



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 12:  
Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)  
Chapters III to VII, VIII, sections A to E, IX to XIV,  
XXI and XXII: report of the Second Committee  
(part II)

Agenda item 47:  
United Nations Conference on the Human Environment:  
report of the Secretary-General  
Report of the Second Committee

} 1

**President:** Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

**AGENDA ITEM 12**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)\***

CHAPTERS III TO VII, VIII, SECTIONS A TO E, IX TO  
XIV, XXI AND XXII: REPORT OF THE SECOND  
COMMITTEE (PART II) (A/8578/ADD.1)

**AGENDA ITEM 47**

**United Nations Conference on the Human Environment:  
report of the Secretary-General**

**REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/8577)**

1. Mr. Salih Mohamed OSMAN (Sudan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly part II of the report on agenda item 12 [A/8578/Add.1].
2. In paragraph 48 of that report, the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of four draft resolutions, and in paragraph 49 it recommends the adoption of one draft decision.
3. The Committee adopted without objection draft resolution VIII, on public administration and development.
4. Draft resolution IX, concerning the creation of an intergovernmental sea service, was adopted by 46 votes to 14, with 25 abstentions.
5. Draft resolution X, relating to the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council, was adopted by 93 votes to 4, with 17 abstentions. This draft resolution provides for the enlargement of the Council from 27 to 54 States Members of the United Nations, and, pending the coming into force of the amendment to the Charter, the sessional committees of the Council will be enlarged to 54.

\* Resumed from the 2017th meeting.

6. Draft resolution XI, on protein resources, was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

7. A draft decision, in paragraph 49 of the report, on the question of measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, was adopted without objection.

8. The other report of the Second Committee is on agenda item 47 and is contained in document A/8577. In paragraph 26 of the report, the Second Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly. Draft resolution I concerns development and environment and draft resolution II relates to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Under the latter draft resolution the General Assembly would approve the provisional agenda for the Conference, scheduled to be held in Stockholm in June 1972.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.*

9. The PRESIDENT: We shall first consider part II of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, which relates to chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council which were referred to the Committee. The report is contained in document A/8578/Add.1.

10. I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their votes before the vote.

11. Mr. VIAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation in the Second Committee voted against the draft resolution which now appears as draft resolution X of document A/8578/Add.1 now before the General Assembly.

12. The reasons for our position are well known, but in view of the importance of the subject I think I should repeat them briefly. First of all, the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council requires a change in the Charter, and changes in the Charter are delicate operations which require reflection. We do not believe that the Assembly has devoted as much time to this problem as it did 10 years ago, the last time the membership of the Economic and Social Council was enlarged. It is mainly for this reason that we were not able to go along with those who adopted this draft resolution.

13. The second reason has to do with the nature of the Economic and Social Council, which is a principal body of the United Nations. As we stated in the Committee, its authority is not necessarily a function of the size of its membership and the distribution of seats among regions. In

our opinion the number of seats is too large. Furthermore, we believe that Western Europe is the loser in the operation. We are not obliged to share the selfishness of some or the blindness of others, and the formula which was finally adopted only increased our objections to a draft which had caused us very serious doubts from the very outset.

14. My delegation then, very much to its regret, will have to vote against the adoption of this draft resolution.

15. Mr. BRITO (Brazil): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution VIII, on public administration and development, in view of the importance it attaches to the subject. With reference to operative paragraph 4, however, the Brazilian delegation wishes to state that it interprets the provisions contained therein as meaning that the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, while giving sympathetic consideration to requests for assistance made with respect to public administration, will retain the necessary freedom of judgement and action to examine the proposals on their merits. In other words, we understand that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution does not prejudice the issue.

16. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the four draft resolutions, one by one, and on the decision recommended by the Second Committee in paragraphs 48 and 49 of its report. After all the votes have been taken, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes at that stage.

17. The voting will begin with draft resolution VIII; if there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution.

*Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 2845 (XXVI)).*

18. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution IX.

*Draft resolution IX was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 2846 (XXVI)).*

19. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution X. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Algeria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Albania.

*Against:* France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Abstaining:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Greece, Hungary, Mongolia, Oman, Poland, Rwanda, South Africa, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta.

*Draft resolution X was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions (resolution 2847 (XXVI)).*

20. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting.

21. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Asian group I should like to state the position of that group on the resolution just adopted concerning the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council.

22. The Asian group supports the principle of amending the United Nations Charter to allow for the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council. We think that the Council will be in a better position to perform its role in the area of economic and social development as provided for in the Charter if it is more representative both of the developed and of the developing countries.

23. The Asian group considers, however, that the allocation of seats provided for in the resolution which the Assembly has just adopted does not satisfactorily fulfil the principle of equitable geographical distribution and puts the group in an inferior and disadvantageous position vis-à-vis the other groups. The Asian group is made up of 34 Member States, including one permanent member of the Security Council, and accounts for half of the world population.

24. The Asian group reserves the right to raise the question of the allocation of seats in the enlarged Economic and Social Council at a subsequent session of the General Assembly.

25. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on the Second Committee draft resolution on the enlargement of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

26. The position of the Soviet Union on this question was explained exhaustively during the debate at the fifty-first—the summer—session of the Economic and Social Council and in the Second Committee at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

27. Now that the resolution has been adopted, the Soviet delegation would like to stress once again that the belief that the work of the Council can be improved solely through enlargement and through corresponding changes in the United Nations Charter is unfounded.

28. We are firmly convinced that the effectiveness of the Council's work depends not on its size but on strict observance by members of the Council of their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

29. Mr. ALULA (Ethiopia): We consider the Economic and Social Council to be a very important organ of the United Nations. We feel that the effectiveness of the United Nations depends on a fair and equitable geographical distribution of its membership. We feel that the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council was of concern mainly to the developing countries, particularly the African countries. Since the creation of the Economic and Social Council the number of African Members of the United Nations has increased greatly. Our concern has been that if we are to play an important role in the activities of the Economic and Social Council, which we consider a very important organ in the socio-economic development of the developing countries particularly, then the African, Asian and other regional groups whose membership has increased should have a proportionate increase in their membership of this organ.

30. Those are the motives and the reasons which guided us earlier in the Second Committee in voting against this draft resolution. We felt then and we still feel that a balance must be maintained between the regions as well as between the developed and the developing countries. We feel that the countries Members of the United Nations must be fully represented regionally in proportion to their number.

31. We abstained from voting on this draft resolution in this plenary meeting because we felt, as others did, that the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council was very important. It should be understood that my delegation feels very strongly that the Economic and Social Council should be enlarged. That was our feeling before and it is our feeling now. We do not want to give the impression in any way that we are against the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council. We have been guided solely by the principle of the allocation of seats to regions. That is the reason why Ethiopia abstained from voting on the draft resolution at this meeting.

32. At a subsequent time, when this matter is brought up again, we shall continue to press for equitable geographical distribution so that all regions are represented equitably and so that the balance between regions is maintained. In that way balanced decisions can be made on the activities of the Economic and Social Council in all spheres.

33. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the last draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee, draft resolution XI.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2848 (XXVI)).*

34. The PRESIDENT: May I now invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the Second Committee in paragraph 49 of its report?

35. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts that decision.

*It was so decided.*

36. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the report of the Second Committee [A/8572] on agenda item 47. In this connexion, amendments have been submitted in documents A/L.661 and A/L.665.

37. I call on the representative of Poland, who has asked to speak in order to introduce the amendments in document A/L.661.

38. Mr. JURASZ (Poland): On behalf of the Polish delegation and the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I have the honour to introduce the amendments to draft resolution II, which is contained in document A/8577, concerning the organizational arrangements for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

39. Let me start by stressing that Poland, as well as other socialist countries, has actively supported the idea of convening the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. For years we have been conducting preparations for that important international event on a large scale. We participated actively in the preparation and proceedings of the successful Prague Symposium on Problems relating to Environment. We highly appreciate the efforts that have been made by the Government of Sweden in preparation for this important international event.

40. For my country, and in particular for Silesia, the main industrial and mining region of Poland, the question of protection and, even more, of rehabilitation of environmental conditions of human life, is far from being an academic question. This important region of Poland has common borders with highly industrialized European countries, namely, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. Could we try to solve, for example, the problem of environment in Silesia or the question of protection of the Baltic Sea without the active participation and co-operation of all interested States, including the German Democratic Republic? The answer can only be: No.

41. But we, together with other sponsors of the proposed amendments, are conscious of the crucial importance of universality in solving environmental problems. Protection of the human environment in the best interests of all mankind requires a universal approach to the problems involved and calls for the co-operation of all States. The soil and water that we share, the air we breathe, cannot be divided by national, political or regional boundaries. So the search for a solution must be a universal endeavour. In order to make real progress for the benefit of all mankind it is indispensable to adhere strictly to the principle of universality in shaping international co-operation and working out international standards in the field of environment protection.

42. We share the opinion of many Governments that the Conference on the Human Environment to be held in Stockholm can be convened and can be successful only if all interested States have the possibility to participate in it on equal terms. Let me emphasize that the Government of the German Democratic Republic in its statement, circulated on 11 October 1971, explicitly stated:

“The Government of the German Democratic Republic is prepared and able to pass its experience so far gained in the field of environmental protection on to other States. As a highly industrialized State in the heart of Europe, the German Democratic Republic can at the same time help in many ways to solve important problems relating to environmental protection which today mankind faces as accompaniments of the industrial development and the scientific-technological revolution.

“The Government of the German Democratic Republic therefore reiterates its readiness to participate in the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment on an equal footing and to co-operate in devising concerted measures for the protection of the human environment.”  
[See A/C.2/269.]

43. Unfortunately, the so-called Vienna formula, a relic of the past, contradicts completely the principle of universality of the Stockholm Conference and by this very fact undermines its purpose and expected results. The initiative of the 16 countries at this session of the General Assembly to solve the problem of participation in the Stockholm Conference by inviting “other interested States”, though it gained considerable support from many countries, has been rejected. In these circumstances, if Western countries do sincerely regard protection of the human environment as an important international problem but do not see it possible at present to accept the concept of universality in participation in the Stockholm Conference, the only proper conclusion would be to postpone the Conference until 1973. This would leave the door open for further negotiations and for seeking ways to a genuinely universal conference.

44. It seems strange to us that we have to arrive at such a conclusion just a few days after the adoption in the General Assembly of resolution 2833 (XXVI) on the World Disarmament Conference which

“Expresses the conviction that it is most desirable to take immediate steps in order that careful consideration be given to the convening, following adequate preparation, of a world disarmament conference open to all States”.

I repeat, “open to all States”.

45. Frankly speaking, we do not understand the logic of the policy of some countries which accept the formula “all States” for one conference, but find it so difficult in the case of the Conference on environment. In particular, it is difficult to understand in this respect the policy of some European States, which should accept the political realities of the 1970s. I hope we could all agree that “In the place of cold war a climate of *détente* and co-operation is being created in Europe”. A communiqué issued after the last

meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty stresses:

“The Treaties signed in 1970 between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany and between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany improve already now the political climate in the relations between these States and favourably affect European events.”

It is now high time to draw conclusions from the new political developments in Europe.

46. Poland believes in international co-operation and understanding. The Sixth Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party, recently held in Warsaw, concluded in one of its main resolutions:

“We are in favour of the elaboration of the principles for the development of co-operation in economy, science, technology and other fields on the basis of equal rights and unhampered by discriminatory barriers. We see the necessity for all-European efforts to protect human natural environment and for the planning and development of the infrastructure of this continent.”

47. Turning now to document A/L.661, we submit the following amendments to draft resolution II, which is contained in document A/8577. First the following new paragraph should be included in the operative part:

“Decides, modifying the decision taken in paragraph 14 of its resolution 2581 (XXVI), to convene the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1973;”

which is a logical conclusion deriving from the position which the socialist States, authors of the amendments, consider as a fully justified stand of principle. The subsequent operative paragraphs should then be re-numbered accordingly. Secondly, the former paragraph 3 should be replaced by the following text:

“Further decides to settle at its twenty-seventh session the question of participants in the Conference;”.

Thirdly, the words “twenty-seventh” should be replaced by the words “twenty-eighth” in former operative paragraphs 8 and 9. The changes in those two paragraphs are logical consequences of the new paragraph 1.

48. In conclusion, I hope that the proposed amendments will gain the support of the majority of representatives, because they are oriented toward creating conditions conducive to a successful conference on the universal problem of the human environment.

49. Mr. LACKO (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from French*): The Czechoslovak delegation has already had more than one opportunity in the Second Committee of the General Assembly or in the Preparatory Committee for the Stockholm Conference to express its views on the problem of participation in the Stockholm Conference. In agreement with delegations from many other countries, we have laid stress on the fact that, in view of the universal nature of the problems of the environment which are to be

dealt with by the Stockholm Conference, these problems cannot be successfully resolved unless all interested States participate and do so on the basis of total equality of rights, non-discrimination and mutual respect for the independence and sovereignty of States. This unequivocal position has prompted us to present to the Second Committee, together with 15 other sponsors, an amendment which is contained in document A/C.2/L.1212, whereby all interested States should be invited to the Stockholm Conference. This amendment was not adopted by the Second Committee. We regret this decision. We consider it unsatisfactory and detrimental to the Stockholm Conference itself.

50. We have before us now draft resolution II which appears in the report of the Second Committee [A/8577], according to which the States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency would be invited to participate in the Stockholm Conference—in other words, the participants would be determined by what has come to be called the “Vienna formula”. This formula, as is well known, is in flagrant violation of the principle of universality and is clearly discriminatory in nature. According to that formula, a State such as, for example, the Democratic Republic of Germany—a developed industrial country in the centre of Europe—would be excluded from participation in the Conference. Without its participation it is obviously quite impossible to resolve the problems of environment which we wish to deal with and which are universal in nature.

51. Furthermore, it seems clear to us that this Vienna formula has had its day and has outlived its time because it no longer corresponds to the present state of international relations in general or to the state of the relations between the Democratic Republic of Germany and the Federal Republic of Germany in particular.

52. Consequently, we continue to believe that the best solution to the problem of participation in the Stockholm Conference would be the adoption of a formula which would permit universal participation, as we proposed in the Second Committee. For this reason, we shall support the amendment contained in document A/L.665 submitted by the four Powers, and I wish to say this here and now so as not to be obliged to take the floor again when this amendment is introduced. However, if it is impossible for the majority of the General Assembly to accept the principle of universality for the Stockholm Conference in 1972, we think that the best solution would be to postpone the conference for one year. This is the purport of the amendments [A/L.661] sponsored by eight delegations including ourselves, which have just been introduced to us by the representative of Poland. According to those amendments the United Nations environment conference would be held in 1973.

53. We repeat that for us the most important thing is the principle of universality. However, on this occasion we cannot fail to point out to this Assembly that the Czechoslovak delegation, from the very first stages of preparation for the Stockholm Conference, both in the Preparatory Committee and in the Second Committee, has shown its preference for postponement of the Conference

so that we may have more time for its preparation and dealing with the substance of the problems to be considered by it. In this connexion I should like to refer to my statement at the 1277th meeting in the Second Committee on 12 November 1969—two years ago—the essential elements of which are in the relevant summary record. We think that by 1973, preparation for the Conference could be much more complete, both with regard to the quality of the preparatory work and the degree of maturity of the problems which it will be called upon to solve. Hence, the success of the Conference itself would be better assured.

54. We want the Stockholm Conference to take place and we want it to be entirely successful. This has always been our desire and we have demonstrated it by what we have done in the preparatory work. However, we can only imagine it as a genuinely universal conference. We do not want to see the Stockholm Conference on the human environment, a Conference devoted to problems which are universal *par excellence*, a Conference which, according to all the rules of logic and common sense should, more than any other international conference, be universal in character, we do not wish to see this Conference go down in history as the last of the conferences to which this discriminatory formula, this so-called Vienna formula was applied. This we do not want. And that is why we favour the amendment contained in document A/L.665. And if that is not acceptable, we unreservedly support the amendments proposed by eight Powers [A/L.661], proposing postponement of the conference until 1973.

55. The intransigent attitude of certain delegations towards the problem of universality—an attitude dictated by political considerations rather than consideration of the substance of the problem of environment—has created a serious situation. Therefore with all the gravity for which the situation calls, on instructions from my Government I have the honour to state that if, in spite of all our efforts, the Stockholm Conference were to take place under the conditions laid down in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II—that is to say, with the application of the discriminatory formula regarding the participants—Czechoslovakia would be obliged to reconsider the whole question of its participation in the Stockholm Conference.

56. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary): My delegation looks forward to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment as a manifestation of the recognition by the international community of the necessity to tackle the problems of the relation between man and nature and the impact of technology on this relation. These problems *per se* are universal, since mankind, nature and technology are universal and indivisible. Consequently, they are to be dealt with in a framework corresponding to this triangle.

57. My Government has attached great importance to all questions related to the human environment and, from the birth of the idea, has supported the convening of a conference under United Nations auspices. We have participated actively in the preparations for the Conference and have taken all the necessary measures to ensure the constructive participation of the Hungarian delegation in the Conference.

58. In its intervention during the debate in the Second Committee, my delegation has already expressed its convic-

tion that the successful outcome of the Conference will be prejudiced unless all the necessary conditions are met to ensure the participation of all interested States, including the German Democratic Republic, on an equal footing, which is in the best interests of all other participants. There will be too great a risk of endangering the outcome of the Conference if we are not able to secure that requirement.

59. Bearing in mind all the consequences, and deeply concerned about the complete success of the Conference, my delegation has the honour to be among the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/L.661. The amendments are simple and self-explanatory, and aimed at ensuring attainment of all the objectives I have just outlined.

60. My delegation earnestly hopes that the amendments will be acceptable to the General Assembly in view of the important issue at stake. If its provisions of those amendments do not meet with a favourable response from Member States my Government will be compelled to reconsider its participation in the Conference.

61. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Yugoslavia, who wishes to introduce the amendment contained in document A/L.665.

62. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia): The world Conference on the Human Environment, which is to be held in Stockholm in June 1972, is one of the most important international gatherings planned for 1972. Much time and effort and great energy have been consumed in two years of preparatory work for the Conference. Suddenly, only a few months prior to its convening, we are confronted with a serious crisis the roots of which do not lie in the essence and content of the Conference but in the political approach of some countries to the Conference.

63. Up till now, we had all agreed verbally, and it seemed there were no differences. However, since we have begun to try to solve the practical issue of universality, a group of countries, through artificial moves and untenable arguments, has been impeding this solution. This attitude also found reflection in the Second Committee at the time of the adoption of the so-called Vienna formula and the rejection of the amendment proposing the participation of all interested countries. In this way the participation of the German Democratic Republic is being made impossible—a country situated in the centre of Europe and on the Baltic Sea without whose participation and engagement it will not be possible to solve a single European problem relating to the human environment.

64. What is being put forward as the main cause and reason for such an attitude? The inter-German talks. But these talks, as we have all learned from the esteemed newspaper, *The New York Times*, have been successfully concluded, resulting in the signing of pertinent agreements. Consequently, the main argument—to the effect that nothing should be done to influence the inter-German talks—is no longer valid.

65. What actually lies behind such an attitude? Nothing but an attempt to discriminate against a country; nothing but an attempt to have independent and sovereign States

once again degraded in the eyes of international public opinion and at the same time to demonstrate that the two States cannot act as equal factors in the international community.

66. I feel, however, there is no need to stress the fact that such an attitude is untenable. We have just heard the statement by the group of socialist countries on this issue; we also have before us the amendments contained in document A/L.661, which proposes that the Conference on the Human Environment be postponed until June 1973—more specifically, for another year.

67. Substantial progress has already been made in preparations for the Conference. In other words, preparations have reached the final stages. The Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Maurice Strong, and his associates have exerted great efforts towards this end. The host country, known for its hospitality and precision, is also finalizing the organizational and technical part of the preparations. International public opinion has been prepared and expects the Conference to convene within six months. Moreover, the problems of the human environment—and this is the most important issue—cannot brook any further delay either in terms of urgency or in terms of dimensions.

68. Bearing in mind the foregoing considerations and the fact that full participation by the German Democratic Republic is essential for reasons so clearly and frequently expressed in the Second Committee, and that hence there is no need for their further elaboration at this point, Algeria, India, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Romania and my own country have decided to submit once again [A/L.665] the amendment presented to the Second Committee proposing that all interested countries should participate in the Conference on the Human Environment.

69. Speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment, I wish to appeal to all States Members of the United Nations to vote in favour of this amendment, for only if they do so will we be able to overcome the crisis in which we find ourselves.

70. Unless this amendment is adopted we fear that the Conference will be seriously undermined. That is demonstrated by the amendments submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other socialist countries [A/L.661], requesting postponement of the Conference to June 1973. In view of the new developments, my delegation will vote in favour of those amendments.

71. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote on the two draft resolutions and the amendments thereto. Representatives will also be given an opportunity to explain their votes after the voting has taken place.

72. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The Swedish delegation wishes to make clear its position as regards the amendments contained in documents A/L.661 and A/L.665, which relate to draft resolution II proposed by the Second Committee. The amendments have the same background—that is, there is still disagreement among us on the question of which Governments should be invited to participate in the Conference.

73. What conclusions have delegations drawn from this continuing disagreement? One group of delegations, sponsoring the amendments contained in document A/L.661, is proposing that the Assembly reverse its decision of three years ago and postpone the Conference until 1973. As my delegation understands this proposal its sole motivation is to gain time in order to find a solution to the problem of participation. While acknowledging that a postponement might indeed achieve this purpose, I must nevertheless make it known that my delegation cannot support this proposal and is instructed to vote against it. In my Government's opinion a postponement would be most harmful to the important purposes for which this Conference has been convened. The awareness of the urgent need for concerted international as well as national action to stop the deterioration of the environment has grown during the preparatory process. A decision to postpone the Conference would, in the view of my Government, deal a severe blow to the cause of international co-operation for the protection and improvement of the environment. The momentum gained would be lost and the prospects for future effective action by the United Nations in the environmental field would be drastically reduced. No factor related to the subject-matter of the Conference indicates any need for postponement. On the contrary, I think it is admitted by all that there is an urgent need to come to grips with these problems and this need increases as time goes by.

74. Further, I should like to point out that the carefully devised time-table for the preparations of the Conference has all along been pin-pointed to the month of June 1972. Indeed, the bulk of the conference documentation has already been submitted for translation and the final documents will be so submitted within the next few days. Within the Conference secretariat, Mr. Strong has assembled a team of dedicated persons who have given their utmost in order to prepare proposals for the consideration of Governments at the Conference. There is no guarantee that it will prove possible to keep this team together should the Assembly decide to postpone the Conference.

75. A second group of delegations, sponsoring the amendment contained in document A/L.665, is attempting, by an insertion in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II, to solve here and now the controversial points in the problem of participation. We understand that one of the motives of these delegations is similar to the thinking of my own delegation: political differences concerning participation must not be allowed to stand in the way of convening the Conference on schedule. However, at the same time we doubt that the method chosen by the sponsors will solve the problem before us. We all know that the same text was voted on less than two weeks ago in the Second Committee and was then rejected by a sizable majority.

76. In this situation of a seeming deadlock I should like to state the following upon express instructions from my Government. Environmental problems, which constitute a threat to the very basis for life, do not recognize any national boundaries. This fact has been summed up in the motto for the Conference "Only one Earth". Therefore, at this crucial moment one should keep in mind the spirit in which the decision to hold the Conference was taken. The urgency of the problem is such that we cannot take upon

our shoulders the responsibility to postpone dealing with this matter which is so important to mankind. On many occasions we have stressed the universal relevance of the problems. This universal concern must be matched by a similar universality in participation. This constitutes the only answer to the challenge of the deteriorating human environment.

77. It does not seem possible at this moment—I repeat and strongly stress "at this moment"—to find a solution to the problem of participation by Governments in the Conference. We are the first to deplore that the consultations which took place before the vote in the Second Committee did not lead to a mutually acceptable result. My Government continues to be of the view, as was expressed during the discussions in the Second Committee, that a decision with regard to invitations to the Conference should not be reached through a majority vote but through agreement. We are not ready to admit even now that the solution recommended by the Second Committee should be regarded as final. We reject the idea that the door is now finally closed for further participants. We are still six months away from the Conference. Up to now the Swedish Government has tried to facilitate an agreed solution. My Government will continue to do everything in its power to contribute towards finding a satisfactory solution. Once the necessary political agreement is found there are always formal and technical ways to make such an agreement operative, for instance, by calling a special session of the General Assembly.

78. Just as, in our opinion, the Assembly is not in fact finally closing any doors in adopting the recommendations of the Second Committee, we would strongly appeal to all delegations in this hall not to close any doors on their part. Instead we would hope, and I feel certain that I speak for the majority of the delegations present here, that all delegations would join in trying to find a solution to an admittedly difficult problem. I am certain that this appeal is supported by all people from all parts of the world who feel that the advancing degradation of the environment is a serious threat to their conditions of life and their future.

79. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet Union, as is well known, has actively and consistently supported the development of broad and fully equitable international co-operation in all areas, including the protection of the environment, which is an important sphere of human activity.

80. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, in presenting a programme of peace and international co-operation at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Party, stated in his report:

"The Soviet Union is prepared to expand relations of mutually advantageous co-operation in every sphere with States which, for their part, seek to do so. Our country is prepared to participate, together with the other States concerned, in settling problems like the conservation of the environment, development of power and other natural resources, development of transport and communications, prevention and eradication of the most

dangerous and widespread diseases and the exploration and development of outer space and the world oceans.”<sup>1</sup>

It is precisely for this reason that the proposal to convene in Stockholm, under the auspices of the United Nations, the first world conference on the human environment received the complete and total support of the Soviet Union from the very outset.

81. The competent Soviet organizations attached the greatest importance to this problem and did a great deal of preparatory work for the Conference. The large amount of practical and scientific experience which has been accumulated in our country on the problems of the improvement and renewal of the human environment is being used for the benefit of everyone. Scientific and technical links between Soviet research institutions and their counterparts in other countries have been established and are developing. The delegations of the Soviet Union have made a significant contribution to the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference and its working groups. All this is eloquent proof of the serious and businesslike approach of the competent Soviet organizations towards the expansion of international co-operation in this area, which is of such importance to mankind.

82. In undertaking this vast amount of preparatory work for the Stockholm Conference, the Soviet Union has held the view, and continues to hold the view, that all interested countries should participate in the Conference without any discrimination whatsoever. The Soviet Union has firmly and consistently supported participation in the Conference by all interested States, since the problems of the human environment are truly universal in nature. Which of us would be bold enough to deny that the peoples and the Governments of all countries, all continents of the world—indeed, all people—have an interest in discussing these problems and in working out possible solutions to them at the Conference. This is so clear that it requires no special proof.

83. In this connexion we should not forget that for the first time in history, the peoples and Governments of our planet intend at a forum as world-wide in nature as the Stockholm Conference to authorize their representatives to exchange views and draft proposals on questions concerning the struggle to preserve the natural environment.

84. The Soviet delegation therefore wishes to state its firm opposition to the course of political bias followed by certain Western countries during the debate in the Second Committee on the question whether all interested States should be invited to participate in the forthcoming Conference. I should like to stress that, when we speak of all interested States, we of course mean sovereign independent States and not the puppet racist régimes of the white minority which, with the help of the imperialist Powers, have usurped authority over the peoples of the colonial territories in Africa.

85. In pursuit of narrow group interests and selfish purposes, the Western countries have imposed on the

Second Committee a decision regarding participation in the Stockholm Conference, based on the so-called “Vienna formula”. It is well known that the purpose of the discriminatory Vienna formula, which remains one of nothing other than a rusty piece of shrapnel left over from the cold war, is in effect to prevent full participation in the Conference by such sovereign States as the German Democratic Republic, a highly industrialized, developed socialist State in the heart of Europe.

86. Flying in the face of common sense and the natural desire of peoples and Governments to co-operate in the cause of exploiting and preserving the environment regardless of differences in their State, social and economic systems, the delegations of certain Western countries have been stubbornly trying in a General Assembly resolution to consolidate their discriminatory approach towards participation in the first world conference on this important problem. Surely it is clear to everyone that this approach has, from the very outset, inevitably limited the potential of the Conference and cast doubt on the practical significance of the recommendations which may emerge from it.

87. Any solution to the problem of the environment at the international level without participation by all interested States, including the German Democratic Republic, would be without foundation, not only from the viewpoint of international law but also from a practical point of view.

88. What we have said of course does not apply to all the Western countries. A growing number of countries are recognizing that to attempt to close one's eyes to the political realities of the modern world is absurd and anachronistic. To realize this we need only look at the Soviet-Danish communiqué of 5 December 1971, which lays down the principle of participation by all Baltic States, including the German Democratic Republic, in the adoption of practical measures to combat pollution of the Baltic Sea.

89. The principle of universality is gaining more and more ground both outside the United Nations and in the decisions of the Organization itself. A good example of this—and one that deserves to be followed—is General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI) on the World Disarmament Conference which was adopted on 16 December, unanimously and with tumultuous applause. The resolution recognizes not only the universality of the problem of disarmament but also the principle of the universality of participation in the Disarmament Conference by all States. Paragraph 1 of the resolution states that the World Disarmament Conference—and I wish to stress this point—should be open to all States.

90. This sensible approach should also be taken with regard to the question of participation in the Conference on the environment. An arbitrary limitation of participation in the Stockholm Conference would show that certain Western countries are still resisting the commencement of truly broad international co-operation in the important field of protection of the human environment. Quite clearly, such actions cast doubt on the real purposes underlying the very idea of convening the Conference.

91. Before the important decision on participation in the Conference on the Human Environment is taken, the Soviet

<sup>1</sup> *Materialy XXI V Sezda KPSS* (Moscow, Izdatelstvo Po'iticheskoy Literatury, 1971), p. 30.



delegation wishes to appeal to all delegations to find a solution to this problem which will be acceptable to everyone. The Assembly has two alternatives. One would be to adopt the amendment submitted by the delegations of Algeria, India, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Romania and Yugoslavia [A/L.665], which provides for participation in the Conference by all interested States. On behalf of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/L.661, I should like to agree to give priority to the amendment of Yugoslavia and other countries, so that it can be put to the vote first. The second alternative is to adopt the other proposal, contained in the amendments to draft resolution II in the report of the Second Committee proposed by the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR [A/L.661]. The purpose of this proposal is to allow additional time to reach an agreed decision on participation in the Conference. The sponsors believe that, if the Western countries genuinely regard the protection of the environment as an important international problem but at the present time are not in a position to come to a mutually acceptable understanding on the Stockholm Conference participants, then it would be better—and, more importantly, in the interests of the Conference itself—to postpone it until 1973. In this connexion, it is difficult for us to agree with the view of the representative of Sweden, who said that postponement of the Conference would deal a severe blow to the cause of international co-operation for the protection and improvement of the environment. We take a different view. We think that in this particular situation postponement of the Conference for one year would be advantageous to the Conference itself and would leave the door open for further negotiations and for a search for ways to enable the Conference to be held on a truly world-wide basis. This is extremely important for all United Nations work, now and in the future, on all problems of the human environment.

92. We wish to stress once again that the question of participation in the forthcoming Conference is of the utmost importance for all future United Nations activities in this field. We have no doubt that the nature of the forthcoming Conference and its practical influence on the development of international co-operation in the preservation and improvement of the human environment depend to a significant extent on whether all interested States take part in it.

93. In this connexion, our delegation appeals to the General Assembly to regard the question of participation in the Stockholm Conference with the utmost seriousness and to show wisdom and far-sightedness in its attitude towards this important question of principle.

94. The Soviet delegation has received explicit instructions, moreover, to make it clear that, if the amendments calling for postponement of the Conference are not accepted and if, despite the dictates of time and common sense, a decision on participation in the Stockholm Conference is taken on the basis of the entirely unacceptable and discriminatory "Vienna formula", the Soviet Union will be obliged to reconsider its own participation in the Conference.

95. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America): The United States supports draft resolution II, as contained in

the report of the Second Committee. That draft resolution provides fully adequate guidance for the completion of the Conference preparations, the holding of the Conference itself and the necessary follow-up pending the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We regret that some Members are dissatisfied with the provision in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution dealing with participation. This provision is the well-established United Nations formula governing what States shall be entitled to participate in United Nations conferences and other United Nations activities, namely, States Members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. This rule has served the United Nations well for many years. It is not a matter of ideology or partisanship. In fact the States that qualify under this rule represent every ideology and every region on earth. It is a matter of sheer practical necessity to have a consistent rule to guide us in issuing invitations and thus to save this Organization much controversy. The validity of this rule is widely recognized, as we know from the fact that votes at this very session both in the Second Committee and in the Assembly itself in quite recent days have overwhelmingly sustained it. However, we now have another attempt to abandon this traditional and well-validated formula. I refer to the amendment submitted by the delegations of Algeria and four other Members in document A/L.665. This would add to the standard participation rule the words "and other interested States". Exactly the same language, when it was offered by the Soviet Union and other delegations as an amendment to this draft resolution, has already been rejected by a wide margin in the Second Committee. This has been pointed out by the representative of Sweden. We trust the same will now occur in plenary meeting.

96. We also have before us the amendments in document A/L.661, submitted by Bulgaria and other sponsors and just introduced by the representative of Poland, which makes the surprising suggestion that the Conference on the Human Environment, already three years in preparation, should be postponed until 1973 and also that the question of participation in the Conference be postponed until the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, a year hence. My delegation is firmly opposed to both these proposals. Behind those proposals is the desire of certain East European countries that a place at the Conference should be found for the German Democratic Republic, which is not now a member of any United Nations agency. My Government, along with others, readily responded to the request of the Soviet Union that it join in working out a practical modality, as the Soviet representatives themselves called it, to enable participants from the German Democratic Republic to take part in the Stockholm Conference. We are disappointed that the inflexible position on the part of the Soviet Union, aimed at undermining the long-established formula for United Nations invitations, has not yet allowed a practical solution to be found. The pending amendments, therefore, are unnecessary and undesirable. One amendment would suddenly postpone, almost at the last minute, a major United Nations conference three years in the making, solely because several Members have been unable to prevail on an essentially political issue of primary interest to themselves. The other amendment would be highly prejudicial to good procedure and good order in the affairs of the United Nations.

97. On behalf of my delegation I wish to say again, as I did in the Second Committee, that the language of this draft resolution leaves open the possibility of finding a way for participants from the German Democratic Republic to attend the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm.

98. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom): I wonder whether it has struck other delegations, as it has struck my delegation, that, until the representative of Sweden spoke and until he was followed by the representative of the United States, no delegation, if it had not known it already, would have understood that experts from the East German régime had been offered full working participation in this Conference at the working level. This was well understood, I think, in the Second Committee, where the draft resolution in the form in which it now appears before us received a favourable vote of 94 to 8, where the Vienna formula received a favourable vote of 64 to 21 and where the identical amendment that now appears before us in document A/L.665 was defeated by a vote of 53 to 34.

99. It is in many ways a pity that at the end of the Assembly session, when we are all so busy, we have to go through this again. I just want to make the point that in fact the issue has been very thoroughly considered, and that, for reasons to which other speakers before me have referred, the Second Committee decided in the way it did in full understanding of what it was doing. Therefore my delegation will vote for draft resolution II as it appears before us, will vote against the amendment in document A/L.665 and will vote against the somewhat new proposals in document A/L.661. I want to give four main reasons for this, which we have already deployed in the Second Committee.

100. The first is that any attempt to upset the present basis of invitations to United Nations conferences—explained fully just now by the representative of the United States—is premature. The representative of Yugoslavia suggested that the conclusion of one more stage of inter-German negotiations showed that the game was over. Those who attended the debate in the Second Committee will know, as my delegation explained then, that there are several more stages to go—we all hope they will be completed successfully, but they have been going more slowly than we had hoped—and until the stages are all complete we shall not have reached the time that would be the right time for the United Nations to disturb the basis of invitations to major conferences on which there has been agreement for so long.

101. Similarly—and again as the representative of the United States said—we must not, during this tricky and, we hope, final period of inter-German negotiations upset present balances. I need not add anything more to that, because the representative of the United States has already said it.

102. Thirdly, the amendment submitted by Algeria and others contained in document A/L.665 is, quite simply, unnecessary for the reason with which I opened these remarks. The three Western Powers with particular responsibilities for Germany agree that there has been a considerable advance in inter-German affairs. It is for that

reason that they have made the unprecedented offer of expert attendance on a full working basis in the committees of the Conference to experts from East Germany. This or something like it has never been done before in the case of a full conference called under the auspices of the General Assembly. We have fully matched and more the progress that has been achieved in the inter-German negotiations. Our position is simply that one must not take one thing faster than the other.

103. Fourthly—and I am particularly glad to say this after hearing the representative of Sweden—nothing in the vote on this issue is designed to close any doors, so far as my delegation or other Western delegations are concerned or affected. When this vote is over the three Western Powers with responsibilities for German affairs will continue to do all they can to negotiate a practical modality—in the words of the representative of the United States, quoting words used earlier by others—to ensure that there is full practical working participation by East Germany at that Conference.

104. Finally, I turn to the different matter of the proposals contained in document A/L.661. Three years ago, in 1968, the Assembly decided to prepare for this Conference on the basis of the Vienna formula. We have been discussing it a good deal during this session of the Assembly. Suddenly, at the last moment, we hear arguments that preparation for the Conference is not ready, or that it must not be ready until this German business has been cleared out of the way. This almost causes my delegation seriously to reconsider whether some delegations here are talking about a conference on the human environment or a conference on the political environment. As far as we are concerned this is a Conference on the human environment; we agree that the problems of the environment know no limits; and we have therefore made this offer to experts from East Germany, which we recognize to be a significant industrial and, therefore, potentially polluting State. But there are priorities in these matters, and the first priority is in the environment, not the manoeuvrings for political position. It is on this basis that my delegation will join others in voting against the new proposals in document A/L.661, and against the suggested amendment in document A/L.665.

105. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru will vote in favour of the amendment presented by the delegation of Yugoslavia [A/L.665] which provides that the General Assembly shall invite to the Conference on the Human Environment not only States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency, but also other States interested in participating in the Stockholm Conference.

106. We are in favour of the broadest possible participation in this encounter because the problem of the human environment is a universal one and must be dealt with universally.

107. This is the same view which prompted Peru to sponsor the resolution on the World Disarmament Conference, which was unanimously adopted just a few days ago by the General Assembly [*resolution 2833 (XXVI)*]. It, too, will be open to all States.

108. Peru's position on who should participate in discussing both these subjects—the human environment and disarmament—does not compromise its position on international instruments based on recognized principles of international law, nor does our position imply any stand on the legal status of States or other political entities which are not Members of the United Nations or which do not participate in various agencies within the United Nations system.

109. Mr. ARNAUD (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has always supported the idea of holding a United Nations conference on the human environment, and our interest was given concrete form by our collaboration and contribution to the preparatory work of the Conference, both in the Preparatory Committee and in intergovernmental working groups. In Argentina, a developing country, intensive work is being done on the local level not only through dissemination of knowledge of problems of the human environment, but also through the adoption of concrete preventive measures to control pollution and through industrial development planning which takes account of existing knowledge and international recommendations in this area.

110. Argentina considers that the Stockholm Conference is a great sound of alarm to the problems of the environment, and that even though the urgency for preventive measures against pollution is greater today for the highly developed countries, the holding of the Conference is no less urgent for the developing countries. That Conference will provide a forum for discussion of these important problems, the means to prevent and control pollution and the dissemination of essential knowledge, which at the present time is not very great. However, in this field there is active progress, although we must realize that new forms of industrialization and progress create new problems. All this makes it necessary to have the greatest possible amount of information, collaboration, consultation and international co-operation.

111. It is for this reason that we do not want a postponement of the Conference. We believe that, for the developing countries especially, this would be a way of postponing their rational development and industrialization and depriving them of a possible forum for discussion of the problems of the environment and of a constantly updated source of information which is absolutely indispensable to their progress.

112. For my delegation this will be the first conference on the human environment, an awakening of consciousness, an alarm. This Conference will recommend principles and methods which can be adopted locally, or in bilateral, sub-regional, regional or international organizations, as needs may dictate. With greater knowledge and experience and with greater confidence other regional and international conferences and meetings will probably follow.

113. For all these reasons, my delegation does not want the Conference to be postponed. We would ask that the programming for it go ahead as it has until now. We do hope, however, that, when the time comes, the greatest possible number of States will be able to attend these conferences on the human environment.

114. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia): I had intended to confine my intervention in the plenary meeting to an explanation of vote on the draft resolution on development and environment. However, with the President's permission, I should first like to say something in response to the statements made by a number of delegations on the question of participation in the Stockholm Conference.

115. The Australian position on this question was outlined by my delegation in the Second Committee at the 1426th meeting. We believe that a distinction needs to be drawn between the environmental issue, on the one hand, and the political issue of the manner of East German participation at Stockholm, on the other.

116. It has been argued that as the environment is a matter of universal concern, steps must be taken to ensure that the German Democratic Republic is not excluded from the Conference. It is also pointed out that the German Democratic Republic is not just another country, but is one which ranks among the first 10 industrial powers, so that a conference on environment without the East Germans would be meaningless.

117. In response, it needs to be said in the clearest possible terms that it is the intention of no one to exclude the people of the German Democratic Republic from Stockholm. This was explained at substantial length and, if I may say so, in most conciliatory terms by the representative of the United Kingdom in the Second Committee and again today by both the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States in the plenary meeting.

118. As we understand it, the Western Powers with particular responsibility for Germany are ready to consider any formula which would make possible the participation of experts from the German Democratic Republic in the work of the Stockholm Conference. We also understand that the Western offer remains on the table, that the three Western Powers stand ready to continue discussions in an effort to find a practical modality which would allow effective East German participation at the expert level. It is therefore not correct to say that the German Democratic Republic is being excluded from Stockholm. It is quite the reverse.

119. The United Kingdom delegation has gone to some lengths to underline the significance of the Western offer. It is in fact an unprecedented one in that never before have the three Western Powers with responsibility for Germany been ready to contemplate the possibility of East German participation in any way in a major international conference convened under the auspices of the United Nations. Thus, the three Western Powers have made a real attempt to arrange for a practical accommodation of the German Democratic Republic without, however, disturbing the basic formula, that is, the Vienna formula, which has governed participation in major United Nations conferences for many years past.

120. My delegation believes it would be untimely at this stage to depart from that tried and trusted formula. We take this view having in mind the delicate political balance which governs inter-German relationships. We have, of course, all welcomed the signs of growing *détente* in Central

Europe: the treaties between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union and Poland, the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin reached on 3 September, and the consequential agreement signed only a few days ago between the German Democratic Republic authorities, on the one hand, and the Federal Republic of Germany, on the other, on the detailed administrative arrangements to give effect to the basic agreement signed by the four Powers on Berlin. All these are clearly important steps along the way towards mitigating and overcoming the divisions of Europe and of Germany.

121. However, it is equally clear that there is still some way to go, particularly in the evolution of inter-German relationships, before it can be said that a stable *modus vivendi* has been established in Central Europe. It is the contention of my delegation that, pending a further decisive advance in the inter-German talks, it would be unwise for third parties to take any action which would change, or imply a change, in the international status of either of the two parts of Germany. We believe that to invite the German Democratic Republic to participate as a full State Member in the Stockholm Conference would furnish such an implication of change in the international status of the German Democratic Republic. We believe that this would be most unfortunate since it would disturb the current political balance between the two parts of Germany and could lead to a stiffening of attitudes on the part of some of the parties to the current European negotiations in such a way as to erode current inducements for a political accommodation.

122. Having said this, I should also like to say that Australia looks forward to the day when, without prejudice to the ultimate goal of German self-determination, both parts of Germany might apply for admission to the United Nations. However, the time for a change in the German relationship with the United Nations will be the time when a decisive advance has been achieved in the inter-German relationship. This point is clearly still some way off.

123. Ours, of course, is not a European country and it may be argued that the political problems of Europe are not Australia's problems. However, I should like to say that Australia sees in recent developments in Central Europe an opportunity of securing a permanent reduction in tensions which would not only be welcomed in a narrow European regional sense, but which would serve the cause of world peace generally by eliminating what has been one of the most dangerous sources of crisis in the world. We therefore contend that all countries have a stake in the successful outcome of the present dialogues in Central Europe and that, conversely, all countries have an interest in not endorsing action which might prejudice or compromise that outcome.

124. For the foregoing reasons, we and a substantial majority of other delegations voted against a draft amendment introduced by the Soviet Union and the socialist and some other States in the Second Committee on 9 December recommending an all-States formula for participation in the Stockholm Conference. The amendment submitted today in document A/L.655 by five countries is substantially the same as that which was turned down in the Second Committee two weeks ago. As was our position then, the

Australian delegation will vote against the amendment today in the plenary meeting, and we hope that other delegations will do likewise.

125. The representatives of Poland and Peru noted that the General Assembly had recently approved an all-States formula in respect of the World Disarmament Conference. Why, therefore, not the environmental conference? The fact is that the resolution on the Disarmament Conference gave no date for convening that Conference. It could be argued strongly that the resolution assumed that by the time the conference on disarmament was convened sufficient progress would have been made in the inter-German talks to permit participation by the German Democratic Republic.

126. However, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment has a firm date. It is to be next June, that is within six months. It is very doubtful if by then that decisive breakthrough in the inter-German talks will have taken place to allow the German Democratic Republic to participate as a full Member State at Stockholm. The socialist delegations have, of course, today proposed that the Conference should be postponed until 1973 in order that the question of participation could be opened at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We cannot accept this. Our position is based on practical grounds. In particular, the whole pre-conference machinery—at both the Secretariat and the inter-governmental level—is geared to a Conference beginning in June of next year. National authorities are similarly geared to this time-table. Conference papers and documents have either been prepared or are well on the way to preparation. Officials and ministers are briefing themselves for the Conference. Financial and administrative arrangements have been made for it to proceed as scheduled.

127. Of course, it may be argued that these are not compelling reasons for going ahead as planned, but neither is the case made by the socialist countries for postponement. Indeed, they openly avow a political motive for requesting postponement. There is no practical merit in their proposal; it is simply that they want to get their own way politically. Moreover, the USSR, and I think Hungary, coupled their demand with a threat that they would otherwise have to reconsider their participation at Stockholm.

128. It is of course to be hoped that the USSR and Hungary will not take a decision which will lead them to absent themselves from Stockholm. This would be unfortunate for the political note that it would inject into the Conference. But the decision is, of course, theirs. It is their privilege to attend or not. If they do not come, the Conference will doubtless proceed and useful discussions will be held and equally useful conclusions will be reached. It would be a pity if the Soviet Union and Hungary were not parties to these discussions and conclusions. But those delegations are wrong if they are maintaining that without them the Conference would be useless. Quite clearly, much can be done in the way of ameliorating the environmental problems facing the world even without Soviet participation. In other words, my delegation, for one, is not about to succumb to the kind of pressure inherent in the Soviet statement.

129. What makes the position of these countries even less tenable is that they are suggesting that the Western countries have conspired to exclude the German Democratic Republic from the Conference. This, of course, is not so. As I have indicated earlier in this statement, the German Democratic Republic can participate in the Conference under the various formulae which have been proposed to the USSR in private talks and which would involve the German Democratic Republic's sending experts to the Conference.

130. We need to be clear about this. What the socialist countries really want is a political concession, namely, that the German Democratic Republic should be accepted into a United Nations conference as if it were already a Member State of the United Nations. Well, it is not—not yet, anyway. Even so, it has to be recognized that the three Western Governments with particular responsibility for Germany have made an unprecedented offer to the German Democratic Republic. Their offer to accommodate the German Democratic Republic through expert participation at the Conference is a substantial concession, one designed to allow adequate working participation in the Conference by East Germany without, however, going so far as to upset the delicate balance in inter-German affairs. It is surely now up to the other side to be equally flexible, to accept realities and to agree to a formula whereby the German Democratic Republic can send experts to Stockholm.

131. I would sum up by saying that my delegation will be voting "No" to the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. We will also be voting against the amendment proposed in document A/L.665, which is substantially the same amendment as that which was introduced in and rejected by the Second Committee. We will, of course, vote for draft resolution II in document A/8577 as it is currently phrased.

132. In conclusion, and to save further time, I should like to make a brief explanation of vote on draft resolution I on development and environment. In the Second Committee, Australia voted against this draft resolution. This vote reflected our concern that none of the nine amendments sponsored by my delegation and that of the United Kingdom could be accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution. It is true that we were disappointed, particularly since the vote in the Committee clearly indicated that some of our amendments had widespread support—support, moreover, which seemed to be shared at the private level by a number of the 38 sponsors of the draft resolution. In our discussions we gained a clear impression that some of the sponsors would have liked to try to accommodate at least one or two of our amendments, but that a smaller hard core was adamantly against this, and it was therefore not possible for them to do so. We can understand this, but we also felt that, having made our position clear during the debate and in the corridors, we had little alternative but to vote against the draft resolution in the Second Committee.

133. However, we are concerned that this should not be taken as a vote against the concept of development. Australia has made clear all along its view that environmental factors need to be assessed in the context of comprehensive developmental objectives and should not be allowed to become an element which would inhibit or slow

down the process of economic growth. In order that our basic position should not be misunderstood, my delegation has decided that it would be inappropriate to vote in the plenary against a resolution which emphasized the needs of development. At the same time, our fundamental difficulties with some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution remain. We have therefore decided to abstain in the vote in plenary on the draft resolution.

134. Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation has been associated with the work of the Preparatory Committee For the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment since this important subject was brought to the attention of the international community here in the United Nations by the delegation of Sweden about three years ago.

135. We therefore consider it appropriate to make our position clear on the amendments, contained in documents A/L.661 and A/L.665 respectively. Nigeria supports the all-States formula in document A/L.665 because we believe that there is a very strong case for participation by the German Democratic Republic. We therefore voted for that formula in the Second Committee and we will support it here in plenary. As regards the postponement of the Conference, which is the essence of the amendments contained in document A/L.661, the Nigerian delegation believes that no useful purpose would be served by postponement at this advanced stage of the preparations for the Conference. Early this year the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Maurice Strong, visited a number of African States, including Nigeria, in connexion with the holding of the Conference in Stockholm in 1972. Our understanding was that the 1972 date would be adhered to. The Nigerian authorities have, therefore, made preparations accordingly and our schedule of attendance at international conferences for 1972 has been drawn up taking into consideration our active participation in the Stockholm Conference.

136. We have all heard the representative of Sweden, the representative of the host country. My delegation fully appreciates the valid arguments he advanced and will do everything possible to ensure the success of the Conference.

137. We believe that the Stockholm Conference should not be held up. Accordingly, the Nigerian delegation will vote for the amendment in document A/L.665, but will vote against those contained in document A/L.661.

138. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 26 of its report [A/8577].

139. I call first on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

140. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Before the Assembly proceeds to the vote on the draft amendments proposed to the plenary of the General Assembly, I should like to make the following brief remarks.

141. I should like to draw attention to the fact that in their statements the representatives of certain Western

Powers once again have shown that underlying their position on the question of participation in the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment to be held in Stockholm are considerations of political discrimination . . .

142. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

143. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America): With all due respect to what is being said by the representative of the Soviet Union, I do not believe that his statement is in connexion with or in explanation of his delegation's vote.

144. The PRESIDENT: I would request the representative of the Soviet Union to be good enough to make his statement after conclusion of the voting.

145. The Assembly will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution I, on which a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions (resolution 2849 (XXVI)).*

146. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution II and on the amendments submitted thereto in documents A/L.661 and A/L.665. The administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution appear in the report of the Fifth Committee contained in document A/8601. I have been informed by the representative of Yugoslavia that the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/L.665 have requested priority in voting on that amendment. I understand

that the sponsors of the amendments in A/L.661 have no objection to that request, and if I hear no objection I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to proceed accordingly.

*It was so decided.*

147. The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote first the amendment contained in document A/L.665, on which a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

*Against:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

*Abstaining:* Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Cyprus, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Singapore, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta.

*The amendment was rejected by 57 votes to 43, with 21 abstentions.*

148. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the amendments contained in document A/L.661, on which a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Mali, Mongolia, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Against:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zea-

land, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Bahrain, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritania, Nepal, Peru, Singapore, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta.

*The amendments were rejected by 70 votes to 17, with 29 abstentions.*

149. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution II on which a recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* Chile, Cuba, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Romania, Yugoslavia.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 104 to 9, with 7 abstentions (resolution 2850 (XXVI)).*

150. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives, who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

151. Mr. VIAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be brief. My delegation abstained from voting on the first draft resolution on development and the environment because the text, which partially met our concerns, was

allowed to be dragged down by excessive financial or technical considerations. We believe that the protection of the environment must not be pursued to the detriment of the struggle against underdevelopment in the world, because economic and social progress in the underprivileged areas of the world remains as the main goal of the United Nations and the one which provides a justification for the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

152. The prevention of the deterioration of the human environment, however, is a task which the entire international community must assume as a matter of urgency. In the long run, it is a question of life and death for all countries, whether they be developed or developing. Consequently, we do not understand why the third world should become so moved as to have had included in the text adopted in the Second Committee provisions which are unacceptable to countries giving aid. Operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of the resolution just adopted do contain an appeal for international co-operation, but stand in contradiction, we think, to paragraph 4 which, to some extent, reflects practically an outright rejection of the servitudes incurred by any international action. In these circumstances, we felt it best to abstain.

153. As for draft resolution II, we were favourably disposed towards it and voted for it. The only outstanding question was participation in the Conference. First, we voted against the five-Power amendment contained in document A/L.665, as we did in the Second Committee. But at this time I should like to remind the Assembly that France has done its utmost to reach a practical settlement on this matter which would have made it possible to associate representatives of some States as experts in the work of the Conference. This solution, which was a major concession—a step forward, as it were—was rejected by the delegations to whom we proposed it. It is still possible even now, within the framework of the rules of procedure of the Conference which will be finalized by the Preparatory Committee. So the intransigence—a word used a moment ago—is not on our side.

154. Furthermore, I should like to remind the Assembly, as regards the provision concerning the States to be invited to attend the Stockholm Conference which appears in paragraph 3 of the resolution adopted a few moments ago by the Assembly, that it must be interpreted so as to respect the spirit of resolution 2758 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly on 25 October.

155. Finally, we voted against the eight-Power amendments contained in document A/L.661. Three years of work might be placed in jeopardy if the Conference on the environment were postponed by one year. The problems which it will be dealing with require solutions as a matter of urgency which, it seemed to us, cannot be postponed any longer. Furthermore, as other representatives stated in the debate before the vote, if the question of participation in the Conference continues to give rise to practical difficulties these difficulties could be settled in the Preparatory Committee for the Conference on the environment when it puts the finishing touches to the rules of procedure for the Conference. By making these clarifications, we hope that we have shown that we still have a completely open mind

on this problem which has divided us, but to which we believe a solution should be found.

156. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway): On behalf of the delegations of Denmark and Norway, I have the honour to state that, with regard to the most important question of participation in the Stockholm Conference, our delegations would like to associate themselves with the views expressed just before the vote by the representative of Sweden.

157. The decision that the General Assembly has just taken should not, in our view, be understood as preventing further consultations to be held in the weeks and months to come with a view to reaching agreement on the question of participation in the Conference.

158. Mr. DIGGS (Liberia): The delegation of Liberia abstained from voting on draft resolution I because of some minor inconsistencies which it was not prepared to accept at this stage, particularly in view of the subject of the resolution concerning development and the environment, which is of paramount importance to a delegation from a developing country such as mine.

159. In the view of my delegation, the positive aspects of the resolution far outweigh the minor difficulties which we were confronted with, and it had been our hope that a few amendments would enable us to cast a vote in favour of the draft resolution, but that was not possible.

160. The inconsistencies are to be found in some of the paragraphs of both the preamble and the operative part, which we could not reconcile in terms of our own concept of co-operation in the total development efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. My delegation rejects any attempt to view the problem of human environment in a restricted sense. This is a problem international in scope and universal in character, and any attempt at this point to allocate cause or effect is simply unacceptable since these two factors are inherent in the problem.

161. My delegation is quite aware of the implications which any action in this area could have were the Stockholm Conference to attempt to internationalize this problem so that it subverted the national sovereignty of the developing countries.

162. Yet we should not at this point attempt to prejudge the discussion and the decisions which will emerge from this meeting.

163. Finally, my delegation saw some elements of the resolution as being in contradiction to the work already undertaken by the Preparatory Committee. Other aspects which we could not accept related to phrases which could only lead to a degree of polarization among Member States.

164. My delegation is strongly of the opinion that the nature of our common problem calls for a unified approach in attempts to find suitable solutions.

165. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation abstained from voting on draft resolution I contained in document

A/8577 since a number of the provisions in the draft do not correspond fully to the position adopted by the Soviet delegation, at the three sessions of the Preparatory Committee or to the statement of the eight socialist countries of 21 September 1970 on the Second Development Decade.<sup>2</sup>

166. In explaining our vote on draft resolution II in addition to the statement which we made in the Second Committee and also at today's plenary meeting, I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the following.

167. First of all, one thing is noteworthy, and that is the increase in the number of delegations which have spoken in favour of the application of the principle of universality to the question of participation in the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. On the amendment [A/L.665] proposed by the delegations of Yugoslavia, Algeria, Yemen and other countries, 43 delegations voted in favour; and if one counts those along with the abstentions, 63 delegations in fact voted against the discriminatory "Vienna formula" and in favour of the principle of universality. This shows that there is progress. The principle of universality is gaining ground, and the day is not too far off when it will triumph completely in the United Nations and beyond.

168. In this connexion, we note that the position taken by some today on the question of participation in the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment is based primarily on political considerations and a policy of political discrimination having nothing whatever in common with the purposes and tasks of the Conference on the Human Environment and the purposes and tasks of developing broad and full international co-operation in this highly important problem for mankind.

169. Today's statements by the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Australia and certain other countries have shown that they want to use the question of participation in the Stockholm Conference for their own selfish political purposes in order to exert pressure particularly on the German Democratic Republic. At the same time they are not too much concerned about the interests and prospects of the Conference on the Human Environment and problems of international co-operation in this important area.

170. I should like to stress that the whole responsibility for the negative results of this position with regard to the German Democratic Republic, and also with regard to the Stockholm Conference itself and the cause of international co-operation, falls squarely upon those Western countries.

171. Mr. EKBLÖM (Finland): My delegation voted in favour of the amendment contained in document A/L.665 because we believe that the principle of universality should guide our work in all its aspects. We therefore regret that it was not possible to adhere to this principle in this context.

172. We voted against the amendments contained in document A/L.661 because we feel that the urgency of environmental problems does not permit postponement of

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/8074.*



this Conference, which, in my Government's opinion, should have an early impact upon the solution of these urgent questions.

173. We voted in favour of draft resolution II in the belief that the Conference is a welcome practical step towards an international strategy to take fully into account the need for co-ordinated international policies in this field.

174. It is still the hope of my delegation that efforts will be made to pursue further an arrangement that would enable all interested States to participate in the Conference.

175. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of the amendments submitted by a group of countries contained in document A/L.661 and abstained in the vote on draft resolution II.

176. My delegation attaches high priority to the problem of the human environment and to the world Conference on the Human Environment. My delegation has clearly demonstrated its concern through its active participation in the work of the Preparatory Committee. However, my delega-

tion has always been of the opinion that this problem could only be solved through the universal participation of all interested countries. Unfortunately, that has been made impossible. For that reason my delegation feels that the planned Conference, precisely because it will not be a universal conference, cannot possibly be a successful one. This has become even more clear from the statement made today by the representatives of the socialist countries.

177. Judging by the most recent developments, in the opinion of my delegation the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm can no longer be considered a "world" conference.

178. In view of the newly emerged situation, my delegation cannot but reserve the right to re-examine its own participation in such a Conference depending on whether there is any assurance or guarantee that such a Conference will respond to the task and produce the results expected of it at the time of its initiation and in the course of the two-year preparations.

*The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.*

