



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 17: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Appointment of six members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;	
(b) Appointment of six members of the Committee on Contributions;	
(c) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors;	
(d) Confirmation of the appointment of three members of the Investments Committee;	
(e) Appointment of two members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal	
Reports of the Fifth Committee	801
Agenda item 123: Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development	802
Agenda item 22: The situation in Kampuchea: report of the Secretary-General (<i>concluded</i>)	802
Programme of work	813

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*):*

- (a) Appointment of six members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/35/491)

- (b) Appointment of six members of the Committee on Contributions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/35/492)

- (c) Appointment of a member of the Board of Auditors

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/35/493)

- (d) Confirmation of the appointment of three members of the Investments Committee

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(A/35/494)

- (e) Appointment of two members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE
(PART II) (A/35/495/Add.1)

1. The PRESIDENT: This afternoon the General Assembly will consider first the reports of the Fifth Committee on subitems (a) to (e) of agenda item 17, entitled "Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments".

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

2. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations with respect to the recommendations contained in the reports of the Fifth Committee to the Assembly are reflected in the relevant summary records of the Committee.

3. The first report under agenda item 17 (a) relates to the vacancies in the membership of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/35/491]. In paragraph 5 of its report, the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the appointment of the following persons for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1981: Mr. Henrik Amnéus, Mr. Michel Brochard, Mr. Ernesto Garrido, Mr. Sumihiro Kuyama, Mr. Tang Jianwen and Mr. Norman Williams. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 35/307).

4. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the report on agenda item 17 (b) which relates to vacancies in the Committee on Contributions [A/35/492]. The Fifth Committee decided, without proceeding to a vote, to recommend that the General Assembly should appoint the following persons as members of the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1981: Mr. Helio de Burgos-Cabal, Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto, Mr. Lance Joseph, Mr. Japhet G. Kiti, Mr. Rachied Lahlou and Mr. Atilio N. Molteni. The Committee's recommendation is contained in paragraph 4 of its report. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 35/308).

5. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 17 (c), dealing with a vacancy in the membership of the Board of Auditors [A/35/493]. The Fifth Committee decided without a vote to recommend the appointment of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh as a member of the Board of Auditors for a three-year term beginning on 1 July 1981. The Committee's recommendation is contained in paragraph 4 of its report. May I take it that the

* Resumed from the 20th meeting.

General Assembly wishes to adopt that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 35/309).

6. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the Fifth Committee's report on agenda item 17 (d) relating to vacancies in the Investments Committee [A/35/494]. In paragraph 3 of its report, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should confirm the appointment by the Secretary-General of Mr. David Montagu, Mr. Yves Oltramare and Mr. Emmanuel Noi Omaboe as members of the Investments Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1981 and of Mr. George Johnston for a one-year term beginning also on 1 January 1981. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 35/310).

7. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to part II of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 17 (a) dealing with vacancies in the membership of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal [A/35/495/Add.1]. The Fifth Committee decided, without a vote, to recommend the appointment of Mr. Arnold Wilfred Geoffrey Kean and Mr. Herbert Reis as members of the Administrative Tribunal for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1981. The Committee's recommendation is contained in paragraph 4 of its report. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt that recommendation?

It was so decided (decision 35/305 B).

AGENDA ITEM 123

Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development

8. The PRESIDENT: As members are aware, agenda item 123 is for consideration directly in plenary meetings. On the basis of representations made to me by several delegations, and as a result of consultations I have conducted in this regard, it is my intention to set up an informal consultative group, under my chairmanship, prior to the Assembly's consideration of the item, which has been tentatively scheduled for 17 November.

9. It is my earnest hope that we shall, at the end of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, be able to record general agreement on the launching of global negotiations.

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in Kampuchea: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)*

10. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1: Belgium, Niger, Upper Volta and Zaire [A/35/L.2/Rev.1/Add.1].

11. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Before turning to the substance of the question now under consideration, I should like to reiterate my delegation's un-

shakable position of principle with regard to the legality of the present consideration of the question by the General Assembly, which has been misled by a propaganda campaign of distortion cunningly orchestrated by the ruling circles of Peking in close cooperation with the United States and its henchmen. My delegation's position of principle is the following.

12. First, the current debate on the situation in Kampuchea, just like the debate last year which gave birth to General Assembly resolution 34/22 of 14 November 1979, is a flagrant violation of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter of the United Nations, provisions which I should like once again to bring to the attention of the defenders or grave-diggers of the principles and purposes of our Organization. They read as follows:

“Nothing” in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State...”

13. Secondly, the problem of Kampuchea—if there is one—is for the people of Kampuchea itself to solve and no one else, especially not the United Nations, in view of the aforementioned provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, has the right to solve it in place of the people of Kampuchea, least of all without the presence and the active participation of the legal and authentic representative of the people of Kampuchea, the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea.

14. Thirdly, in the light of the two points I have just mentioned, the current debate on the so-called problem of Kampuchea is not only futile but also illegal, and, because of its illegality at the very outset, this debate can lead to nothing but a new resolution which, regardless of any majority support, will suffer the same fate as last year's resolution 34/22, to which reference has constantly been made during the course of this debate.

15. Having said that, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to give its full support to the contents of the telegram addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations from Mr. Hun Sen, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea [A/35/536, *annex*], which is a genuine State meeting all the criteria of international law relating to the concept of a State, whereas so-called Democratic Kampuchea, led by the genocidal gang of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary which was, moreover, overthrown and driven out by the heroic people of Kampuchea on 7 January 1979, only exists on paper.

16. Therefore, these sinister representatives, who are only a handful of individuals supported by the United States and its friends, despite their professions of good or bad faith with regard to the monstrous crimes committed by that gang of individuals, and particularly by the leaders in Peking who have succeeded in misleading the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] and in pushing the reactionaries of the extreme right in Thailand's governing circles to adopt a position of open confrontation with Kampuchea, Laos and Viet Nam, represent no one but themselves.

* Resumed from the 40th meeting.

17. Despite all the reservations and elements I have mentioned, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic has nevertheless decided to take part in this debate in the hope that, because of its country's geographical location in relation to the so-called battlefield of Kampuchea, it can provide international public opinion with the necessary clarifications concerning the true situation prevailing in that country and in South-East Asia as a whole.

18. The Lao People's Democratic Republic is, in fact, a small country with barely 3.5 million inhabitants. It has common borders with the People's Republic of China to the north, with the sister republics of socialist Viet Nam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea to the east and south, with the Kingdom of Thailand to the west and with Burma to the north-west, with which we enjoy friendly and good-neighbourly relations. The Lao people is a profoundly peace-loving people. It wishes to live on good terms with everyone, and particularly with its neighbours, with strict respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and mutual advantage. We have no ambition other than to live in peace in order to devote all our efforts to the national reconstruction and rebuilding of our country, so seriously ravaged by colonialist wars and imperialist aggression.

19. In its nearly-1,000-year history the Lao people has never attacked or dominated anyone; it has been the one to be the object of aggression and domination by others, particularly those which today claim to be defending the right of the people of Kampuchea to self-determination and peace and stability in South-East Asia.

20. Thus, objective and impartial international public opinion must ask itself what these true or false defenders of the right of the people of Kampuchea to self-determination and of peace and stability in South-East Asia were doing when the people of Kampuchea and the other peoples of Indochina were being subjected to intensive bombing by American B-52 aircraft, when the imperialist war of aggression was at its height, setting the entire Indo-chinese peninsula aflame and putting it to the sword, thereby threatening even more seriously than at present the peace and stability of that part of the world.

21. In this connexion, the representative of Viet Nam, in his statement before this Assembly at its 36th meeting, has already given a detailed description of the position of each of those countries, and for that reason I shall not repeat it, but I should like none the less to endorse unreservedly the highly pertinent words of the representative of Viet Nam.

22. Although it is a small country, the Lao People's Democratic Republic has never been afraid to speak the truth, particularly when some among us here are so blatantly attempting to twist it, either to serve their own interests or the interests of the group of States to which they belong or to serve the expansionists and imperialists in the hope of obtaining from them in return some political or economic advantages. It is a question of the truth about the situation in Kampuchea and the state of tension that prevails in South-East Asia.

23. With regard to the situation in Kampuchea, except in the areas bordering on Thailand, to which I shall return later, it has clearly been consolidated and improved since the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea took over power in the State.

24. Under the leadership of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea and the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, the Kampuchean people, after having suffered severely for many long years the dreadful results of the United States war of aggression and the even worse consequences of the policy of genocide practised for almost four years by the Pol Pot régime—better known by the unfortunately notorious name of "Democratic Kampuchea"—are now experiencing a vigorous new birth and taking their future into their own hands. Relying on the little they have left following the tragic events I have mentioned and thanks to their close and militant solidarity with the peoples of Laos and Viet Nam, as well as to the fraternal assistance of the latter, the Soviet Union and other brother socialist countries, including my own, and the assistance of peace-loving peoples and international organizations, the people of Kampuchea—contrary to what certain speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum have tried to make the international community believe in order to bolster their cause—have overcome the obstacles and the difficulties; they have exerted great efforts and made great sacrifices to rebuild their country and they have achieved important successes in many areas, particularly in the fields of agriculture, industry, communication, public health, culture and education.

25. Almost all the large cities, including the capital Phnom Penh, which suffered forced evacuation when the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary gang took power, are gradually being repopulated; the surviving members of the families dispersed by the genocidal gang have begun to come together again; schools, hospitals, pagodas and temples, after having for four years served as places of detention and torture for millions of Kampuchians, have been cleansed of the traces of suffering and reopened.

26. In a word, from the eyewitness reports of the many visitors to Kampuchea last year of different political and religious persuasions and from all four corners of the world, people such as Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame at South Bend, Indiana, in the United States; Victoria Butler, a special envoy of *The Globe and Mail* of Toronto, (Canada); John Swain of *The Sunday Times*; and Brian Eads, of OXFAM, life in Kampuchea is getting back to normal and is progressively improving. For more details concerning this normalization and improvement, I would refer interested representatives to *The Los Angeles Times* of 2 September 1980, *The Globe and Mail* of Toronto, of 8 September 1980, *The Toronto Star* of 7 September 1980 and *The Observer of London*, of 31 August 1980.

27. Furthermore, there are many other similar eyewitness reports by high officials of such international organizations as UNICEF and the International Committee of the Red Cross, which operate in Kampuchea.

28. On the basis of those solid, irrefutable reports, I would ask the preceding speakers at this rostrum who contended that war was raging inside Kampuchea and

very seriously spoke of the supposedly indescribable sufferings currently being endured by the people of Kampuchea the following questions.

29. First, on what did they base their assertions? I shall refrain from calling them lies.

30. Secondly, how many times have those very speakers visited Kampuchea since 7 January 1979—in other words, since the overthrow of the régime of the genocidal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary band, whom they today stand up to defend on the pretext of respect for the sacrosanct principles of the Charter of the United Nations?

31. Thirdly, as for respect for the very same principles, why do they raise only the cases of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, publicly shutting their eyes to other situations that have occurred in other parts of the world?

32. Fourthly and finally, how should we interpret that kind of conduct on the part of those who confine themselves to vehement denunciation of violations of the Charter of the United Nations by Viet Nam and the Soviet Union, when there are certain other Powers whose past and present policies are worse than the policies of those two countries?

33. My delegation is deeply concerned not only for the future of the people of Kampuchea—who, I am sure, will always progress despite the denigration and calumnies which they are suffering at present—but about the dismal role being played and the dubious efforts of those so-called defenders of the Charter. In any event, history will judge those “brilliant” advocates as they deserve.

34. By now, however, my delegation has no doubt that that exercise, camouflaged with noble professions of defending Charter principles, is nothing but inadmissible interference in the domestic affairs of the people of Kampuchea, and it is this type of activity that will not enhance the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations; quite the contrary.

35. I should like now to turn to the situation prevailing along the Kampuchean-Thai border and to the fate of the Kampuchean refugees living in refugee camps located on Thai territory not far from the border between the two countries. Of course, as can well be imagined, the situation in that region must be tense because of the continuing clashes between the combined Kampuchean-Vietnamese forces and the vestiges of the Pol Pot army and other forces coming from small reactionary bands, who are not, contrary to what the expansionists, imperialists and other reactionaries would have us believe, as interested in the so-called liberation of the country as they are in the illegal traffic between Thailand and Kampuchea. By a strange combination of circumstances those tiny groups of reactionary forces which formerly fought against the bloodthirsty Pol Pot régime, have now joined forces with the debris of the Pol Pot army in order, together with them, but each in its own way, to wage the so-called struggle for national liberation. At times it is armed confrontations between those small groups of reactionary forces themselves, by way of settling accounts, that provoke tension in Kampuchean-Thai border areas and thus upset civilian life along the border.

36. As for the matter of the number of civilians massed on the Kampuchean-Thai border, the representative of Malaysia, in his statement before this Assembly [36th meeting], advanced a figure of 1.5 million people, whereas the representative of China, in his statement before this Assembly [37th meeting], mentioned the figure of only 500,000 to 600,000 refugees.

37. In other words, if we compare the two sets of figures furnished by the “defenders” of the right to self-determination of the people of Kampuchea, we find ourselves in a welter of confusion over the true situation in Kampuchea. My delegation is far more qualified to provide the necessary information on the situation in Kampuchea, in order to thwart the attempt to mire the General Assembly in this morass.

38. And incidentally, since we are speaking of the self-determination of the people of Kampuchea, which constitutes a basic element of the concept of human rights, my delegation wishes in passing to express its indignation over the recent signing of the United Nations human rights covenants by the representative of the genocidal band that exterminated more than 3 million people in Kampuchea. That act, obviously instigated by the band's powerful masters and wicked allies, flouts good sense and the most elementary moral principles of humanity and gravely dishonours the United Nations.

39. Be that it as it may, let us return to the situation in Kampuchea. Evicted by the combined Kampuchean-Vietnamese forces, those small reactionary groups, as well as the leftovers of the Pol Pot army, have crossed the border, taking with them by force a large part of the civilian population, thus swelling the numbers of refugees in Thai camps in order to alarm world public opinion regarding the grave situation in Kampuchea, and particularly in order to divert the humanitarian assistance destined for the refugees to their own purposes.

40. On the subject of those forced refugees and the international assistance distributed in the refugee camps set up in Thailand, as well as the assistance from Thailand intended for Kampuchean civilians in the border areas, I wish to inform you of the following.

41. First of all, with regard to the refugees living in Thai refugee camps, including the Sakeo camp, which was visited by the First Lady of the United States, Mrs. Rosalind Carter, last spring: in the course of that visit, as will still be recalled, the First Lady of the United States tenderly took an emaciated child in her arms—a picture which moved the whole world. But poor Mrs. Carter did not see anything but what they wanted her to see and heard nothing but what they wanted her to hear; because the truth of the matter is that the First Lady of the United States was the dupe of a perfectly stage-managed scenario set up by members of Angkar, the omnipresent political organization of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime, which, according to Mr. Roland Pierre Paringaux, exercises effective control over the refugees in all refugee camps in Thailand. This may be unbeknownst to or with the connivance of the Thai officials responsible for those camps, the majority of whom are thoroughly corrupt and are engaged in the scandalous smuggling of products intended for distribution by international human-

itarian assistance but which they hand over to the armed bandits of the Pol Pot régime. I refer representatives to *Le Monde* of 21 June 1980.

42. It is this situation which explains, when it is a matter of international humanitarian aid, the strange findings of John Pilger, after he visited the refugee camps, that children and in general all the refugees in the camps were less well fed than the Pol Pot soldiers. The feeling openly expressed to Mr. John Pilger by Miss Phillis Gestrin of Texas, an official of UNICEF on duty on the Thai frontier, in the course of a trip they took in a convoy of trucks that carried humanitarian assistance to the so-called Kampuchean population in Kampuchean territory near the Thai frontier, was even more revealing with regard to the final destination of that assistance. Miss Gestrin said:

“I don't like to think about what this aid is doing. We are handing it to those blackshirts, and I don't trust them. We want to help only hungry people, but the politics here have changed all that. It's very distressing.”¹

The food and cereals given for the most part by Western countries, including the United Kingdom, John Pilger says, are destined for the operations of the Khmer Rouge based in Kampuchea, at Phnum Chhat, a few kilometres from the Thai border.

43. In view of what I have said, nothing causes us more indignation than to see today so many crocodile tears shed over the fate of the suffering Kampuchean people by those who have caused the suffering of those people and who still supply and help the remnants of the Pol Pot army, who were and are the sole source of the suffering of the people of Kampuchea and are causing so much misery and upheaval in the neighbouring countries. The international community must now see clearly the reasons that led to the insistence of certain Western countries, the major suppliers of assistance through the international Conference organized and camouflaged under the auspices of the United Nations, and of the representatives of the ASEAN countries that the humanitarian aid intended for the Kampuchean people be sent through Thailand. And it is for that very reason that UNICEF, which is not interested in politics, has quite rightly decided to set up its own assistance programme inside Kampuchea with the full co-operation of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, leaving aside the other countries.

44. The main cause of the tension at present prevailing in South-East Asia does not lie in the situation in Kampuchea which, as I have just described, is being progressively improved and normalized. On the contrary, the roots of the problem lie in the pre-meditated activities of the military elements in Peking which, acting in close co-operation with those in the United States, are dragging in their wake the ASEAN countries. As the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Phoun Sipraseuth, said in his statement in the general debate at this session:

“The leaders of Peking have for some time now been pursuing towards the three countries of Indo-China, an openly hostile policy aimed at sabotaging

peace and the building of socialism in those countries and at dominating them and using them as a bridge-head for their expansionist designs in South-East Asia. In order to achieve their evil purposes, they have tried, in collusion with the imperialists and other reactionaries, to pit the other countries of South-East Asia, in particular Thailand, against the three countries of Indo-China, to divide the three, Lao, Kampuchean and Vietnamese nations, to sow discord and division among each of these three peoples.” [19th meeting, para. 189.]

45. This hostile policy of the Peking leaders towards the three peoples of Indo-China was exacerbated after the failure of their Maoist experiment in Kampuchea, which resulted in the overthrow of the genocidal régime of Pol Pot-Ieng Sary, which was their creature. But, instead of realizing that the three peoples of Laos, Viet Nam and Kampuchea want to follow their path of independence and socialism, they obstinately persist in their designs and try to control those peoples. In so doing, through Thailand and with its help they are still giving massive support to the overthrown Pol Pot-Ieng Sary gang in order to turn back the clock of history in Kampuchea to their own advantage. This was particularly the case during the last rainy season. In this way, together with the imperialists, they pushed Thailand into organizing with a great propaganda campaign the so-called voluntary repatriation of Kampuchean refugees to Kampuchea, whereas it was really a large-scale operation to conceal the clumsy conspiracy against the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Furthermore, how can those operations possibly be called “voluntary repatriation” when we know full well that incredible pressure was exerted on those poor refugees by the Thais to induce them to leave Thailand. In this connexion, I refer representatives to the article by Mr. Roland Pierre Paringaux in *Le Monde* of 21 June 1980.

46. A little before these events in Kampuchea which resulted in the frontier incidents of 23 and 24 June, of which there was enormous political exploitation to the detriment of Kampuchea and Viet Nam by the leaders in Peking, the imperialists and their henchmen, those same elements forced the reactionaries of the extreme right in the governing circles of Thailand to undertake a series of provocative acts against my own country along the Mekong River, the most serious of which took place on 14 and 15 June and led to the unilateral closure by the Thais of their border with our country despite the provisions of international law concerning freedom of transit and access to the sea and the joint Thai-Lao communiqués of 1979 establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence and good neighbourliness between the two countries.

47. However, desirous of reducing the tension as much as possible, Laos has never tried to make political capital out of that grave incident to the detriment of Thailand. We trust and hope that the Thai side will understand sooner or later that it is in the interest of the peoples of both our countries to live in a spirit of understanding and good neighbourliness, returning to the strict and scrupulous application of the joint communiqués in question. We also trust and hope that Thailand and the other ASEAN countries will bow to the inevitable and realize that the tense situation on the Thai-Kampuchean frontier is of benefit neither

¹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

to the people of Thailand nor to the people of Kampuchea, neither to the peace nor to the stability of the region.

48. In the recent past in this Assembly and elsewhere we have heard the following words spoken by the representative of one of those countries in explanation of the position that his country has taken on the so-called problem of Kampuchea: "When you see your neighbour's house burning, you must help him put out the fire if you do not want the flames to spread to your own house."

49. As far as the case of Kampuchea is concerned, is it truly, as those countries contend, a matter of assisting the people of Kampuchea to staunch their deep wounds or to find a political solution to the problem of Kampuchea when, instead of remaining neutral, they give sanctuary to the Pol Pot armed gangs and allow their territory to be used for the supply of weapons to those same forces that are carrying out activities designed to destroy and undermine Kampuchea?

50. My delegation is not trying to give lessons to anyone, but I should like to stress the fact that the policy of the poor simpleton who, when it was raining, jumped into a pond to avoid getting wet, is not the most appropriate policy to apply in the case before us or in other similar cases that occur elsewhere.

51. It is for this reason that we are deeply convinced that the joint declarations by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the three countries of Indo-China on 5 January 1980 in Phnom Penh and on 18 July 1980 at Vientiane could clear the way to a solution acceptable to both groups of countries, through dialogue, not through confrontation. As far as we are concerned, we have no intention of imposing our views on Thailand or the other ASEAN countries but, by the same token, logic forces us not to bow to demands that do not meet or guarantee our own interests and security.

52. We appreciate fully the worth of the Secretary-General's exercise of his good offices between Viet Nam and Thailand, which led to a meeting between the Ministers for Foreign of the two countries at United Nations Headquarters on 1 October last, and we trust that that dialogue will continue and will ultimately lead to fruitful results for the benefit of peace and stability in South-East Asia and elsewhere in the world.

53. As far as draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 is concerned, my delegation would like to make the following comments.

54. First, this draft resolution does not reflect the true situation in Kampuchea and in the whole of South-East Asia, primarily as far as the cause of tension in that part of the world is concerned.

55. Secondly, it is not a factor likely to bring closer together the differing views of those primarily concerned and interested in the situation. Quite the contrary: in operative paragraph 2, it has introduced a new element by suggesting the convening of an international conference on Kampuchea. That initiative at this stage is an escalation by the sponsors of the draft amendment of their interference in the domestic affairs of the people of Kampuchea.

56. Thirdly, this draft resolution reflects the determination of one party to impose its views on the other, without taking due account of the legitimate interests and security of the latter.

57. Fourthly, the proposed conference, according to the document circulated as A/C.5/35/27 and Corr.1, will entail enormous expenditure for the United Nations at a time when its budget is suffering from a very large deficit.

58. As of this moment, as far as the conference is concerned, because the People's Republic of Kampuchea is not being allowed to participate in the discussion of a matter that concerns it first and foremost and because it energetically opposes the decision to call that conference, I wish, on behalf of the three countries of Indo-China, categorically to state that we shall not participate in it.

59. For all the reasons that I have mentioned, my delegation most vigorously speaks out against draft resolution now before the Assembly.

60. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. President, this is the first time I have spoken since you took your high office, I should like formally to congratulate you on your success in the election. We know the campaign was long and arduous up to the finish.

61. I should like to make a few remarks on the situation in Kampuchea which has been the subject of many and long debates at the United Nations and in other international meetings for nearly two years now. One line of the debate which we concluded just over a week ago calls for the removal from this Organization of the representatives of Democratic Kampuchea. The leader of that line of debate is none other than the representative of Viet Nam who no doubt recalls, as we do, similar arduous efforts to remove the representatives of Cambodia from the Organization barely five or six years ago. Although the players and the sides taken have changed, the game is the same. The Khmer people have been subjected to external aggression and the aggressor is seeking to control Kampuchea through his selected Kampuchean collaborators.

62. We have said no to the pleas of Viet Nam and we call for the removal of its forces from Kampuchea to allow the people of that sad country to manage their own affairs. We spent many years calling for the people of Viet Nam to be left alone to manage their own affairs, and Viet Nam cannot expect us to do less for the people of Kampuchea. We opposed external forces in Viet Nam, and we cannot now turn round and say it is all right for the Vietnamese forces to overthrow Governments they do not like in the area and occupy other countries in a new form of imperialism.

63. Viet Nam has tried to conceal its deplorable role in the Kampuchean case by constantly singing the song of the evils of the Pol Pot régime. We say yes, the Pol Pot régime was a shameful disaster for the people of Kampuchea, but the existence of that evil does not correct or overcome the evil of the Viet Nam invasion of Kampuchea. Viet Nam has broken the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations by committing aggression against Kampuchea. The song of diversion rises to a tragic extreme when the representative of Viet Nam compares the situation in

Kampuchea with the situation in Namibia and in Zimbabwe before independence, among others. The suggestion is that only Viet Nam and its supporters can understand the issues involved in Kampuchea, and everyone else is either blind or a tool of some one else. We reject the misinterpretation of the events given by Viet Nam and call for its withdrawal from Kampuchea.

64. The draft resolution before this Assembly attempts to deal as comprehensively as possible with all the issues involved in the situation: the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea, humanitarian assistance to the displaced and suffering people of Kampuchea, the issue of aggression against Thailand by Viet Nam and the maintenance of peace on the borders, the establishment of peace and formation of a government in Kampuchea after the withdrawal of the Vietnamese forces, and so on. The draft is a good one, and no doubt the details of how its provisions can be implemented will be worked out once the invading forces of Viet Nam start pulling out. We shall therefore support the draft.

65. Mr. KOH (Singapore): In the past 10 years, tragedy has struck Kampuchea on three successive occasions. The first tragedy occurred soon after the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk by his Prime Minister, General Lon Nol. Between 1970 and 1975, Kampuchea suffered from a bloody civil war between, on the one hand, the forces of General Lon Nol and, on the other hand, the forces of the National United Front of Kampuchea, formed by Prince Sihanouk and the Khmer Rouge. During that period the flames of the Viet Nam war also spread to and consumed Kampuchea.

66. On 17 April 1975, the forces of Lon Nol were defeated and the capital city of Phnom Penh was captured by the Khmer Rouge. From April 1975 until December 1978 the people of Kampuchea suffered under the cruel and oppressive rule of the Khmer Rouge.

67. In late December 1978 a third tragedy struck the unfortunate people of Kampuchea. Beginning on Christmas-day 1978 the Vietnamese launched a large-scale invasion of Kampuchea involving a force of over 100,000 troops. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea was forced to flee the capital and to continue armed resistance to the Vietnamese occupation army. Meanwhile, the Vietnamese installed Heng Samrin as the head of its puppet régime in Phnom Penh. Two months after the invasion, a treaty was signed between Viet Nam and Heng Samrin. That treaty has been cited as the justification for the invasion and for the continued presence of over 200,000 Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea.

68. I wish to say at the outset that Viet Nam, as one of the countries in the region of South-East Asia, can claim to have a legitimate interest in Kampuchea. Viet Nam has the right to expect that Kampuchea, which is its neighbour, would respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Viet Nam. Viet Nam has the right to expect that Kampuchea would pursue a policy of peace and good neighbourliness towards it. Viet Nam has a right to demand that no extraregional Power should use Kampuchea as a base for subversion or aggression against Viet

Nam. On those points I do not differ with my Vietnamese colleague. I would, of course, point out to him that Viet Nam's neighbours, including Kampuchea, also have the right to demand and to expect that Viet Nam would observe the same principles and norms.

69. Where my Vietnamese colleague and I differ is over the question whether the Government of Viet Nam has the right, under the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and under international law, to launch a large-scale military invasion of Kampuchea, to overthrow its Government and to impose a puppet régime on the Kampuchean people.

70. My contention is that what the Vietnamese Government has done exceeds the right of self-defence. It exceeds the right of self-defence because the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea are completely disproportionate to the incidents which occurred along their common border. It is also my contention that the gross and extensive violations of the human rights of the Kampuchean people by the Pol Pot Government give no right to Viet Nam to invade Kampuchea and overthrow its Government.

71. My Vietnamese colleague has argued that Viet Nam was invited to send its armed forces into Kampuchea in order to help the Kampucheans overthrow their hated régime. By whom were the Vietnamese invited? The Vietnamese answer: by the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea. The Front was organized by Vietnam, on Vietnamese territory, approximately three weeks before the Vietnamese invasion. The Front had no legal or other acceptable authority to invite Vietnamese intervention. My Vietnamese colleague has also argued that the Vietnamese invasion and occupation of Kampuchea are justifiable under the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation concluded between Viet Nam and the Heng Samrin régime. To demolish that argument it is only necessary to point out that the Treaty was signed on 18 February 1979, almost two months after the Vietnamese invasion.

72. More recently, my Vietnamese colleague has tried to justify the action of his Government in Kampuchea on the ground that it was taken in response to the Chinese threat to South-East Asia. He has argued that until the Chinese threat is removed, Vietnamese troops must remain in Kampuchea. I do not wish to dispute Viet Nam's claim that it fears China. Such fears are obviously not unfounded in the light of the Chinese armed attack on Viet Nam in February 1979. I wish only to point out that, until Viet Nam's invasion of Kampuchea, relations between Viet Nam and China were good. The following extract from a speech by the Secretary-General of the Vietnamese Communist Party, Mr. Le Duan, made on 21 November 1977 at Peking at a banquet given in his honour by the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Mr. Hua Guofeng will illustrate my point:

“Viet Nam and China share mountains and rivers... For many decades our two peoples have shared weal and woe, constantly supporting and assisting each other and building a great and militant solidarity as both comrades and brothers. The Vietnamese people's victory is closely associated with the vigorous support and great assistance provided

by the Party, the Government and the fraternal people of China. The Vietnamese people will remember this selfless aid for ever.”

73. My thesis is therefore that the quarrel between Viet Nam and China and the Chinese attack upon Viet Nam were caused, in large part, by Viet Nam's invasion of Kampuchea. If that thesis is correct, then the Chinese threat to Viet Nam can be removed only if Viet Nam puts an end to its armed intervention in and occupation of Kampuchea.

74. In draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1, the 30 sponsors have put forward a proposal for ending the conflict in Kampuchea which we believe is consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, consistent with the right of Kampuchea to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, consistent with the right of the Kampuchean to determine their own destiny, and consistent with the legitimate interest of Kampuchea's neighbours, including Viet Nam.

75. We propose that an international conference on Kampuchea be held as soon as possible in 1981. We propose that all the parties to the conflict in Kampuchea—I repeat: all the parties to the conflict in Kampuchea—and others concerned should be invited to participate in the conference. We do not insist on any pre-condition for the convening of the conference. The purpose of the conference is to find a comprehensive political settlement to the Kampuchean problem. A comprehensive political settlement must include the following seven elements.

76. First, the Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea must be totally withdrawn within a specified time-frame and the withdrawal must be verified by the United Nations.

77. Secondly, during the process of the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea, measures must be undertaken by the United Nations in order to maintain law and order, to ensure the observance of human rights and in order to prevent Kampuchean armed elements from seizing power.

78. Thirdly, the United Nations will undertake measures in order to ensure that no outside Powers interfere in the internal affairs of Kampuchea.

79. Fourthly, free elections in Kampuchea will be held under the supervision of the United Nations.

80. Fifthly, the conference will agree to prohibit the introduction of any foreign forces in Kampuchea.

81. Sixthly, the conference will negotiate and agree on guarantees to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kampuchea.

82. Seventhly, and finally, the conference will conclude guarantees to ensure that Kampuchea will not be a threat to any of its neighbours. In this way, Viet Nam's interest that Kampuchea should not be a hostile and aggressive neighbour, and that Kampuchea should not be used by any extraregional Power as a base for subversion or aggression against it, would be safeguarded.

83. In the past, our colleagues from Viet Nam have been in the habit of saying that their invasion and occupation of Kampuchea have created a new reality which the world must accept. The situation, our Vietnamese colleagues have been fond of saying, is

non-negotiable and irreversible. I should like, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 and Add.1, to appeal to Viet Nam not to reject our proposal to negotiate a political settlement. We assure Viet Nam that any political settlement will take Viet Nam's legitimate interests into account. We urge Viet Nam, in its own enlightened self-interest, to reconsider the course which it has taken in Kampuchea. As the vote on the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea has demonstrated and as the vote on this draft resolution will further demonstrate, the world has not accepted and will not accept the fait accompli which Viet Nam has established by military force. We appeal to Viet Nam to consider the heavy price it has paid and will continue to pay for its action in Kampuchea. Viet Nam's word is no longer believed and its reputation is tainted. Viet Nam's position in the world is isolated. The international support for the reconstruction of the war-ravaged economy of Viet Nam has dried up. Viet Nam is completely dependent upon the succour and support of one super-Power, and this undermines Viet Nam's claim to pursue a foreign policy of non-alignment.

84. We, the countries of ASEAN, contemplate the sorry state of Viet Nam at home and abroad with no pleasure. We should like to see Viet Nam become a strong, prosperous and non-aligned country, for such a Viet Nam would be an asset to South-East Asia. We should like Viet Nam to resume its interrupted mission to rebuild its economy and to channel the talents and energies of its people to the task of development. We, the ASEAN countries, should like to help in such efforts. We should also like to see the process of confidence building in South-East Asia, begun in 1975 and interrupted by Viet Nam's invasion of Kampuchea, begin anew. All these developments are possible only if we can negotiate an acceptable political solution to the conflict in Kampuchea. We ask Viet Nam to eschew the path of force and to come to the conference table. We appeal earnestly and in good faith to Viet Nam to accept our proposal. We ask all Members of the United Nations to help us persuade Viet Nam to come to the conference table by voting for our draft resolution.

85. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes.

86. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Last week my delegation cast its vote in favour of the acceptance of the credentials of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea. In casting that vote we made our position sufficiently clear, but we refrained from intervening in the debate because many of the reasons we would have urged in support of our position had been cogently argued by a number of delegations that voted as we did. As several delegations repeatedly emphasized, acceptance of Democratic Kampuchea's credentials carried with it no endorsement of the Pol Pot Government, whose record of violence against its own people is, to say the least, a sordid chapter in Kampuchea's tragic contemporary history.

87. We voted on the validity of the credentials of the Kampuchean delegation and no less categorically on the unacceptability of a challenge to those credentials by a Government imposed and sustained by foreign troops.

88. Draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1, which has been discussed by the General Assembly, has as its objective an international conference on Kampuchea to resolve, first, the political issues that will have to be faced in any over-all settlement, political issues which have been set out in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. We note also that such a conference should involve the participation of all—and I repeat, all—the conflicting parties in Kampuchea. I need not say that without the participation of all the conflicting parties such a comprehensive and, some will say, ambitious formula for the settlement could hardly be followed.

89. My delegation views this draft resolution as another example of the only recourse which small countries have—namely, the United Nations—when their sovereignty and territorial integrity are violated by the intervention of more powerful States. My delegation recognizes that the United Nations, which has been called upon to intervene, can play no greater role than that which all the parties to this conflict will allow it to perform. My delegation can and will support the principles set out in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

90. We also recognize and support the humanitarian objectives set out in operative paragraphs 7 to 12 of the draft resolution. These, we know, are the most urgent concerns of the Kampuchean people, whose cause is so assiduously espoused by the rival administrations in Kampuchea while they wage a savage war for the soul and loyalty of that same Kampuchean people.

91. We must nevertheless express our reservations on operative paragraph 5 of this draft resolution. While we appreciate the considerations that may have necessitated the provision in operative paragraph 5 (a), a note of caution must be sounded in respect of any step which would lead the United Nations into involvements that would detract from or compromise its indispensable non-partisan character. Operative paragraph 5 (b), which calls for the establishment of safe areas under United Nations supervision, notwithstanding its humanitarian purposes, is one on which my delegation has reservations. It seeks to establish a somewhat novel principle that has far-reaching implications which we believe require careful study.

92. Subject to these reservations, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1.

93. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Suriname): A casual reader of the records of our meetings on the Kampuchean tragedy will surely wonder why such a clear-cut case of aggression against and interference in the affairs of another country sparked off so many statements by Member States.

94. Why is it that apologists and opponents alike attempted to put the greatest possible distance between themselves and the victim of that aggression, the Pol Pot régime, in explaining their position in this council of nations?

95. The answer must be sought in the abominable human rights record of the Pol Pot Government and in its massive atrocities against its own people.

96. For this reason, only a few days ago, on 13 October [35th meeting], my delegation abstained in the voting on an amendment concerning the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea. A positive vote on that proposal could be construed as support for the régime of Heng Samrin, which owes its existence to the presence of more than 200,000 Vietnamese soldiers throughout that country. A negative vote, on the other hand, might lead to the wrong conclusion, namely that the Government of Suriname acquiesced in the atrocities committed by the Pol Pot régime against its own people and in its flagrant violations of basic human rights.

97. The many statements made during the discussions on that amendment, as well as those on draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1, seem to reflect a growing conviction that substantial infringements of human rights transcend the frontiers of the country in which they are committed.

98. Patterns of violations of human rights perpetrated in one country do increasingly attract the attention of the region and of the world community. That is one important fact the Pol Pot régime has to face in considering its international isolation, notwithstanding its strong case against Viet Nam.

99. Having said this, my delegation fully supports the draft resolution prepared by countries of ASEAN and sponsored by some 30 countries which, in our opinion, contains a basis for practical progress. We specifically endorse the call for the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea and the convening of an international conference in early 1981 with the aim of finding a comprehensive political settlement.

100. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia): My delegation will vote against draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1. As I said in my statement on 13 October [35th meeting], no problem affecting the internal or external affairs of Kampuchea can be resolved in any international organ, including the General Assembly, without the participation of the duly appointed representatives of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea. The draft resolution, in the main, repeats the terms of resolution 34/22 and again turns a deaf ear to the facts of the matter. We regard the convening of an international conference on Kampuchea, which is supposed, *inter alia*, to negotiate on United Nations-supervised free elections in Kampuchea, as a gross violation of the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State.

101. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which fully controls the whole territory of the country and conducts its internal and external affairs in conformity with the interests and aspirations of the Kampuchean people, does not need any supervision from outside.

102. The draft resolution is once again imposing consideration of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the sovereign rights of a Member State. In the opinion of my delegation, the adoption of such a draft resolution will not help in bringing about

peace and stability in the region. On the contrary, it will encourage the subversive activities of the remnants of the Pol Pot bands and their masters, the Peking hegemonists and will therefore undermine the efforts aimed at a general settlement of the problem.

103. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): In the statements made in the course of the debate on item 22, some representatives have appealed to Viet Nam to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter and to co-operate with the United Nations. We are open to such friendly appeals and with a profound sense of responsibility and a very clear conscience we can assure those who made those appeals that from the moment when independent Viet Nam saw the light of day in 1945, although it was not at the time a Member of the United Nations, the Vietnamese people sacrificed the best of its sons in the defence of the purposes and principles of the Charter, particularly those concerning the right of peoples to self-determination and the maintenance of international peace and security.

104. We must deplore the fact, on the other hand, that the United Nations did not adopt towards the people of Viet Nam an attitude in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter that it was committed to serve. Viet Nam has survived only thanks to its determination to fight for its own existence, thanks to the solidarity in combat of the people of the three countries of Indo-China and thanks to the approval, support and international assistance we received, particularly from the socialist and other friendly countries, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations. For that we are ever grateful.

105. At present, those same countries that failed in their bloodthirsty efforts to subject and dominate Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos by force of arms are trying to use the United Nations for their own ends by submitting draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 in order to impose upon us a solution contrary to the national interests and legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Indo-China and, therefore, contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter and international law. They are trying to confuse the sacred right of individual and collective self-defence of the three countries of Indo-China to ensure their survival with the intervention and aggression of imperialism and Peking hegemonism. They wish to deprive us of the right collectively to defend ourselves at a time when not only does the Chinese threat weigh heavily on the three countries of Indo-China, but also Chinese troops, contrary to the lying statement of the representative of China on 15 October last before this Assembly, continue to occupy the Hoang Sa archipelago of Viet Nam and many other parts of our territory along its northern frontier. At the very time when its representatives were seeking to justify their aggressive policies against Viet Nam, Chinese troops, on 15 October last, unleashed a large-scale attack over three consecutive days—the biggest since February 1979—in the Xin Man district, a frontier province of Ha Tuyen, where for seven hours they bombed several localities, including its main town, causing great loss of human lives and material possessions. The aggressors continue even today to occupy certain points of this frontier district and are in the process of building up their forces to the rear of these points.

106. We denounce with the greatest vehemence this new act of aggression on the part of the authorities at Peking against Viet Nam and we demand that they put an immediate end to these aggressive activities in the northern frontier region of our country.

107. Denial of the living reality of the Chinese threat, in collusion with imperialism, to the three countries of Indo-China, denial of their legitimate right to unite in the defence of their respective territories, and serious interference in the internal affairs of a Member State, Kampuchea—that is the true meaning of the proposal of ASEAN, which has been carefully camouflaged by fine words.

108. While loudly proclaiming respect for the Charter, they want to use the United Nations to impose a solution contrary to the principles of the Charter and international law, which is extremely dangerous for the cause of détente, peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia and throughout the world. In the present circumstances, we believe that the United Nations should encourage neither the forces threatening Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea with war nor one group of countries to impose its viewpoint and its solutions on another group of South-East Asian countries.

109. Should the General Assembly adopt the ASEAN draft resolution, co-sponsored by countries that have caused so much mourning and suffering to the peoples of the three Indo-Chinese countries, the United Nations, in my delegation's view, would be failing in its duty to preserve peace and security in South-East Asia and to contribute to better understanding in the negotiation among the South-East Asian countries for the restoration of peace and stability and the promotion of co-operation among the countries of the region.

110. The representative of Singapore has just mentioned a number of events that occurred in Kampuchea towards the end of 1978 in order to justify his theory of the so-called Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea. Unfortunately, that representative wilfully omitted certain other basic events that had occurred before and during that time in Kampuchea. They included the presence at the time in Kampuchea of 20,000 Chinese advisers and technicians who dictated domestic and foreign policy to their Pol Pot-Ieng Sary flunkies and directed the widespread aggression of the Pol Pot army, which consisted of 19 divisions commanded by Chinese advisers, on the south-west frontier of Viet Nam from April 1977 to December 1978. That wilful omission by the representative of Singapore has revealed to us his ulterior motives in his interpretation of the situation in Kampuchea and demonstrates that his lamentations concerning my country are only crocodile tears.

111. The draft resolution submitted by the ASEAN countries calls for a series of measures to be adopted with regard to Kampuchea, particularly the convening of an international conference, which should lead to negotiations on problems relating to the sovereignty of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Everyone knows that the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, the only legal representative of the Kampuchean people, has firmly rejected the idea of such a conference for the simple reason that the convening of such a conference by the United Nations

without a request from that Council and the discussion of the internal affairs of Kampuchea at the United Nations without the participation of its authentic representatives would constitute gross and inadmissible intervention in the affairs of Kampuchea and, consequently, a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

112. Furthermore, by their adoption of a position identical to that of the People's Republic of Kampuchea with regard to the inscription on the agenda of the General Assembly of an item on the so-called situation in Kampuchea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam have, through their respective representatives at this session of the General Assembly, declared that, should such a conference be held, the three Indo-Chinese countries would not participate, for we shall not allow ourselves to be involved in a manoeuvre aimed at undermining not only the sovereignty of a brother country, Kampuchea, and our own national interests but also peace and security in South-East Asia.

113. For the above reasons, my delegation, in spite of its complete readiness to co-operate with the international community, will vote against draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 and hopes that friendly countries will do the same.

114. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, I should like to emphasize that those delegations will vote against draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 entitled "The situation in Kampuchea". We decisively reject it in principle as an attempt to use the United Nations to interfere inadmissibly in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, the People's Republic of Kampuchea. One of the central paragraphs of this document is a request to convene a certain "international conference" with the aim of finding a so-called "political settlement to the Kampuchean problem "involving" the participation of all conflicting parties in Kampuchea and others concerned".

115. We might reasonably ask what is meant by the term "others concerned". None of those who came forward with the idea of convening a conference has given any details about this matter.

116. From the standpoint of common sense, it must be assumed that included among those termed "others concerned" is the Government headed by Ieng Samrin, since it alone is in control of the situation in that country, is enjoying the support of the overwhelming majority of the population of the country and is taking successful steps to revive the nation. But that Government has stated unequivocally that it does not regard this draft resolution as legal and that it condemns it and will not participate in the conference.

117. Other countries of Indo-China—Viet Nam and Laos—will not participate in it either and have stated as much quite clearly today. Hence the reference to "the participation of all parties concerned" has no sense.

118. Therefore this conference venture is doomed from the outset.

119. It is particularly regrettable and harmful to the prestige of the United Nations that certain persons should be trying to cover up this type of action by using the flag of the United Nations. We cannot possibly go along with that.

120. In the light of these considerations, the delegations on whose behalf the Byelorussian SSR is speaking would like to state that they entirely support the position of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic with regard to the conference suggested in the draft resolution which is about to be put to the vote. It is on the basis of these positions that the delegations I mentioned at the beginning of my statement will regard all—and I repeat, all—questions with regard to the proposal to convene a conference of this kind.

121. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/35/551. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Cape Verde, Chad, Finland, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 23, with 22 abstentions (resolution 35/6).²

122. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

123. Mr. GYEE (Burma): The delegation of Burma voted for draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1. However, having taken into consideration the aberrant contentions and lack of common ground between the parties concerned on the issues of the demilitarized zone and the nature and concept of the regional peace zone, the delegation of Burma would like to put on record its reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of the aforementioned draft resolution.

124. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/35/L.2/Rev.1 because of its scrupulous respect for the principles invoked in that text and, in particular, for the following reasons.

125. For any international solution to be valid, we have to begin with the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the country, since their very presence there, regardless of the dialectical jugglings aimed at disguising it, is intolerable and unjustifiable, violating as it does such principles as the non-use of force in international relations, non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of such States. We believe that a government can never win genuine legitimacy and legality thanks to the support of foreign troops, since it would lack the basic requisite of consecration by a popular vote in free elections.

126. Since the only source of civil power is the sovereign people, in order for a democratic decision to be taken by a people, the last soldier and foreign agitator must first have left its national territory. Only then can one speak of universal respect for the majority decision of the citizens of a country that is at present invaded and occupied by foreign garrisons. Once it is free of such invaders, then the people will be able to decide upon their own destiny in free elections, with the participation of all political parties and under the supervision of the United Nations.

127. It is contrary to its dignity for the international community to continue to allow the use of the abusive and already well-known anti-democratic method of manufacturing custom-made governments designed to serve the political purposes of certain Powers and disguising them as progressive régimes in order to impose them through the use of foreign occupation forces, while at the same time accompanying such acts with a well-orchestrated international propaganda that is as alien to the subject as the foreign troops to the country, thereby creating a veneer to cover up the system imposed on the country to serve the major occupying State. For history has always shown the ephemeral nature of governments exclusively supported by bayonets, particularly when the bayonets are held in foreign hands.

² The delegation of Mexico subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention. The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the draft resolution.

128. Ecuador is a firm defender of human rights. We believe in them and we practise them. It is for that reason that, with regard to the subject now before our Assembly, our vote can in no way be taken as indicating solidarity with the abusive régime of Pol Pot and its violations of human rights. Our country wishes those rights to be fully respected throughout the world, including of course Kampuchea and all those countries whose spokesmen have invoked human rights in the course of this debate.

129. The draft resolution that we have supported seeks from the United Nations measures that will give guarantees against interference by foreign Powers in the domestic affairs of Kampuchea and against the infiltration of foreign forces into that country, a matter that is of the utmost concern to all sovereign countries, and in particular the smaller countries.

130. For all these reasons, my delegation believes it timely to call an international conference on this matter to be held next year in which all the parties to the conflict and other parties concerned would participate in order to achieve a broad political settlement of the problem, a settlement that would we hope be characterized by its respect for democratic procedures, with the full participation of all the countries concerned in full respect for human rights and all the principles of the United Nations.

131. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation's position on the question of Kampuchea has been repeatedly aired in this forum. It is simple and clear because it is based on the basic principles of the Charter which governs our Organization.

132. We have always condemned all foreign interference in the internal affairs of any State. Our position is even more categorical when such interference degenerates into the occupation of a State's territory by foreign armed forces. We are convinced that the grave humanitarian problems in Kampuchea can only be resolved by a just and lasting political settlement of the conflict. That is why my delegation supported the draft resolution just adopted by the Assembly and is convinced that it contains the necessary elements which could lead to a political settlement of the conflict and enable the Kampuchean people to decide its own future in full sovereignty.

133. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply.

134. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): I do not wish to prolong unduly the proceedings of the General Assembly this evening but the statement made by my colleague and friend from Laos invites a reply from my delegation.

135. In his statement my Laotian colleague and friend adverted to the situation regarding the relations between my country and his. I will not reply to that because we are discussing and have concluded the voting on the situation in Kampuchea, not the situation in Laos.

136. But, on the second point, on which he elaborated at great length, concerning the humanitarian questions relating to the border situation between Thailand and Kampuchea, my delegation deeply regrets the injection

of politics into humanitarian matters and I should like to bring to the attention of this General Assembly the following four points.

137. The first point, briefly, is that the humanitarian situation along the Thai-Kampuchean border is pretty well summed up in a document which is in fact before the General Assembly—namely, document A/35/502 of 16 October 1980—which shows adequately that Thailand over the past year has co-operated closely with the Secretary-General, United Nations agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross and non-governmental organizations in their efforts. It has facilitated, furthermore, and without discrimination, the provision and transport of assistance, both from the border and via Kompong Som, in ferrying relief supplies to the Kampuchean people.

138. The second point is that the voluntary repatriation programme mentioned by my Laotian colleague was undertaken at the request and under the supervision of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as is made clear in that Office's press release dated 26 June 1980.

139. The third point is that the International Red Cross, in its report which has been distributed to certain delegations, including Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam, contains a short summary of the latest situation in this respect. It says, among other things, that 13 October marked the first anniversary of the Red Cross relief flights to Phnom Penh. During the past year a total of 714 flights have been made, of which 152 left from Singapore and 562 from Bangkok, Thailand. Those flights air-lifted 13,716 tons of relief supplies, representing an estimated value of \$US 13 million. This is part of our joint effort, to which my Government has made a unique contribution.

140. The fourth and final point is in regard to the reference to the Sakeo refugee centre in Thailand and to the visit made by a prominent United States personage recently.

141. I simply wish to point out that the Sakeo camp, just as other camps located in Thailand, is under the direct supervision of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in co-operation with the International Red Cross and other international and voluntary agencies.

142. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*intrepretation from French*): I should like to give a few clarifications regarding the statement just made by my friend and colleague from Thailand, who mentioned a few matters which merit elucidation. It was very kind of him not to reply to what I had said concerning the border incident between his country and mine. It was also very wise of him; it is better for him not to do so because I also have no desire to provoke an argument on this subject, as I clearly declared in my statement.

143. As for humanitarian assistance and the situation along the Thai-Kampuchean border, I have nothing to add. I merely quoted articles. I do not challenge the factual content or have any doubt about the good intentions of the person who drafted the document to which he referred and which is now before the General Assembly; I merely wanted to provide additional information to complement that document. This information is not something that I have invented; it is the testimony of observers, special envoys, international organizations that are operating on the spot. In my statement I never suggested that Thailand had not co-operated with the international organizations in channelling international humanitarian assistance to the civilian population of Kampuchea. I simply mentioned the aid channelled by land from Thailand. I made no mention of the aid transported by aircraft from Bangkok to Phnom Penh.

Programme of work

144. The PRESIDENT: Before we adjourn I should like to remind members that, beginning tomorrow morning, the Assembly will consider agenda item 119, entitled "Question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia". It is my intention to announce tomorrow morning that the list of speakers in the debate on that item will be closed at 5 p.m. so that we can determine how many plenary meetings will be needed. So far very few names have been inscribed on the list. Therefore, I urge those who wish to participate in the debate to inscribe their names on the list as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.