulty of ascertaining the extent of the limits regarding the prescribed behaviour.

There is a hint of a global legislative authority in certain articles of the draft treaty, notably articles 1, 2 and 12. That legislative authority, whether or not implicit in Articles 2, 10 and 11 of the United Nations Charter, can only be morally based 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 paragraph 14 of the treaty, where it "calls on all States".

However, how much stronger would have been the moral basis for assuming global legislative jurisdiction in 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.

I have taken pains to explain the position of my delegation on this important 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 document A/6621.

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.

It cannot be denied that even at first glance the 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 scrutiny than had hitherto been granted to most delegations.

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.

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.

Taking into account what happened in the First Committee, my delegation has no intention of coming 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.

Mr. HAMED (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.

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 the activities in outer space.

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

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 article 4, paragraph 1, we note with disappointment that they are not so prohibited on the moon.

(Mr. Hameed, Ceylon)

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.

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.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote, seriatim, on the three draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 19 of its report (A/6621).

Draft resolution I is entitled "International 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.

The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Treaty Governing 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.

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.

The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who wishes to make a statement.

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.

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.

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.

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.

(The Secretary-General)

No less gratifying is the decision of the General Assembly which endorsed the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on 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.

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.

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.

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.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I had the opportunity in the First Committee 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,

(Miss Brooks, Liberia)

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 had no other recourse.

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: 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: REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6618) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly also has before it document A/L.514 containing amendments submitted by several Members. I call on the representative of Cuba to introduce his amendments.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation made very clear in the course of the debate in the First Committee its position in principle regarding the so-called Korean question. In the First Committee we expressed our opinion that the discussions that for year after year have taken place in this Organization are illegal in nature and furthermore assume viciously tendentious and useless forms reflected in the yearly repetition of a procedure which prohibits the participation in those debates of the parties directly concerned.

Consistent with that position of my delegation we co-sponsored the inclusion of item 93 in our agenda and a draft resolution which we submitted on that item and which was discussed in the First Committee. That draft resolution called for the immediate withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces deployed in South Korea at present, the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the conclusion once and for all of the discussion of these matters in our Organization.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Everyone is aware of the result obtained in the First Committee on our proposal, which would have led to a true solution of the so-called Korean question. Instead, the General Assembly has today again to deal with a draft resolution similar to those that it has been considering for twenty years, with results whose effect is known to all delegations. My delegation still tried in the First Committee to find a practical and concrete solution to this problem which could have been found had the Committee been ready to discuss a second proposal that was submitted by the delegation of Cuba. But that was not possible. In the same spirit of trying at this session, before our deliberations are over, to find some effective way out of a problem which has been discussed in sterile debates for twenty years, delegations, among which I have the honour to count that of Cuba, have submitted a series of amendments to the draft resolution submitted to us by the First Committee. Those amendments, as all representatives will note, were drafted in a spirit of generosity and comprehension of the points that we have reiterated and which we trust will be supported by a wide number of the Members of the General Assembly.

The adoption of the text proposed by us would allow us to emerge from the present session of the General Assembly with the Korean question taken out of the mass of statistics in which it has been placed for twenty years. We believe that although this draft resolution would not fully satisfy us, nevertheless it would be the first constructive assistance towards a solution of the so-called Korean question.

In view of the extreme lateness of the hour and in order to hasten the end of our work, I shall not go into detail concerning the modifications that we have proposed to some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee. All delegations have before them copies of the amendments in all languages. I am sure that all our colleagues have understood the meaning of the amendments and will act accordingly.

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.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On the initiative of the Soviet Union and of several other socialist countries, the General Assembly has inscribed on its agenda an important and urgent question entitled "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 which took place in the First Committee we again drew attention to the fact that one of the main causes of the continuing division of the Korean nation is to be found in the foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people. The Soviet Union and other countries which request an examination of that question thought that a discussion on that item would make it possible to rectify the injustice committed against the Korean people -- when all the foreign forces would be withdrawn from South Korea, when UNCURK would be dissolved and when the so-called Korean question would be withdrawn from the agenda of the United Nations.

It is to be regretted that because of the discriminatory attitude -- an attitude contrary to the Charter -- of the United States and certain of its allies, the Committee did not wish, in the course of this session also, to invite the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic to participate in the examination of the Korean question. This is an absolutely intolerable and abnormal situation. The Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic was thus deprived of the possibility of expressing its position on a problem which after all affects the vitally important interest of the whole Korean people.

It is in connexion with the present position in the General Assembly that a large number of States have spoken against the unjust and inconsistent policy of the United States. It is understood that the absence of the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic obviously has had a most negative influence on the consideration of the Korean question at this session of the General Assembly. The United States and its allies have again succeeded in having the First Committee adopt a decision which contradicts the provisions of the Charter and which is against the aspirations of the Korean people. That decision was dictated by the imperialist policy of the United

States designed to change South Korea into an aggressive base of the United States in the Far East, which is being used against the national liberation movements of the people in Asia, including the just and heroic struggle of the peoples of Viet-Nam against the American intervention.

We again consider it our duty to emphasize that there is no need at all for the Pentagon to occupy South Korea. It is well known that more than twenty years have elapsed since the end of World War II and more than thirteen years have elapsed since the Armistice in Korea which, in particular, provided for a stable peace in Korea and the need to withdraw all foreign forces from that territory. There are no foreign forces, not one foreign soldier, on the territory of the Korean Democratic People's Republic.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

South Korea is still occupied by United States troops. The so-called United Nations forces in South Korea are in fact United States occupation forces.

The restoration of the unity of the temporarily divided territory of Korea and the creation of a united and independent and democratic Korea are legitimate aspirations of the entire Korean people, which, like any other people, has the inalienable right to determine its own destiny in accordance with the free self-determination of peoples, which is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and has been solemnly reaffirmed by many decisions of the United Nations. That of course is an internal affair of the Korean people, which must determine for itself its own destiny and freedom, without any intervention from outside. Following the General Assembly, we once again declare that the Soviet Union has great sympathy and respect for all the heroic Korean people and that it resolutely supports the peaceful proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has never spoken against the Charter and has not jeopardized the authority of the United Nations. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has shown that it stands for a positive solution of the Korean problem in accordance with the aspirations of the heroic people of Korea.

Let us first of all recall that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upholds the view that the unification of the people should be undertaken by means of a unified Government which would represent all the strata of the population through elections by all the Korean people, North and South, without any intervention in the affairs of the country, after the withdrawal of all the foreign forces from South Korea. Secondly, as we all know, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has suggested the setting up of a committee that would be purely economic in character and would be composed of representatives of business circles, in order to promote trade between North and South, if the authorities of South Korea could not accept the confederation of North and South. Thirdly, the

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has proposed the concluding of a non-aggression agreement so that the forces of South and North Korea should be reduced to 100,000 on each side or less, after the withdrawal of all United States forces from Korea. Fourthly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as we all know, has taken a position in favour of the carrying out of a joint operation by all political parties and civilian organizations in North and South Korea through the convening of a conference of North and South Korea or in any other form for the purpose of discussing the unification of the country officially. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has also declared that it is prepared to carry out negotiations with any representatives of South Korea who really want the national unification of the country, irrespective of their political views or creeds or any property census. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea also believes that other decisions could be taken along those lines.

All this shows good will and a will to solve the question by peaceful means. That cannot be doubted. However, the United States representatives have tried to pass over in silence those peaceful proposals and to distort the facts. It would seem that the Seoul régime rejects all proposals because they are not in accordance with the designs of the overseas Power which wants to use South Korea as a base for fighting against national liberation movements.

The Soviet delegation feels it must repeat that it is the duty of all the States Members of the United Nations to contribute to the earliest realization of the aspirations of the Korean people and to contribute to the preservation of peace and security in the Far East and in Asia. As we have indicated, for that it is necessary to withdraw as soon as possible all the United States and other foreign forces, with all their arms and equipment, which under the flag of the United Nations occupy South Korea and immediately to dissolve the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Furthermore, we should put an end to the consideration of the so-called Korean question in the United Nations. That would meet the interests of the Korean people, and that was reflected in the draft resolution which was submitted

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

by the Soviet Union and several other countries for the consideration of the First Committee. In the present conditions we believe that the General Assembly should as a minimum adopt that proposal which is being submitted as an amendment by the delegation of Cuba to the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee. This is a positive and realistic proposal and it is also a just one.

We should take into consideration the obvious fact that the Korean question has been discussed in the United Nations for twenty years and that there has been no progress towards a solution. It is clear that we must immediately find a new way for solving the problem. Such a new path, as we have already indicated, may be found in negotiations between the Governments concerned, with the participation of representatives of North and South Korea appointed in equal numbers. At the same time, we should also take a decision for the withdrawal of the so-called Korea question from the agenda of the General Assembly and not discuss that question any more. We appeal to the Members of the United Nations to support that proposal.

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). 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.

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.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

It is worth mentioning that official United States spokesmen have never hidden 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.

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.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

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.

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.

In view of these considerations, my delegation is opposed to the recommendation contained in document A/6618. We firmly believe that the course chosen by the draft resolution leads nowhere except to new crises and failures of the United Nations.

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.

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 (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.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

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 whole-heartedly supports the amendments to this recommendation submitted by the representative of Cuba. We believe that these amendments should be given serious consideration.

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.

For these reasons, the Hungarian delegation recommends adoption of the amendments and the amended draft resolution by all Member States of the Assembly.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly has been called upon to deal with the report of the First Committee concerning two aspects of the Korean question. The question submitted by the Soviet Union and other countries, including my own, concerns the withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. This is one of the questions touched upon in the Committee's report. The other is the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

These two questions, which together form the Korean question, were discussed hastily in the First Committee -- and, it must be emphasized, discussed in the absence of one of the parties most directly concerned. I would say that it was discussed in the absence of the only person^{*} duly representing the Korean people, namely, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

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

Despite the efforts made by many delegations to bring the question of Korea within the context of present day realities and to contribute in some measure to the unification of Korea, some countries -- in the first place, the United States of America -- this year made a successful attempt to have the First Committee vote on a draft resolution entirely contrary to the purposes -- at least the official purposes -- enunciated in the report presented by the Committee and in the interventions of the majority of delegations, namely, the unification of Korea.

The unadmitted but obstinately pursued aim of certain delegations since the beginning of the discussion of the Korean question -- namely, to reach a negative result on the question, as in former years -- was obvious then, and even more so now. As a matter of fact, from the outset, some Western delegations violently opposed our aims by exerting powerful pressure and were thus able to bar the participation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the discussions in the First Committee. In such circumstances the General Assembly can hardly expect to receive a realistic proposal on the question of Korea from the First Committee; nor could we expect the First Committee to succeed in voting on a draft resolution which would be in keeping with what is expected of that Committee.

Indeed, the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee and on which the General Assembly is now called upon to vote was conceived in the same negative terms as all those adopted at previous sessions on the same question and found to provide no solution to the Korean question. In the past -- the same question having been presented on several occasions -- as the Assembly is aware, no adequate solution has been offered to the Korean question.

Nevertheless, in the draft resolution now before us mention is made of the fact that Korea continues to be divided and that this division does not correspond to the wishes of the Korean people. It goes on to say that the division of Korea constitutes a source of tension which prevents the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. But it is no less true that the provisions contained in the draft resolution are completely opposed to these affirmations and are not consistent with what such affirmations should lead to because, in the first place, they are contrary to the desires and affirmations expressed in the Committee by the majority of delegations which wish to contribute to the unification of Korea.

The efforts made to arrive at a reasonable and realistic solution in the First Committee having been thwarted, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is gratified to pay tribute to the efforts now made by the delegation of the Republic of Cuba somehow to improve the inadequate draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee. The amendment submitted by the delegation of Cuba (A/L.514) try to lead the decision of the United Nations along more realistic lines by urging us to recognize that thus far the United Nations efforts have been completely unsuccessful all these years, and therefore the Cuban amendment places the Korean question on a more realistic basis.

First of all, it is requested that a conference be called to arrange for the solution of the Korean question, to which North and South Korea would be invited, and in so doing a position would be created where a solution might be found. In these circumstances, it would be really possible for us to decide, once that has been done, to delete the Korean question from the agenda and thus truly to contribute to the creation of a better atmosphere conducive to the solution of the important question of peaceful coexistence, and not take up the time and the energy of the Assembly in dealing with questions that only revive the cold war between nations and among the Members of the United Nations.

Furthermore, this will allow the Korean people themselves to decide upon their own future and to exercise their right to self-determination. Surely, this is the best contribution we can make to a solution of the Korean question, and that is why we believe that the amendment submitted by the delegation of Cuba should be supported by all delegations.

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.

My delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document A/6618 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.

However, my delegation wishes to make an observation on the report submitted by UNCURK. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 contained in document A/6618.

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 approved 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.

As we have already pointed out in the First Committee, 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 Commission 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.

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?

(Mr. Tomorowicz, Poland)

A special conference of States interested in the Korean question may offer 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, as embodied in document A/L.514. The Polish delegation hopes that in its modified form the draft resolution will prove acceptable to a majority of the Assembly and we warmly recommend it to the approval of the General Assembly.

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

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 in document A/6618. The co-sponsors of the draft amendments contained in document A/L.514 were among the delegations that tried in vain in the First Committee to push through draft resolution A/C.1/L.389 which, inter alia, would have the Assembly decide that the Korean question should not be discussed "in the United Nations in the future".

That was rejected by the First Committee by the decisive vote of 61 to 21, with 25 abstentions.

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. They are indeed new proposals. 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?

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 interests of facilitating the work of the Assembly, we would refrain at this stage of our deliberations from raising a question of

(Mr. Jimenez, Philippines)

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.

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 contained in document A/6618.

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, as indicated in paragraphs 14 and 15 of its report (A/6618). Under the circumstances the introduction of similar proposals at this late hour can only be interpreted as a last-ditch effort to nullify everything the United Nations has done and what it stands for with regard to the Korean question.

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 and independent and unified Korea, we strongly oppose an attempt such as the one now made in the amendments contained in document A/L.514, submitted by ten Powers. We hope that those proposals will be decisively rejected.

Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The General Assembly is considering the report of the First Committee on items 31 and 93 relating to the so-called Korean question.

My delegation already had the opportunity of outlining its position on this question during its discussion in the First Committee.

We have two items concerning the Korean problem on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly. First of all, there is the item introduced on the basis of the proposal made by the socialist countries concerning 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

(Mr. Busniak, Czechoslovakia)

the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, an item which for many years now has unlawfully been included in the agenda of the United Nations and which is devoted to the report of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

The First Committee discussed two draft resolutions concerning that question. The draft resolution submitted by fourteen countries, contained in document A/C.1/L.389 concerning 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 was unfortunately rejected due to the pressure of some States, in particular, the United States. Thus the General Assembly again does not have any recommendation from the First Committee which would make it possible to adopt a decision on the Korean question that would best respond to the hopes and aspirations of all the Korean people and which would contribute to the cause of the unification of Korea by the Koreans themselves through peaceful means. On the contrary, we again witness the fact that once again this year the General Assembly has before us a draft resolution adopted by the First Committee which not only cannot contribute to a decision on the Korean question but can only impede it. If the General Assembly were to adopt that draft resolution, it would be just one more unlawful measure against the Korean people.

The delegation of Czechoslovakia objected very resolutely in the First Committee to that draft resolution and voted against it. We will vote against it in this plenary meeting again because we are deeply convinced that the adoption of such a draft resolution could only do harm to the cause of the unification of Korea and to the final solution of the Korean question, which is solely within the jurisdiction of the Koreans themselves in both parts of the country and that any intervention, including the intervention of the United Nations, is illegal and unlawful.

(Mr. Busniak, Czechoslovakia)

My delegation is of the view that the only correct measure we can adopt in this present situation is finally to expunge the so-called Korean question from the agenda of the United Nations and stop interfering in the affairs of the Korean people. That is the purpose of the amendments submitted by the delegations of ten socialist countries in document A/L.514. My delegation bases itself on the premise that adoption of this amendment would put an end to intervention in the affairs of Korea and create conditions for solution of the question of the unification of Korea by the Koreans themselves. That is why my delegation, which is one of the co-sponsors of the amendments, calls upon the General Assembly to adopt them.

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.

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 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 amendments 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.

It is open to serious question whether the motives behind this new move, any 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

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

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.

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 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.

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.

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

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

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.

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.

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

We urge therefore that this effort also be resisted. We urge that the Assembly turn aside this obviously diversionary movement. We oppose the amendment 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 sixty-six to nineteen. 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.

Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): In the course of the debates that took place in the First Committee on the Korean question, the Romanian delegation went into detail on the true meaning of this question, and gave its views on the ways to solve the question. At that time, we stressed that the so-called Korean question is nothing but the re-establishment of the national unity of a divided country and that, therefore, that problem falls squarely within the domestic jurisdiction of the Korean people, and must be solved only by the Korean people itself, in the exercise of its inalienable and inherent right to self-determination, without any foreign interference.

The lengthy discussions that have taken place in the United Nations on the Korean question have not only not assisted in the solution of the problem, but furthermore have made that solution even more difficult to obtain. They have confirmed the impossibility of applying to the question of the unification of Korea an answer forged outside the country without the participation of those directly concerned.

In order to extricate the Korean question from the stalemate in which it has found itself in the last twenty years, Romania joined thirteen other States in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/L.389, by which the General Assembly was requested to ensure the withdrawal of all the 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 no longer to consider or discuss the question of Korea at its sessions.

(Mr. Diaconescu, Romania)

The adoption of that draft resolution would have allowed our Organization to place the question of Korea in the right context, to let the Korean people freely decide for itself, and thus open the road to a solution of the question. By such a measure the United Nations would have been able to make a valuable contribution to the settlement of this grave national problem besetting the Korean people. We very much regret that the Political Committee did not succeed again in adopting a realistic position regarding the proposals made in draft resolution A/C.1/L.389. It preferred to follow the same course which, up to now, instead of bringing us closer, has been leading us ever further from the objectives we claim to pursue in this Organization.

The amendments now submitted to the Assembly by the delegations of ten countries, including Romania, in document A/L.514, are the expression of the sincere desire not to let another opportunity go by without making at least a minimum contribution to the solution of the Korean question. The proposal contained in the amendments could not be simpler. All we asked to do is have the General Assembly decide to eliminate the so-called Korean question from its agenda and no longer deal with the problem. If the United Nations were to act thus it would give the Korean people itself a right to decide its own affairs according to its own will and in keeping with its own national aspirations. The adoption of these amendments on the part of the General Assembly would be a wise move; it would be an encouragement to the negotiations taking place between the two parties in Korea in their attempt to find the means for a solution to the problem of the unification of Korea. Such a decision would be all the more precious since it would come at a moment conducive to fruitful negotiations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea.

As is known, in its memorandum of 21 July last, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea again stated its readiness to negotiate with any South Korean authority sincerely desirous of achieving the national unity and unification of the country. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea likewise declared itself in favour of the convening of a conference for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question in which the interested parties would be represented.* Such a conference, which would have the participation

* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Diaconescu, Romania)

of representatives of North Korea and South Korea, as well as of countries nominated in equal number by the North and South Korean Authorities respectively, would be called upon to study the means for arriving at a durable peace in Korea and achieving the peaceful unification of the country.

For all the reasons I have just outlined, I should like to appeal to my colleagues to support the amendments contained in document A/L.514.

Mr. MOUANZA (Congo (Brazzaville)) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly has just received an American draft resolution that offers no solution to the Korean question. In point of fact, this question has been vainly and uselessly studied for twenty years in the United Nations, and it becomes more and more obvious that the chances of solving it are dwindling.

This very year, the idea of a dialogue, which was voiced by certain countries believing in the effectiveness of dialogue, was discarded for the simple reason that certain Powers -- the United States in particular -- have made South Korea their private reserve and would not want to encourage contact between the peoples of the two Koreas -- a contact which would certainly lead all Koreans to evict those who are exploiting them.

(Mr. Mouanza, Congo (Brazzaville))

As I have said, the United States are the proprietors and the land-owners in South Korea, and they still keep our Organization under their thumb. This has happened for a long time, and it will perhaps happen for a long time to come. The United States cannot accept that this question of Korea should be dropped from the agenda of the United Nations. As can be seen, by hook or by crook the United States tries to ensure that the question of Korea be kept on the agenda of the United Nations but perhaps tomorrow they may come to their senses and see the importance of the Cuban amendments. Therefore, it would be vain and useless to continue to waste breath here discussing this matter.

It is for these reasons that my delegation will not support the draft resolution submitted by the United States and we commend to all Members of the General Assembly the amendments contained in document A/L.514 submitted by the delegation of Cuba, which we believe are more likely to lead to an immediate solution of the Korean question.

For these reasons, my delegation can in no way countenance or condone the manoeuvres of those who wish to keep South Korea in a state of perpetual slavery, a State used as a military base in order to subjugate other States and we commend to all Members of the General Assembly to support the amendments submitted by the delegation of Cuba.

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.

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, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, 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, 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 amendment was rejected by 62 votes to 20, with 34 abstentions.

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, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, 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, 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 amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 22, with 34 abstentions.

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 for the solution of the Korean question, in view of the fact that it is an urgent question which can no longer be left in abeyance."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, ^{BULGARIA} Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, 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, ~~Bulgaria~~, 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 amendment was rejected by 61 votes to 20, with 35 abstentions.

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, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, 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 amendment was rejected by 62 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions.

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 for settlement of 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, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

(page 115a-z follows)

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

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

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in document A/6618.

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 contained in document A/6618 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: REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/6598) (continued)

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

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly has considered as an urgent and important question an item entitled, "The 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, a Declaration which was adopted last year. The Soviet Union raised this question because of all the developments of the international situation which continues to become more and more tense precisely because of the criminal acts of armed intervention and other forms of intervention in the internal affairs of States and peoples on the part of the imperialist Powers, and in the first place on the part of the United States of America.

The duty of the United Nations and of its Members is precisely to spare no effort in order strictly to implement one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, principles that were enshrined again in the Declaration adopted last year on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States.

The debate that took place in the First Committee, by its scope and through the participation of many delegations, has shown the importance and the urgent character of the question inscribed on our agenda. The majority of the delegations that have expressed their views openly condemned the continuing intervention in the affairs of other States by some Western Powers. The debates has confirmed the fact that the most blatant violation in the domestic affairs of peoples, the most flagrant violation of the Declaration is reflected by the ever-increasing aggressive intervention of the United States of America in Viet-Nam.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

American troops have come to the territory of Viet-Nam as invaders, as occupiers, as those who want to stifle the freedom and independence of the Vietnamese people. The war of the United States against the Vietnamese people is the most cynical manifestation of the aggressive policy of American imperialism. It is a mockery of international law and of universally accepted standards of morality and of humanity. All those crimes lead to and bring forth grave consequences and, even on this day when the General Assembly is meeting, after the American representative had raised his hand in favour of the draft resolution which calls upon States strictly to respect and to implement the Declaration of non-intervention, the Pentagon continues to commit new and heavy crimes in Viet-Nam, grossly violating the Declaration.

Quite recently, these last few days indeed, Hanoi itself was bombed -- the capital of a sovereign socialist State, the Democratic People's Republic of Viet-Nam. American pirates, on 13 and 14 December, have bombed the residential districts in Hanoi, destroying houses and killing peaceful citizens. But the just struggle of the Vietnamese people is enjoying the support on the part of all those who hold peace dear to their heart and who want to fight for justice, for independence and for freedom of peoples. The Government ^{of} the Soviet Union and indeed the whole Soviet people have resolutely condemned the new act of American aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Viet-Nam. True to its international duty, the Soviet Union continues to stand by the side of a brother socialist State, the Democratic People's Republic of Viet-Nam. We shall continue to give all possible help to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the criminal aggression of American imperialism. Washington must put an end to aggression, and to the violation of the Declaration on non-intervention. It is up to the Vietnamese people alone to decide questions that pertain to the future of Viet-Nam.

As a result of the consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention, the First Committee has also adopted unanimously the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union with the amendments proposed by a large number of countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America. The draft resolution is now submitted for the consideration and approval of the General Assembly. In that draft resolution the General

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

Assembly condemns all forms of intervention in the domestic or external affairs of States, orders an immediate cessation of 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 the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

The Soviet delegation believes that this draft contains some measures that should be taken at the present juncture in order to strengthen peace and in order to uphold the rights of nations and peoples against those who intervene in their internal affairs. 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 fundamental provisions of the Soviet proposal have been supported by an overwhelming majority of delegations.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation makes an appeal once again for strict compliance with the provisions of the Declaration on non-intervention. In doing so we should like to emphasize that the peoples of the world will judge our loyalty to the Declaration not by words, not by statements, but by real deeds on the part of States. States will be judged on how they implement the provisions of the Declaration in fact. My delegation hopes that the consideration of this question by the twenty-first session of the General Assembly and the resolution we adopt will eradicate from international life one of the main sources of tension in the world, that is to say, intervention in the domestic affairs of States, and particularly armed intervention, which nowadays represents the main threat to peace and to the freedom and independence of countries and peoples, especially of the small countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain briefly the vote that will be cast by the delegation of Costa Rica on this draft resolution. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution, but not exclusively for the reasons adduced by the representative of the Soviet Union. He has tried to create the impression that with this draft resolution we are going to condemn the attitude resulting from the situation in Viet-Nam. The delegation of Costa Rica does not share the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution but we shall do so because the Committee in which this subject was discussed approved by a great majority the amendments submitted by Costa Rica and other Latin American delegations, which with the draft resolution wished to condemn the subversive activities inspired by the so-called Tricontinental Conference of Havana in which, by means of procedures of indirect intervention, such as the organization of

(Mr. Tinoco, Costa Rica)

guerrillas, support for terrorist activities, propaganda and other methods which we might call psychological warfare, it was intended that the democratic order in the Latin American nations be overthrown. The delegation of Costa Rica will vote in favour of the draft resolution precisely because it does condemn activities of that kind.

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. The draft resolution, as a result of appropriate amendments which were accepted, introduced by our Latin American colleagues, 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.

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-Namese 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?

(Mr. Goldberg, United States)

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."

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.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee, in precisely the same way as we voted in the First Committee itself when this question was discussed. However, I must repeat here the reservations of my delegation regarding that draft resolution. They are the same reservations as 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 law which are very dear to many peoples, particularly the small and weak peoples, is not sufficient for guaranteeing the effective implementation of such principles in the usage of everyday life.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

While the policies of interference, aggression and exploitation on the part of the United States still exist, those documents run the risk of becoming nothing but dead letters. The facts of today, the events that have been and still are taking place, even while in the First Committee and the General Assembly we discuss and adopt these principles, need no rehearsal in order to convince everyone of what I am saying. The bombing of Hanoi, the massacres, the criminal slaughter of the civilian population of the capital of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam -- all these are part of the policy of subversion, intervention and aggression of the American imperialists, reaching new heights, which, a year ago, when we adopted resolution 2131 (XX), would have seemed impossible and unbelievable. Yet these facts are known; these events do take place and will continue to take place even while the United States representative, even with his beatific smile, tells us that he will support this draft resolution, and he will press the green button before him a few moments from now. But we repeat what we said a year ago, that it is not by means of this kind of document that we can effectively guarantee the independence and sovereignty of States, but by the heroic, dedicated and resolute fight being carried out by those heroic peoples in all corners of the world against imperialism. And that struggle will not stop, but will culminate in the overthrow of American imperialism. It will be thus despite efforts made here by the imperialists and those who serve them and who stand behind and help them in their efforts to falsify these principles and turn them into weapons for exploitation, interference and aggression.

I shall go no further because we have said enough in the First Committee. Twice in the First Committee, as well as 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.

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

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have just heard the statement of the representative of the United States in connexion with the question under consideration, namely, status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention. What the United States representative has said is merely a repetition of what has been said many times by him, as well as in earlier years, including occasions when discussions on this questions were taking place in the First Committee. The representative of the United States told us what should be done and what should not be done by States. And he addressed his statement to us, the Soviet delegation. I should like to reply to the representative of the United States.

What should be done to put an end to the barbarous acts that are taking place before our very eyes? To put an end to the piratical raids against an independent State? To put an end to mockery against the independence and freedom? To put an end to the violations of our Charter and of the Declaration which we are again discussing and which it behooves us to fulfil? It should be done by the United States of America in the first place, which has grossly and blatantly violated the provisions of the Geneva Agreements, to which the representative of the United States has referred. It was the United States which, two days after signing the Geneva Agreements, began to violate them. In Viet-Nam there had not been one American soldier, not one adviser, no American equipment. And what is happening now? Almost half a million interventionists are flooding that unfortunate and wretched country. Murders are taking place in front of people's eyes. And then we are asked what to do?

The United States representative spoke of responsibility, and in his words could be heard reproaches levelled at others. But who, if not the United States, bears full responsibility for this intervention, for aggression, for the murder of people? By what right is this mockery taking place? Who provided grounds for it? Who is giving its benediction to this aggression, to this bloodshed? The Viet-Namense people, and they alone, have the right to decide their own future. No one has been given the right to interfere and to torture that land. It is the United States that should put an end to its barbarism, to the bombings. It should get out of South Viet-Nam and leave the Viet-Namense people alone. Let them alone to determine their own destiny like other people.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10 of the First Committee's report (A/6598).

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)

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 2 of resolution 2153 E (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 association of nuclear States with the work of the Conference and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session."

In that connexion representatives will find in the records of the Assembly a statement made by the representative of Pakistan as to the understanding and interpretation of the word "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.

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

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.