



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda First report of the General Committee.....	1

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda

**FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/8100)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the first report of the General Committee [A/8100]. We shall first deal with the General Committee's recommendations in section II of its report, relating to the organization of the session. These are contained in paragraphs 3 to 9. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the arrangements recommended in paragraph 3 concerning the schedule of meetings?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 4 relates to the general debate. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the procedure approved at the twenty-fourth session concerning the general debate, particularly in connexion with the list of speakers and the exercise of the right of reply?

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 5 refers to the commemorative session of the General Assembly. In this connexion the General Committee recommends that priority should be given in the plenary meetings and in the main Committees to the consideration of those items for which documents must be prepared for adoption at the commemorative session. May I take it that the Assembly has no objection to that recommendation?

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the proposal of the General Committee in paragraph 6 regarding the closing date of the session? If there is none, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that proposal.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 7 deals with the question of verbatim records of the main Committees. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the recommendations of the General Committee on this matter?

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 8 states that the General Committee was informed of the seating arrangements to be observed for the session. May I consider that the General Assembly takes note of these arrangements?

It was so decided.

7. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 9 refers to the use of the General Assembly hall on a rotating basis by the main committees. May I take it that the General Assembly approves that suggestion?

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section III of the report of the General Committee relating to the adoption of the agenda. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of paragraph 11, relating to the report of the Economic and Social Council?

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly likewise takes note of paragraph 12, regarding item 31 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/176, para 16].

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 13 with regard to item 77. May I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

11. The PRESIDENT: I now invite Members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 14 of its report, with regard to item 101. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

12. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to paragraph 15, which contains decisions made by the General Committee on various items proposed for deletion from the agenda of the twenty-fifth session and for inclusion in the provisional agenda of the twenty-sixth session. If there is no objection to the recommendation of the General Committee in sub-paragraph (a), regarding item 21, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

13. The PRESIDENT: No action was taken by the General Committee on the postponement of item 52. I take it that the Assembly takes note of sub-paragraph (b).

It was so decided.

14. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the recommendation in sub-paragraph (c), regarding item 53, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees that the item be included in the agenda.

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT: The recommendation of the General Committee in sub-paragraph (d) relates to item 54. May I take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

16. The PRESIDENT: Next the General Committee recommends the inclusion of item 58 in the agenda of the twenty-fifth session. I take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

17. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly also approves the recommendation of the General Committee in sub-paragraph (f), regarding the inclusion of item 61 in the agenda of this session?

It was so decided.

18. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the recommendation of the General Committee in sub-paragraph (g), I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

19. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the Assembly also approves the General Committee's recommendation regarding item 91?

It was so decided.

20. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the recommendation in sub-paragraph (i), regarding item 92, I shall take it that it is approved.

It was so decided.

21. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly approves also the recommendation regarding item 93?

It was so decided.

22. The PRESIDENT: No action was taken by the General Committee on the postponement of item 94. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of sub-paragraph (k)?

It was so decided.

23. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to paragraph 16 of the General Committee's report. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the action taken by the General Committee regarding item 102?

It was so decided.

24. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the General Committee's recommendation in paragraph 17. May I take it that the Assembly approves the inclusion of item 103?

It was so decided.

25. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 18 the General Committee recommends the inclusion of item 104. May I take it that the Assembly approves the Committee's recommendation?

It was so decided.

26. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 19 relates to the question of Korea. I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak.

27. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia): Before coming to the subject I have asked for permission to touch upon, I should like to take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you sincerely on your election to the high office of President of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. I am confident that your rich knowledge and experience of United Nations affairs will contribute significantly to the success of this very important session of the Organization.

28. My Government, together with those of a number of other socialist and Afro-Asian countries, has requested the inclusion of the questions entitled "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" [A/8044 and Add.1-3] and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" [A/8045 and Add.1-3] in the agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly as separate items.

29. In doing so we, like the other sponsors, have been prompted in the first place by the interests of peace and security in the Far East and by a sense of urgency for the settlement of the problem of the peaceful reunification of Korea on a democratic basis. In other words, we have been guided by the principles and aims of the United Nations Charter.

30. The reasons for such a request are clear to everyone taking an objective look at world matters. It has become an open secret that South Korea has been turned into a United States military base, with the Seoul régime serving as an obedient tool and accomplice of the United States and other imperialist schemes in the Far East and elsewhere.

31. As the sponsors rightly pointed out in their explanatory memorandum, the continued United States occupation of the southern part of Korea and the stepping up of war preparations and provocations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a source of grave threat to the peace and tranquillity not only of the Korean peninsula, but also to the whole region of Asia.

32. It is hardly necessary for me at this stage to cite the many facts which speak for themselves on this score. However, to substantiate the foregoing, may I be permitted to refer to one further instance? According to official sources of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, during the first seven months of this year well over 6,000 provocations, including armed attacks, shellings and shootings, have been committed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the United States occupation forces and the Seoul régime.

33. This alone demonstrates how grim is the danger of the presence of the United States and other foreign forces in South Korea. Furthermore, the military occupation of South Korea by the United States and the infamous activities of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea constitute the main obstacles in the way of a settlement of the question of the peaceful reunification of Korea on a democratic basis. This illegally established Commission has always been at pains to accommodate, to the embarrassment and contrary to the sense of justice of some of its members, the United States policy of perpetuating the division of Korea against the clearly expressed will of the Korean people to decide their internal affairs, including the reunification of their country by themselves without any external interference. This so-called Commission also does its utmost to slander the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which has time and again submitted constructive proposals aimed at the speedy solution of the Korean problem in full conformity with the vital national interests of the Korean people. Those proposals are so forceful that even *The New York Times* could not avoid commenting on them in its issue of yesterday.

34. On the other hand, the so-called UNCURK has become so unpopular in the eyes of the world community that it even shuns submitting its report to the General Assembly without, as it puts it, an "adequate pretext" for doing so.

35. At this time the United States-blessed "report" of UNCURK is being proposed for inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly not as a constructive document of a serious and responsible body, but only

as a counterbalance to issues vital for the United Nations and for the world community as a whole.

36. The urgent need for the taking of constructive steps by the United Nations for a positive solution of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of UNCURK has been augmented by the fact that of late the United States has stepped up its collusion with the militaristic and other reactionary forces of Asia in and around South Korea to the detriment of the cause of peace and tranquillity in the Far East and the world over.

37. For these reasons my delegation requests the Members of the General Assembly to endorse the inclusion of the aforementioned items in the agenda of the General Assembly as separate items.

38. From what I have just said it clearly follows that my delegation strongly objects to the inclusion of the so-called Korean question which asks this Assembly to deal with the so-called report of UNCURK.

39. Further, my delegation would like to place on record its suggestion that the General Assembly should give high priority to the items of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called UNCURK. We also suggest that the question of unconditional and simultaneous invitation of the representatives of the two parts of Korea should be taken up in the stage of the organization of the work of the First Committee, as was wisely done at the previous session.

40. Mr. OGISO (Japan): It is the understanding of my delegation that this item was included in the agenda of the previous sessions of the General Assembly in just the same manner as it appears in paragraph 19 of the General Committee's report [A/8100] and my delegation finds no good reason why we should depart from past practice in the consideration of the Korean question.

41. My delegation will not object to the inclusion of items 105 and 106 of the draft agenda [A/BUR/176, para. 16] in the agenda for this session, as recommended by the General Committee. As to the inclusion of item 107 of the draft agenda, "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea", also recommended by the General Committee, we strongly support its inclusion. My delegation has a very high regard for the assiduous work of UNCURK and we believe that all of us should have the opportunity to examine its report and to consider the question of Korea in proper perspective.

42. My delegation is convinced that the three items concerning Korea on the draft agenda, namely, 105, 106 and 107, should be taken up together as sub-items (a), (b), and (c) under the single heading "Question of Korea", as recommended by the General Committee. It is absurd to try to separate artificially the items which are obviously so closely interrelated. Frankly, I must ask why we should waste our precious

time with an unnecessary repetition of this procedural debate when we are trying our best, in close co-operation, to lighten the burdens of the twenty-fifth session, which is already so heavily charged with the programmes of the commemorative session.

43. For those reasons my delegation fully supports the recommendations of the General Committee on the Korean question.

44. The previous speaker has to some extent entered into a discussion on the substance of this question. However, in the view of my delegation this plenary meeting should confine itself to the questions now before us, namely the organization of our work, the adoption of the agenda and the allocation of items. Therefore, my delegation will refrain from entering into the substance of this matter but will naturally be prepared to express its views on this question in the proper forum and at the proper time.

45. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Mr. President, as this is the first time that the Australian delegation has had occasion to speak at the present session, may I extend our warmest congratulations to you on your election to the Presidency?

46. Yesterday the General Committee agreed to recommend that this Assembly include in its agenda an item entitled "Question of Korea", with three sub-items which had been respectively items 105, 106 and 107 of the draft agenda. I wish now to associate my delegation with what the representative of Japan has said in opposition to the proposal of the representative of Mongolia, which, as I understood it, was that the General Assembly should oppose the inclusion in its agenda of item 107 of the draft agenda which has the title "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea".

47. The item on Korea is an important one. It deals with the situation existing in that country as a result of its artificial division at the end of the Second World War and the war of aggression launched against the Republic of Korea by the North in 1950—aggression which was successfully repelled and contained by the people of South Korea and the forces under United Nations command.

48. My delegation considers that sub-item (a), the very wording of which is a gratuitous slight against United Nations forces which helped the people of South Korea to preserve their independence, should not in fact properly be on the agenda of the Assembly. We feel similarly about sub-item (b), which is entitled "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". We are naturally in favour of discussing sub-item (c), which was included in the draft agenda by the Secretary-General and which deals with the report of UNCURK.

49. I would not carry our objections to sub-items (a) and (b) to the point of voting against them, in view of the fact that the General Committee has proposed

their inclusion. My delegation considers, however, that it would be an absurdity for this Assembly to discuss the question of Korea without including in its discussion the report of the Assembly's own subordinate body—the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

50. I shall not go further into the substance of the discussion on the Korean item, important though it undoubtedly is, but my delegation cannot let this occasion pass without publicly reaffirming its insistence that any reasonable and useful discussion in this Assembly of the difficult situation in Korea, exacerbated as it is by the intransigent attitude of the North Korean authorities, should begin with a discussion of the report of this Assembly's own Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

51. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland): The Polish delegation has asked for the floor in order to explain its attitude on a question to which it attaches great importance, particularly in view of the very close relations of co-operation and friendship which my country maintains with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We also take into consideration that the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is an essential element of the stability, peace and security in the Far East, and therefore an important element of international peace and security, the strengthening of which is the main item of the present session of the General Assembly.

52. This being so, we consider that the twenty-fifth session should, among other things, do away with myths—harmful myths—which have crept into the United Nations, the question of Korea being the most striking example of that. We look at the problem of Korea in the following manner. Firstly, there are foreign troops on Korean soil; almost 60,000 of them. They are not in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; they are in South Korea. They are United States troops. They constitute an instrument of interference within the internal affairs of the Korean people since only the Korean people can decide on their own destiny without the presence and, much more so, without the interference of foreign troops.

53. The presence of those troops is a factor of tension in the Far East. It is an instrument directed against the vital interests of the Korean people, against its unity, against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, against peace and security in that region. Hence the first proposal, of which Poland is a co-sponsor: the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

54. Secondly the presence of United States troops in Korea is being perpetrated under the flag and authority of the United Nations. We all know full well that this is only a shield, that the United Nations does no more than give its seal of approval to activities directed against the vital interests of the Korean people. The

so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is an instrument of United States policy in the Far East. It is an obstacle to the only rightful solution of the problem, a solution that can be effected only by the Korean people themselves. The attempt to use the United Nations stamp and shield is inconsistent with the realities of the situation. Moreover, and unfortunately I would add, it is extremely harmful to the prestige and authority of the United Nations. Then there is the second proposal which has been co-sponsored by Poland: the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

55. Having said that, I see no need to dwell on the reasons for which we oppose the inclusion of the sub-item entitled: "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". I think that I have also explained why my delegation opposes the proposal of the General Committee to discuss the three problems I referred to in one item.

56. We question the viability of the item concerning the report of the so-called UNCURK. We are against the discussion of this report either as an item or as a sub-item. The Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, has an opportunity to detach itself from harmful practices, to do away with anomalies. It has an opportunity to assist the cause of a peaceful solution of the Korean question, of peace and stability in the Far East, of peace and security in general. It can do it if it takes the right decisions, which are proposed in the two memoranda of which Poland is a co-author [A/8044 and Add.1-3 and A/8045 and Add.1-3].

57. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I have already had the opportunity, in the General Committee, to congratulate you on your election to the high international post of President of this twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly. On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I should like once again to congratulate you and to wish you all possible success in carrying out the important task entrusted to you by the General Assembly.

58. The Soviet delegation would like to set forth its position on the items dealing with the Korean problem.

59. The General Committee is recommending the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of two items concerning Korea submitted by a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian States [*ibid.*]. These items are entitled "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". The Governments of eighteen countries Members of the United Nations, in submitting these proposals, have been motivated by a sincere desire to direct the efforts of the United Nations, in matters relating to the Korean

problem, towards assisting the Korean people to achieve peace and the reunification of the country.

60. The need to discuss the question of the withdrawal of foreign forces from Korean soil is dictated by the fact that the occupation of South Korea by United States forces, despite the clearly expressed will of the Korean people, continues to be the main cause of the division of Korea.

61. The presence and the activities of 50,000 United States troops in South Korea are causing a very dangerous and tense situation, both in Korea and in the neighbouring areas. As a result, Korea has become a permanent centre of instability and tension, and this tension is being aggravated by ever new armed provocations directed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea along the Armistice Line and by the intensification of military preparations in which the puppet régime in Seoul and certain neighbouring countries are being involved on an ever increasing scale. We see evidence of this in the reports of generous promises given by Washington—behind a camouflage of talks about a partial reduction of United States forces in South Korea—to increase the military assistance given to the Seoul régime in order to strengthen the South Korean army and to equip it with the most advanced modern weapons. The danger of such a course for peace and stability in this area is quite obvious.

62. Washington is spending enormous sums on the militarization of South Korea, which has already been transformed into a dangerous military base and is being used to prepare and carry out aggressive plans in Asia directed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the peoples of that area, who have gained their political independence and have embarked on the road to independent, progressive development.

63. The puppet South Korean régime has long since become an accomplice in the imperialist aggression in Indo-China. During the five years of the war in Viet-Nam the Pentagon has paid out \$1,000 million for the participation of 50,000 Korean mercenaries, officers and men, in the war against the freedom-loving Vietnamese people, which is defending its national freedom and independence.

64. The illegally created United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is still being used to camouflage and justify the activities of foreign armed forces in South Korea and to intervene in the affairs of the Korean people. The whole world, the whole United Nations, both those States that were Members of the Organization when the Commission was set up and those that joined the United Nations later, know that the Commission was created illegally.

65. The existence and activities of that Commission run counter to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, as well as to the interests of the Korean people, and constitute an impediment to the peaceful reunification of Korea.

66. The many years of activity of the so-called United Nations Commission on Korea have convinced everyone that the United States is shamelessly using this organ of the United Nations as an instrument and shield for its own policies aimed at continuing the occupation of South Korea by its forces and perpetuating the division of that country.

67. The delegation of the Soviet Union has already expressed its views in the General Committee and now wishes to confirm its objections to the item dealing with the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Throughout its existence that Commission has made no progress whatsoever in the matter of the unification of Korea, since it is being used for purposes which are directly opposed to the achievement of unification, stability and peace in Korea. It is not a Commission for the unification, but rather for the division and occupation, of Korea.

68. The discussions of the Korean question at the General Assembly in connexion with the reports of the Commission have been utilized year by year to justify the presence of foreign forces in South Korea and the continued division of that country. From year to year the Commission submits reports concocted by the United States and expressing merely the point of view of the United States command on the situation in Korea. This has been frequently demonstrated during the many years this question has been discussed in the United Nations.

69. Throughout the brief twenty-five years of popular rule in North Korea, after the liberation of the country from the domination of the Japanese colonialists, and despite the grievous three-year war from 1950 to 1953 against United States imperialism, for their freedom and independence, the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have, despite constant military provocations along the Armistice Line, achieved remarkable and momentous successes in the development of their economy and culture and in raising their level of living. This summer, I had the honour of being invited by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to visit that country, where I met some African representatives. Before them some representatives of Asian countries had been there. Many of the representatives sitting in this room have visited the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. They have been able to see for themselves what remarkable results the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has achieved during its twenty-five years of independent existence.

70. The most striking example of the successful, peaceful development of Korea is the capital of that country, Pyongyang. I saw that city with my own eyes lying in smoking ruins after the United States air forces had bombed it in the nineteen-fifties and had not left a single building undamaged. Today Pyongyang is a fine modern city with wide avenues, fine buildings and handsome monuments. I told my Korean friends that

I thought many west European cities and cities in other continents might well envy this new capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which has been reborn like the legendary phoenix.

71. Such are the results of the peaceful efforts of the socialist Democratic People's Republic of Korea and I would warmly recommend the representatives of the developing countries to visit the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to see what that country and its hard-working and peace-loving people have achieved in the twenty-five years of their independence after ridding themselves of foreign colonial domination and embarking on the path of socialist development.

72. Everyone who has been in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has seen how strongly the Korean people, its Government and its ruling party—the Labour Party of Korea—headed by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Labour Party of Korea, Comrade Kim Il Sung, yearn for peace, tranquillity, stability and the peaceful unification of the country. Only the presence of a United States army of 50,000 men in South Korea, and of the puppet rulers of South Korea who are egged on by a foreign Power and have created an army of 1 million men in South Korea, are interfering with the peaceful existence of the Korean people and preventing the peaceful reunification of the country.

73. In the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [*A/8026 and Corr.1*] all these facts are turned upside down. The reports of the Commission, which are concocted from year to year by the United States military command, distort and misinterpret the true situation in North Korea. They endeavour to discredit the peaceful aspirations of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, its Government and its party, and the efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to bring about the peaceful and democratic reunification of the country. A country which is engaged in peaceful labour is accused in the Commission's reports of having warlike intentions; and cock-and-bull stories are invented about the "northern threat" to South Korea. This United States propaganda is put out year by year in order to delude the General Assembly and all its Members.

74. The facts show convincingly that the existence and activities of this Commission run clearly counter not only to the interests of the Korean people but also to international peace and the interests of the international community. The question of the reunification of Korea is exclusively an internal affair of the Korean people. The peaceful reunification of Korea can be achieved only by giving the Korean people the possibility to decide its own destiny itself and by stopping all foreign intervention, including intervention under the flag of the United Nations and its organs.

75. Motivated by peaceful intentions, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has frequently put forward proposals aimed at the peaceful reunification of Korea on a democratic basis. Quite recently it sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, a memorandum dated 22 June 1970 for circulation and publication as an official United Nations document [see A/C.1/999]. The contents of this document are a further confirmation of the peace-loving and constructive attitude of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea towards a solution of the Korean problem.

76. I shall not go into the details of this document. We shall set them forth when the matter is discussed in the First Committee.

77. In the present circumstances, the only correct solution of the Korean problem lies in the proposals made by a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian countries, which provide for the withdrawal from South Korea of foreign forces and the dissolution of the Commission. Such an approach is in complete accord with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and is fully in keeping with the interests and wishes of the people of Korea. The Korean people must be given the possibility to settle its own internal affairs, including the solution of the question of reunification.

78. In this connexion we should also recall that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its representatives have, as a result of the efforts of those occupying South Korea and of those assisting them, been barred for almost twenty years from participating in the discussion of items concerning the Korean problem in the General Assembly. It is high time to put an end to this situation. The representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited to participate in the discussion of these items. The General Assembly will better understand the situation in that country and the true and real intentions of the Government and people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

79. Unfortunately the General Committee under pressure from the Western Powers and those interested in maintaining the occupation in South Korea has, as it has done for many years past, adopted a recommendation to combine three items concerning Korea in the draft agenda into a single item under one general heading—"Question of Korea"—with sub-items on the withdrawal of forces, the dissolution of the Commission and the report of the Commission respectively [A/8100, para.19]. In the light of all these considerations it has expressed, the Soviet delegation requests a separate vote on the sub-item recommended in the report of the General Committee and entitled "Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". The Soviet Union will vote against that sub-item, against its inclusion in the agenda and against its consideration by the General Assembly. We also request a separate vote on the general heading—the *chapeau*, if it may so be described—for these three sub-items, namely "Question of Korea". The Soviet delegation will vote

against that general heading because the two first sub-items under this combined agenda item, i.e. the sub-item on the withdrawal of United States forces and the one on the dissolution of UNCURK should be discussed as independent items in the First Committee to which they should be allocated as separate and independent items.

80. I should like to draw attention also to the statement by the representative of Japan. We have seen during our discussions of the items on Korea in the past few years how actively the Japanese delegation has participated in the discussion of these items, in which it has defended the policy and actions of the Power occupying South Korea. We most seriously consider why this should be the case. Why does Japan, which was not a Member of the United Nations at the time this question arose, when as a result of United States aggression, North Korea, its resources and towns, were destroyed and wiped off the face of the earth—why does Japan now come out so actively in favour of the continuation of the occupation? What plans and intentions lie behind this attitude of Japan? The First Committee should examine this question. What lies behind these statements of the Japanese delegation so strongly supporting the continued occupation of South Korea?

81. The Australian representative's statement was the same as always. With a zeal worthy of a better cause, the representatives of Australia have, throughout the history of the discussion of the items on Korea, always actively supported the continued occupation of South Korea by foreign forces, evidently following the self-same policy which leads Australia now to participate in the aggressive war in Viet-Nam as well. The aims and intentions are the same. Consequently the statements by the representative of Australia do not stand up to any serious analysis and cannot be accepted as arguments against the proposals submitted by a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian countries on the questions concerning Korea.

82. The PRESIDENT: According to the rules of procedure, it is permissible to hear three speakers against and three in favour of keeping an item on the agenda. Since I called on the representative of the Soviet Union, the representative of the United States has asked to speak. He will be the third speaker on that side, and after his speech we shall proceed to the vote.

83. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): Mr. President, it is with the greatest pleasure, both officially and personally, that I offer you the congratulations of the United States on your election as President of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of this General Assembly. Your election is, among other things, a tribute to your country, Norway, which stands in the front rank in the services it has rendered to the United Nations.

84. From Norway the United Nations chose its first Secretary-General, the illustrious Trygve Lie, and Norway has been an outstanding contributor to many pioneering United Nations efforts, particularly in

peace-keeping and in the field of technical assistance and economic development. There is no finer example of a Member serving not just its own interests but the general interests of the United Nations.

85. You, Mr. President, have personally served that same tradition with distinction from the beginning of the United Nations. We are fortunate indeed in having you to guide our work in this session which, we all hope, may prove historic and fruitful. On behalf of the United States delegation, let me wish you every success in your presidential duties and assure you that my delegation will do its best to support you in your heavy task and to do nothing which would impair that genial and compassionate disposition for which you are justly famous.

86. I now turn to the matter before us. Frankly speaking, we had hoped that it would be possible this afternoon for the General Assembly to consider and adopt the report of the General Committee in a prompt and harmonious fashion. We believe—and I am persuaded that a majority here share this belief—that the General Committee has carried out its consideration of the draft agenda in a thorough and responsible manner and that its recommendations deserve prompt acceptance by the General Assembly. However, the Soviet representative has chosen once again to reopen the question of the inclusion of sub-item (c) of what is now, in the General Committee's report [A/8100, para.21] item 98 under the question of Korea, dealing with the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the so-called UNCURK report.

87. The inclusion of sub-item (c) was considered at some length in the General Committee and the decision reached by that Committee—again by a very substantial majority—was to recommend inclusion of that sub-item and to group it with the other clearly interrelated items on Korea under a single heading. We consider that the decision of the General Committee was both logical and correct. Now the Soviet representative repeats his delegation's cold war rhetoric and bizarre and topsy-turvy view of Korean history, including a complete misrepresentation of the vital role of the United Nations and UNCURK there.

88. To be frank, I would note that my delegation had hoped that a divisive debate of the kind we have had year after year on the Korean question might have been avoided during this anniversary session. Unfortunately, some Governments saw fit to request the inclusion of the same tendentious items—and I refer, of course, to sub-items (a) and (b) of item 98. The Secretary-General subsequently, and quite properly, proposed the inclusion of an additional item when he received the report of the General Assembly's own subsidiary organ UNCURK. Under these circumstances, it is only sound procedure to consider the three items as a unit.

89. I must also say that some of the language used by the Soviet representative just now does not inspire confidence that the debate on Korea will take place

in a constructive atmosphere devoid of polemics. Indeed, many of his statements appeared to be for the benefit of an audience other than the one present here. We, for our part, intend to stick strictly to the provisions of rule 40 of our rules of procedure.

90. My delegation is fully prepared, of course, to discuss the Korean question, including the two tendentious sub-items submitted by the Soviet Union, at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum, which is the first Committee. That discussion will, I am confident, reveal the true objective of the Soviet Union concerning Korea for what it is: an attempt, through repeated, gross misrepresentation of history, to persuade this Organization to end its constructive role in Korea and to withdraw the protective shield which hinders North Korea from attaining the subversive and aggressive objectives which it first demonstrated by its unprovoked military aggression in 1950.

91. Elementary logic dictates that any discussion of sub-item (b), prepared by the Soviet Union and calling for the dissolution of UNCURK, cannot take place in the absence of consideration of the timely report of the Commission itself which is contained in document A/8026 and Corr.1.

92. We recognize that the existence of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and its reports are a source of embarrassment to the Soviet Union and the North Korean régime. The reports provide an impartial and accurate record of the real state of affairs in Korea. I am certain that Members will wish to acquaint themselves with the report of UNCURK which sets forth its continuing efforts to achieve the peaceful reunification of Korea under democratic circumstances and under United Nations supervision.

93. I am confident, therefore, that the General Assembly will decisively reject this effort by the Soviet Union to delete sub-item (c) from the item entitled "Question of Korea".

94. The PRESIDENT: We have now heard three speakers in favour and three speakers against, and this concludes the debate on this point.

95. A request has been made for separate votes on two parts of this item in paragraph 19 of the report of the General Committee [A/8100], and a recorded vote has been suggested for both.

96. The first proposal is that the Assembly should not accept the recommendation of the General Committee to include item 107 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/176, para.16]. That part of the report of the General Committee will be put to the vote first. After that vote has been taken and if item 107 is retained, there will be another vote on the title of this item in the report.

97. We shall now vote on the recommendation by the General Committee to retain item 107 of the draft agenda.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic), Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Finland, Guinea, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Tunisia, Yugoslavia.

*The recommendation to include item 107 on the agenda was adopted by 72 votes to 24, with 15 abstentions.**

98. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the recommendation of the General Committee that the title "Question of Korea" should be retained.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic), Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania,

* The delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to be recorded as having voted against the recommendation.

Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Finland, Guinea, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Tunisia, Yugoslavia.

*The recommendation to retain the title "Question of Korea" was adopted by 71 votes to 24, with 16 abstentions.**

99. The PRESIDENT: I take it then that the Assembly has decided to include the item as recommended in paragraph 19 of the General Committee's report [A/8100].

100. We now turn to the recommendations of the General Committee in paragraph 20 of its report. May I consider that the Assembly approves the inclusion of the item as recommended by the General Committee?

It was so decided.

101. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the agenda which the General Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly. In accordance with past practice we shall follow the numbering given in paragraph 21 of the General Committee's report and consider together several items in groups where that seems appropriate.

102. Items 1 to 6 have already been acted upon in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. May we therefore consider that their inclusion has been approved?

It was so decided.

103. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with item 7, "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations", the General Assembly is required only to take note of the communication submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/8064. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the General Assembly takes note of that communication.

It was so decided.

104. The PRESIDENT: I now submit to the General Assembly items 8 to 33 inclusive. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves their inclusion in the agenda.

Items 8 to 33 inclusive were included in the agenda.

105. The PRESIDENT: Item 34 refers to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa.

106. Mr. VON HIRSCHBERG (South Africa): Mr. President, may I, on behalf of the South African

delegation, extend to you our warm and sincere congratulations on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly. We wish you every success in the performance of your duties and assure you of our whole-hearted co-operation at all times.

107. I have asked to speak in order to reaffirm my Government's reservations with regard to the inclusion in the agenda and eventual consideration of item 34 of the draft agenda. My Government's position in this matter is well known and need not, therefore, be repeated again today.

108. The PRESIDENT: As no other representative wishes to speak, I take it that item 34 has been approved for inclusion in the agenda.

Item 34 was included in the agenda.

109. The PRESIDENT: I now submit to the General Assembly items 35 to 87. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to their inclusion in the agenda.

Items 35 to 87 inclusive were included in the agenda.

110. The PRESIDENT: The Soviet representative wishes to speak on item 88 and I now call on him.

111. Mr MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): When this question was discussed in the General Committee, the Soviet delegation advanced some well-founded and closely argued reasons why we consider it premature to deal with questions relating to the review of the United Nations Charter.

112. The United Nations Charter was drafted at the end of a war unprecedented in human history, the Second World War, in which our country's losses were reckoned at 20 million lives and when all mankind was imbued with the determination and the desire never to wage war again. This is the first point. The second point is contained in the Charter, itself. The Charter has recognized the equal status of the two social systems which exist in the contemporary world—the socialist and the capitalist systems. The Charter contains provisions making it impossible for either system to impose its will on the other.

113. This is an objective reflection of the realities of the present-day world and an objective reflection of the fact that the Charter is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence.

114. Accordingly, to scrap these basic provisions of the Charter would mean to destroy the United Nations. The United Nations cannot exist on the basis of any other provisions.

115. We are therefore firmly convinced that the principal task of the United Nations at the present time is not to engage in the hopeless, useless and fruitless exercise of reviewing the Charter, but to focus its attention on strengthening international security and saving

mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear war; for, if there is a thermonuclear war, if the United Nations cannot save the world from the threat of war and if the Organization is unable to fulfil the main purpose spelt out in the Charter—to save succeeding generations from the threat of a new war—then there will be no need for any charter, neither the present one nor a new one. We therefore consider that at this time it is wrong to divert attention to the review and revision of the Charter, and it is wrong at the present to engage in such a useless and hopeless exercise. We should rather—let me stress it again—concentrate our attention on the strengthening of peace and international security.

116. We expressed this position of ours in detail in the General Committee, and we voted against the inclusion of this item in the agenda for the present session. At this meeting, we do not intend to propose that the question should be put to the vote, but we thought it necessary to explain our position publicly before the item is included in the agenda.

117. The PRESIDENT: I take it that the Soviet representative has not made a formal proposal that this item should be deleted, but has registered and strengthened his opposition to the inclusion of this item, which he expressed in the General Committee. With this understanding I take it that this item, as proposed by the General Committee, is included in our agenda.

Item 88 was included in the agenda.

118. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly decides to include items 89 to 98 inclusive in its agenda.

Items 89 to 98 inclusive were included in the agenda.

119. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has now adopted its agenda for the twenty-fifth session, as proposed in paragraph 21 of the first report of the General Committee [A/8100].

120. We shall now turn to the question of the allocation of items, which is dealt with in section IV of that report. The modifications indicated in paragraph 22 are reflected in the proposed allocation, as well as the decisions in paragraph 23. We shall consider them when we come to the relevant items.

121. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the allocation of items 1 to 11 for consideration in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

122. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to item 12 entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council". I should like to invite the attention of the Assembly to the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 22 (a) (i). If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the Commit-

tee's recommendation regarding item 12 for consideration in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

123. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 22 (a) (ii), the General Committee recommends that the item "The situation in the Middle East" should be considered as a matter of urgency. I take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

124. The PRESIDENT: The Committee's recommendation concerning agenda item 23 for allocation to plenary meetings is to be found in paragraph 22 (a) (iii). May I take it that the Assembly agrees that all the chapters of the report of the Special Committee relating to specific Territories should be referred to the Fourth Committee?

It was so decided.

125. The PRESIDENT: Are there any objections to the allocation of the remaining items listed for consideration in plenary meetings? If there are none, I shall consider that the Assembly approves that allocation.

It was so decided.

126. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the list of items which the General Committee has recommended for allocation to the First Committee. Two representatives have requested to speak with respect to agenda item 25.

127. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): On the initiative of the Governments of a number of countries, including the Government of the Soviet Union [A/8047 and Add.1-4], an item entitled "Question of the breadth of the territorial sea and related matters" has been included in the draft agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. This proposal was introduced because of the need to strengthen the legal basis for co-operation between States in the oceans of the world and to settle outstanding problems arising in the course of this co-operation.

128. The question of the breadth of the territorial sea is an important problem of international maritime law for which no appropriate solution has yet been found. The absence of any clear treaty definition of the outer limit of the territorial sea and, consequently, the limit of State sovereignty over the coastal zone, is a serious shortcoming in international maritime law and, hence, a source of differences and often disputes and friction in relations between States.

129. Although the practice of most countries in the world with regard to the breadth of the territorial sea is substantially uniform, the different approaches to this problem adopted in the national legislation of certain countries lead to complications and conflicts between the claims of coastal States and the interests

of other countries; including nearly thirty land-locked countries.

130. In order to remedy this situation and to avoid such complications, conflicts of interest, friction and disputes between States, it is urgently necessary to examine this problem, hold an exchange of views in the General Assembly and find a rational solution for the problem of the breadth of the territorial sea which will take into account the legitimate rights and interests of coastal States and of all other countries using the high seas, including, of course, the interests of the land-locked countries.

131. The sponsors of the proposal regarding this item, as well as a number of other delegations, asked that this item should be included in the agenda as an independent, separate item and should, together with sub-item (c) of item 25 on the convening of a conference on the law of the sea, be referred for consideration to the Sixth—or Legal—Committee. Unfortunately, this request was not complied with in the General Committee. This is unquestionably a matter for great regret. The fact is that this item is a purely legal item, and should be discussed in the Sixth Committee.

132. Experience of United Nations proceedings shows that questions relating to the convening of international conferences are discussed first in the Sixth Committee. This is only natural. Some representatives mentioned in the General Committee that certain international treaties, such as the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear weapons, etc. have been discussed in the First Committee. But no one will deny that these are specifically political questions, which are directly concerned with the problem of war and peace. It is therefore perfectly natural that they should be examined in a political committee, that is to say, in the First Committee. But the item I am referring to, the item on convening a conference on the law of the sea, and also the item on the question of the breadth of the territorial sea—these are primarily legal, juridical questions, questions of international law, and they should naturally be considered in the Sixth Committee.

133. We believe that, in the General Committee's decision on this item, a mistake has quite obviously been committed, I would say, under pressure from a certain group of States. It would be desirable for the plenary Assembly to take appropriate steps to remedy this situation. If we are guided by practical considerations and base ourselves on established United Nations practice in allocating items between Committees, these items—that is to say, the question of the desirability or undesirability and the possibility or impossibility of convening an international conference and the question of the breadth of the territorial sea—should be allocated to the Sixth or Legal, Committee and not to the First, or Political, Committee.

134. It may be objected that this would mean dividing up items. But, gentlemen, do we not often divide up

items in the work of the Assembly and its Main Committees? Let us consider the report of the Economic and Social Council. We allocate the items dealt with by the Economic and Social Council to a number of Main Committees, and there are no alarming results. On the contrary, this is done solely in the interests of efficiency. Let us also look at the experience of the last session: the First Committee held over seventy meetings, and the other Committees considerably fewer. It is therefore essential to lighten the work-load of the First Committee. From this point of view also, it would be desirable to allocate these two items, or sub-items of item 25, to the Legal Committee, in order to relieve pressure on the First Committee at least to some extent.

135. The question of the territorial sea and the question of convening a conference on the law of the sea have always traditionally fallen within the competence of the Sixth Committee; they have been considered in the Sixth Committee and in the International Law Commission. Since these are problems of international law, they should be considered in the organs in which States are represented by people with the necessary specialized legal training and qualifications in international law.

136. We greatly regret that the General Committee—or, rather, part of the General Committee—did not take account of the fact that the States sponsoring this proposal made a quite legitimate and well-founded request that this item—that is, the item on the territorial sea—should be referred to the Sixth Committee for consideration.

137. To sum up, therefore, the Soviet delegation still thinks that it would be advisable to allocate this item to the Sixth Committee and requests a vote on the proposal that sub-items (c) and (d) of item 25 should be referred to the Sixth Committee for consideration.

138. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, since this is the first occasion on which my delegation has had the opportunity to speak in the General Assembly, let me take the opportunity to extend to you our congratulations and to say that, confident of your wisdom, experience and wise judgement, we are absolutely sure that the deliberations of this Assembly will move forward smoothly. Let me assure you that you will always have the co-operation of my delegation in making your onerous task as easy as possible.

139. My delegation is frankly worried by this recommendation of the General Committee. All the matters covered by item 25 are of importance, and we want to make progress with them. My delegation had in particular looked forward to making further progress on the question of the establishment of an international régime to govern the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed. This is something which is of importance to us all, not least to the developing countries. Our fear is that, by referring all the matters covered in item 25 to the First Committee, which is already heavily overburdened with thirteen items, compared with only four in the Special Political Committee, it will not be

possible to make the progress on any of them that we desire.

140. We saw much merit in the suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union that sub-items (c) and (d) should be referred to the Sixth Committee. If that is not possible—although I do not wish to make a formal proposal—we should see merit in the allocation of the whole of item 25 to the Special Political Committee, where time would permit of a more thorough discussion.

141. I have no doubt that when the two Committees meet their Chairmen will have all this in mind, and I am sure we can rely on them to consult each other and to make an appropriate recommendation for an adjustment of the burden of work between them, if that seems desirable.

142. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): My delegation is strongly in favour of our accepting the recommendation of the General Committee on the allocation of the matters concerning the sea and, therefore, equally opposed to the Soviet Union's suggestion, which, if accepted, would allocate parts of item 25—I refer to sub-items (c) and (d)—to the Sixth Committee for consideration. We fail to see any logic in such a proposal. It is obvious to us that all questions relating to the sea should be considered as a whole, at the same time, and within the operational framework of a single Committee. For the same reasons, we cannot accept the suggestion that has been advanced by the representative of the United Kingdom to the effect that this item should be allocated for consideration to the Special Political Committee.

143. Mr. Malik mentioned that the action of the General Committee was possibly due to pressure by certain States, which he did not specify. There is no evidence to that effect. However, as it was the delegation of Brazil that in the General Committee proposed the joint treatment of those questions of the sea, I cannot fail to feel a little flattered at the thought of Mr. Malik's seeing me exercising pressure on Members, including the super-Powers. If there was any pressure brought to bear, it was the pressure of logic, the pressure of good sense and the pressure of the necessity of having an orderly conduct of business. We have divided too many things in this Assembly. Let us not divide up the sea.

144. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to begin by praising the ability and talent of the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik. I knew that he had a good deal of talent and ability, but today he has demonstrated one further skill, the one that Penelope possessed of being able to weave and unweave the fabric of events.

145. If we read the report of the General Committee we see in paragraph 22 (b) of the report, that the General Committee decided by a vote of 15 to none, with 9 abstentions, to recommend that item 25 should be assigned to the First Committee. There is no record of the representative of the Soviet Union in the General

Committee having voted against the allocation of the item, including sub-paragraph (d), to the First Committee.

146. That was yesterday, but today the representative of the Soviet Union has woven and unwoven and woven again the arguments he put forward yesterday and he has done so with a certain dialectical sense, which is not particularly materialistic, because the only materialistic effect his arguments would produce would be to provoke again action by the great industrialized Powers of whatever leanings and ideology against the developing countries.

147. Let us point out that in yesterday's vote there was no opposition on the part of the Soviet Union to this, but today the Soviet representative has changed his position and suggested that this item be divided into two parts. This is something like what is called in biology cellular division. The item is taken apart, it is broadened, it is put together again, it is taken apart again. Now there is a desire to take apart what was put together yesterday, to undo what was done yesterday and to present an entirely new view today.

148. What his reasoning is I do not understand. I have misplaced the note I made of what he said, but I believe I can remember what it was. He said that the question of the breadth of the territorial sea was a question which might cause friction among States and that the lack of a clear definition of the limits of territorial waters might cause friction among States. Unless I am mistaken, the memorandum presented with the request for the inclusion of the item also said as much.

149. What is meant by "friction among States"? It is an essentially political problem that might endanger peace. Let us not say security, but peace. When there is friction among States there is a potential threat of conflict, and a conflict is always a threat to peace. Is this a legal issue or is it essentially a political issue? It is a political issue. Anything that may endanger peace and cause friction and conflict is a political issue. For Mr. Malik, however, it is a legal issue, and his essential argument is that the Sixth Committee has always been the body that has studied conventions and dealt with recommendations for international conferences. However, I could mention international conferences which have not been dealt with in the Sixth Committee but in the Third Committee—the Covenant on Human Rights, for example. Then he referred somewhat disparagingly to certain treaties which were not dealt with in the Sixth Committee such as that on outer space, which was discussed, unless I am mistaken, in 1966 in the First Committee, and the so-called Moscow Treaty banning nuclear explosions which was dealt with in the First Committee. Why should this be sent to the Sixth Committee? Because it is a legal issue? What matter in the United Nations is not partly a legal issue? Law is a way of regulating human affairs. Obviously, anything that we are trying to deal with has political implications and also legal implications. The only real reason for this insistence on the part of the Soviet Union must be what I said in the General

Committee and what I find myself obliged to repeat today.

150. Let us take the results of the vote. Not counting the sponsors and a few from the Socialist bloc, there were some abstentions and those who voted in favour. There was the United Kingdom, a developed country, although its representative said at one point that he was from a mini-State and the Soviet Union, which is a highly developed state. Those of us who voted in favour were developing countries; African and Asian countries, which were aware that at the present time the tendency of the major Powers, no matter what their leanings or ideologies, is to establish first the breadth of the territorial sea in order then to establish a restrictive régime for their own benefit and not for the benefit of mankind.

151. Like the representative of Brazil, I wish to say that at the present time to change what was decided on yesterday without a negative vote in the General Committee would be, through clever manoeuvring, to create a situation which could only be to the detriment of small countries which are in the process of developing and which it is our duty to defend.

152. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): We are now discussing an item included in the agenda of the First Committee on the request of the Bulgarian delegation and a number of others under the title: "Question of the breadth of the territorial sea and related matters": [A/8047 and Add.1-4]. We felt that this point deserved special attention because of its particular place among all the items on the First Committee agenda concerning the law of the sea, such as the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and marine pollution. Why did we feel that this subject deserved special attention and should therefore be discussed separately? It was because we felt it was a particularly important question and once it was clearly defined it would help us to solve related matters. It was originally intended that a conference on the law of the sea be convened in order to discuss all these questions as a whole. Thus the entire problem was raised again and matters for which a solution had already been found were reopened.

153. The view of those in favour of an over-all study of problems of the law of the sea was that by studying these matters as a whole, a lasting, over-all solution (which is our basic objective) might be found rather than immediate solutions on certain limited points. However, by entrusting a solution to these problems to a conference on the law of the sea (which would require ten years to convene as was the case with the last conference) is it their hope that, in the meantime, certain States, perhaps friendly to them, would elaborate their own law of the sea which would consolidate their domination of the sea area?

154. The world was divided, the earth was divided by certain States at certain points in history. Now, under the pretext of wishing to resolve at the same time questions presented as a group, they are seeking

to appropriate certain portions of the sea area which, on the other hand, is defined under another agenda item as the "common heritage of mankind".

155. It cannot be denied that an over-all study of these problems would permit a better understanding and clarification of them. But this would require time which we do not have and would adversely affect land-locked States. What basis would they have for exercising their right to the sea? None. Only the coastal States could freely exercise their sovereign right and appropriate ever larger portions of the sea-bed and this encroachment could provoke international conflicts as has been stressed here.

156. It has been said that, since the political aspect was paramount, this subject should be included in the agenda of the First Committee. Naturally, every legal question is political and vice versa. I share the view of the preceding speaker here who stated that any categorization could be reviewed at any time. However, by deferring not a decision but a mere clarification of the question we would indeed not be contributing towards its solution. On the contrary, we would be impeding a clarification which might, in turn, assist us in the over-all task. This would amount to simply placing all outstanding problems in the same basket and prolonging the discussion.

157. For this reason my delegation, which represents a small country which can not allow itself to encroach on the sea area, is concerned—as indeed are all States with perhaps a few exceptions—to see that some order be brought to the matter and that the breadth of the territorial sea be defined once and for all and as soon as possible, or at the very least, that we ascertain without delay the various viewpoints on this important question. It has been said that pressure is being applied. Of course there is pressure but it is being applied by those who wish to exercise their sovereignty in the sea area as they have done on other occasions.

158. What, for example would the African land-locked States do? What would those African States do which have a coastline and islands as well? What would riparian States to a closed sea do? Nothing. They would have to remain as they are. Consequently, only a few States of the world would take the liberty of acting because they would envisage the possibility of creating a sea empire. This is why we feel that this question must be clarified and studied separately and as soon as possible so that the whole world should understand it and so that a decision can be taken and a solution found as soon as possible. I know that certain States would like to encroach on this area but that is another problem.

159. I consider that this matter should be put to a vote.

160. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile followed with great attention yesterday the debate in the General Committee. Without any opposing votes, it was decided there to allocate all items concerning the sea in one

single item to the First Committee. My delegation is surprised that whereas yesterday there were no votes against this proposal, this proposal should come up for discussion once again. The General Assembly on a number of occasions has decided that matters concerning the sea should be discussed as a whole. General Assembly resolutions 798 (VIII), 1105 (XI) and 2574 A (XXIV) of past General Assembly sessions have so decided. The Secretary-General conducted consultations as a result of resolution 2574A (XXIV) adopted at the last session of the General Assembly. These concerned the desirability and the nature of a possible conference on the Law of the Sea. An overwhelming majority of States, in line with the General Assembly's resolutions which I have referred to and in line with the opinion of the International Law Commission and consistent with economic, political and juridical logic and with the interests of the developing countries have replied to the Secretary-General that if there is to be a conference on the law of the sea, it should be open for discussion on all problems relating to this area of law, it should be far-ranging and problems relating to the law of the sea should be discussed as a whole.

161. Some States which have spoken this afternoon conducted diplomatic consultations with other States in past years in an effort to organize a limited conference. Those diplomatic consultations were not successful, and the international community, in its replies to the Secretary-General, has decided that matters concerning the sea should be dealt with as a whole.

162. As this diplomatic manoeuvre, however, was to no avail, an attempt now has been made to introduce a separate item, the purpose being that matters concerning the sea should be dealt with separately so that the developing countries cannot adequately defend their interests by dealing with matters concerning the sea as a whole, which would be in their interests. This has been an attempt to violate the determination of the international community as expressed in three resolutions in three different sessions of the General Assembly and in replies sent to the Secretary-General.

163. Yesterday, the General Committee reflected what the General Assembly itself had decided on a number of occasions. It reflected what sovereign States have replied to the question by the Secretary-General. It decided once again without any opposing votes that matters concerning the sea should be debated as a whole. The decision was then that all matters relating to the sea constituted a single item which should be assigned to the First Committee. This makes perfect sense in the General Assembly and this is what should take place in the future conference on the sea—which is our primary concern. A violation of this principle is a violation of logic. The sea is a single unit. No country can seriously defend its interests relating to the sea except as a whole. Reference has been made to the land-locked countries. Yesterday, three land-locked countries, Bolivia, Afghanistan and Zambia, voted in favour of dealing with these matters together. They voted that all matters concerning the law of the sea should be discussed jointly. The Ambassador of Bolivia very ably explained why these matters should

be dealt with together and why it is in the interest of the land-locked countries to have them discussed together.

164. If we take what is called in English a piece-meal approach, if we fragment questions relating to the law of the sea, the only result will be that a few powerful countries will impose their will on the common interests of the developing countries. Yesterday all the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America voted in favour of dealing with these matters jointly. It is the conviction of my delegation that once again they will do so today as indeed they have in their replies to the Secretary-General. It is with very great astonishment that the delegation of Chile sees that this whole question has been reopened this afternoon.

165. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): Mr. President, the Head of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Cameroon will in due course bring you greetings on the occasion of your election to the high office of the Presidency of the General Assembly. I can only briefly in my humble capacity give you my personal warm congratulations and express the great satisfaction I have felt that it has been my fortune to know you, especially in juridical circles.

166. My delegation feels compelled by the debates that we have heard within the last seventy-two hours to state quite clearly in the General Assembly what our position is. The General Committee has recommended that the four sub-items under agenda item 25 now assigned to the First Committee, should in fact be sent to the First Committee.

167. There is a proposal before the General Assembly that these four sub-items should in fact be split in such a way that (c) and (d) are sent to the Sixth Committee. My delegation has had the privilege of participating in the work of the Committee¹ dealing with the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof. Now, we are fully aware of the basic problems and the arguments that have been proposed here. We wish simply to state the position of our delegation.

168. We are of the opinion that there are a series of issues that are so closely interrelated that they must not be separated, and accordingly ought to be left together. My delegation is not particularly impressed by the argument about the breadth of the territorial sea and related matters as being ones which are suitable for the Legal Committee of the General Assembly.

169. A close look at what is involved in this particular matter immediately reveals the fact that certain basic political questions must be decided with regard to this matter. Today there is no recognized rule of international law that fixes the breadth of the territorial sea. It is therefore obvious that the decision to fix a particular limit must be a political one, and we feel that at this stage it would be undesirable to send to the technical Legal Committee an issue which requires

purely political arguments to settle. We are, of course, convinced that it is desirable that all sections of the international community must participate in the effort to settle the problems involved.

170. That is a very impressive argument, especially with regard to the work that is to be done under sub-item (c). However, as was quite rightly pointed out earlier, there is, at least for the young countries, a basic problem: many so-called rules of international law, especially in the customary international law field, which are directly a result of intercourse between European States, are not in fact recognized by the young nations which have emerged into independence within the last ten years. Accordingly, it has become desirable that at every stage these young countries must participate in the work of codification and development of international law. On this score I agree with the representative of Bulgaria.

171. However, I would suggest, with due respect, that before a conference is in fact called, it is the practice, which is recognized even by the International Law Commission, that certain basic political guidance must be given to the technicians who are to deal with these matters. I regret to say at this stage that my delegation sees no such guidance from any source. It is for this reason that we insist that the political issues be discussed in the Political Committee, in the political arena, in order that a clear mandate be given, if it is necessary, at a later stage, for a conference that will deal with the over-all problem.

172. I have spoken much longer than I had expected, but I thought that we should make quite clear our viewpoint at this stage. We consider that the whole question of the sea, the question of restoration for peaceful purposes of some part of the sea, which we now call a sea-bed, an ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, still requires such close joint examination that to separate them at this stage would be premature, in fact would be prejudicial.

173. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Cameroon suggested that he had probably spoken too long. Without necessarily agreeing with that statement on his part, I do feel that we might be ill-advised to continue this debate much longer, after the very long debate we had in the General Committee. We have now already heard seven speakers on this question of allocation. I have one more speaker inscribed, and it is my hope that it might be possible to take a vote after that.

174. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all, I should like, personally, to extend to you my sincerest congratulations on your election to the Presidency of the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly. The head of my delegation will have an opportunity later to express to you, on behalf of my delegation and Government, our sincerest congratulations.

175. I know that this subject was debated at considerable length in the General Committee. I am also aware

¹ Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

that a number of speakers have taken the floor. I have taken the liberty of taking the time of the General Assembly to support my colleagues who have argued in favour of allocating this agenda item to the First Committee.

176. This problem of the sea-bed is one which is essentially, by definition, a political problem. For this reason, the appropriate body of the United Nations should be given a chance to reach the necessary decisions, which will inevitably be political decisions.

177. Obviously, there are technical, economic and legal implications, which should be discussed at the appropriate time by the appropriate bodies in the United Nations and, when necessary, by a conference convened for the purpose of discussing all problems relating to the sea. But for the time being, I believe that we would be ill-advised indeed to fragment this problem and to call on a number of different United Nations bodies to discuss the matter, when what is required at present are specifically political decisions.

178. Therefore, my delegation appeals to all delegations present here to support the idea of allocating this item to the First Committee.

179. The PRESIDENT: As I see it, the situation is as follows. With regard to agenda item 25 there have been no objections to the inclusion in the First Committee agenda of sub-items (a) and (b). The Soviet Union has proposed that sub-items (c) and (d) be referred to the Sixth Committee. As that proposal may be regarded as an amendment to the recommendation, I shall put it to the vote first.

The proposal was rejected by 69 votes to 18, with 23 abstentions.

180. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has therefore decided that all four sub-items will be allocated to the First Committee.

181. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly agrees to the other recommendations concerning the allocation of items to the First Committee.

It was so decided.

182. The PRESIDENT: The General Committee has recommended four items for allocation to the Special Political Committee. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

183. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to examine the list of items recommended for allocation to the Second Committee. With regard to agenda item 12, "Report of the Economic and Social Council" the General Committee has made recommendations in paragraph 22 (c). If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly has no objection to those recommendations.

It was so decided.

184. The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly also approves the allocation of the other items to the Second Committee.

It was so decided.

185. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the proposed allocation of items to the Third Committee. The General Committee has also made recommendations regarding the report of the Economic and Social Council in paragraph 22 (d). If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves those recommendations.

It was so decided.

186. The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves the allocation of the other items to the Third Committee.

It was so decided.

187. The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on the allocation of the thirteen items to the Fourth Committee? If not, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that allocation.

It was so decided.

188. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves the recommended allocation of items to the Fifth Committee.

It was so decided.

189. The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves the recommended allocation of items to the Sixth Committee.

It was so decided.

190. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has now taken its first important decisions regarding the organization of its work. I should like to thank the members of the General Committee, who worked very hard yesterday afternoon to avoid any delay. We have made a good start, and I hope we shall continue in the same way.

191. We know this session may be a hard one, and we all want to finish it at the date agreed upon. May I therefore take this opportunity to appeal to all representatives to co-operate with the President and the Committee Chairmen in order to make the fullest possible use of the time at our disposal, and to start meetings on time with full lists of speakers for all agenda items and to observe the time limits concerning the items.

192. Each Committee will promptly receive the list of the agenda items allocated to it, so that it may begin its work as early as possible next week.

193. Two representatives wish to exercise the right of reply. I shall call on them in the order in which

they signified their desire—first the representative of Japan, then the representative of the Soviet Union.

194. Mr. OGISO (Japan): Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to exercise the right of reply to the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning item 98 entitled "Question of Korea".

195. As I made clear in my statement, it is my delegation's view that this is neither the proper time nor the proper place to go into details of substance on this question. Therefore I shall be as brief as possible.

196. It is common knowledge in this Assembly that the Government of the Republic of Korea has been declared by a resolution of the General Assembly to be the legitimate Government in Korea. It is also an established fact that UNCURK was set up by a resolution of the General Assembly as an official organ of the United Nations. It is therefore only natural that my delegation, as on previous occasions, has defended the Republic of Korea and the work of UNCURK.

197. With regard to another point made by the representative of the Soviet Union—that, since Japan was not a Member of the United Nations when the Korean question was placed on the agenda of the United Nations for the first time, Japan should not take an active part in the discussion and consideration of this problem—I think it is unquestionably clear that that point is entirely irrelevant since many Members of the United Nations were not Members at the time when the Korean question was first placed on the agenda of the General Assembly.

198. I wish to conclude my brief remarks at that point. However, my delegation will be prepared to express its views on the substance of this question in further detail in the proper forum and at an appropriate time.

199. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I had not intended to speak, but the representative of Ecuador made two remarks in his statement to which the Soviet delegation is bound to reply.

200. In the first place, he tried to give the impression that the Soviet Union, or the Soviet delegation, in submitting a proposal to discuss the question of the territorial sea and the convening of a conference on the international sea-bed, is attempting to prejudice the interests of the small countries.

201. We strongly object to such an interpretation of our position. From the earliest days of the existence of our country, the Soviet Union, Lenin, the founder of our State, proclaimed the full equality of all peoples and all nations, irrespective of colour and irrespective of race, and we, the Soviet Union, are an example of a multinational State in which the principle of equality is implemented fully and unconditionally. Any racial discrimination, any prejudice to the national interests of small peoples, is severely punishable by law and is prohibited by our Constitution. The entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union over its whole history of more than fifty years has been a policy of defending the interests of small States against imperialism. Accordingly, this interpretation of our position is either a misunderstanding or a deliberate distortion, and we cannot allow such an interpretation to pass without rebuttal.

202. Secondly, as regards the vote, the representative of Ecuador proposed in the General Committee that all four sub-items of item 25 should be allocated to the First Committee. The Ecuadorian representative is aware that I submitted an amendment to his proposal. The Chairman of the General Committee, who is also President of the Assembly, ruled that a vote should be taken first on my amendment, to the effect that sub-items (c) and (d) should be referred to the Sixth Committee. I submitted this amendment in the General Committee, and I did not say that I would not submit the same proposal here. Accordingly, the assertion now made in the Assembly in plenary that the Soviet delegation took one position in the General Committee and is taking a different one here does not correspond to the facts, to say the least.

203. With regard to the statement by the Japanese representative, he seems to have misunderstood what I said. I did not say that the Japanese delegation was not entitled to take part in the discussion on the question of Korea. Nothing could be further from my thoughts. Every State Member of the United Nations, every delegation, is entitled to discuss any agenda item in the General Assembly. I only mentioned that Japan is now actively supporting the occupation of South Korea by foreign forces, a circumstance which gives rise to melancholy speculations. The First Committee will, it seems, have to give some attention to this matter too.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.