



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 26: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea	1525
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>continued</i>) Report of the Second Committee	1530
Agenda item 95: Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Sixth Committee	1539

**President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA
(Algeria).**

AGENDA ITEM 26

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will first consider agenda item 26, entitled "Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea". The Assembly has before it a draft resolution [A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2] and a report of the Fifth Committee [A/9977] on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution.

2. I now call on the representative of Sri Lanka, the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

3. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): When I address the General Assembly on this subject, I do so in the dual capacity of Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations and President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

4. The first session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea was convened and took place from 3 to 14 December 1973 in accordance with paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 3067 (XXVIII), adopted on 16 November 1973. That session of the Conference dealt with matters relating to the organization of the Conference, including the election of officers, the adoption of the agenda and the rules of procedure of the Conference, the establishment of subsidiary organs, and the allocation of work to those organs.

5. The substantive part of the mandate of the Conference was to adopt a convention dealing with all matters relating to the law of the sea, taking into account the subject-matter listed in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV) and the list of subjects

and issues relating to the law of the sea formally approved on 18 August 1972 by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction. In adopting the convention, the Conference was required, under resolution 3067 (XXVIII), to bear in mind that the problems of ocean space are closely interrelated and need to be considered as a whole.

6. By paragraph 4 of that same resolution, the General Assembly decided to convene the second session of the Conference, for the purpose of dealing with the substantive work of the Conference, for a period of 10 weeks from 20 June to 29 August 1974 at Caracas and, if necessary, to convene not later than 1975 any subsequent session or sessions as might be decided upon by the Conference and approved by the General Assembly, bearing in mind that the Government of Austria had offered Vienna as the site for the Conference in 1975.

7. The Conference, at its inaugural session, held in December last year, could not secure agreement on the rules of procedure and this task was left over for the second session, which was expected to deal with substantive matters. The Conference succeeded in adopting its rules of procedure by the end of the first week in Caracas, namely 27 June. That was in itself no mean achievement considering the differences of opinion that had manifested themselves at the inaugural session. At Caracas, the Conference could not complete the mandate assigned to it under paragraph 3 of resolution 3067 (XXVIII). It did, however, examine the main issues in great detail both in the course of general statements in the plenary Conference and in the three main Committees.

8. There was agreement at the end of the Caracas session that the stage of general discussion had been completed and that at its next session the Conference should proceed immediately to the process of negotiation. In my letter [A/9721] of 4 September 1974 addressed to the President of the General Assembly, I informed you, Mr. President, of the main decisions taken by the Conference at Caracas. They were that the next session should be held at Geneva from 17 March to 3 or 10 May, depending upon arrangements to be made with WHO and that, when matters reached that stage, the Conference should hold its final session at Caracas for the signing of the Final Act and other related instruments of the Conference. That decision was taken in response to the kind invitation of the Government of Venezuela to serve as host for the signing ceremony of the Final Act and related instruments.

9. Those decisions require the General Assembly's approval in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 3067 (XXVIII).

10. Unfortunately, the Austrian Government's kind offer could not be accepted owing to difficulties regarding the date and the duration of the next session, but I am sure all the participants in the Conference deeply appreciate that Government's offer.

11. I trust that it will not be necessary for us to refer here to matters of substance, as they now fall strictly within the competence of the Conference itself.

12. I feel also that no useful purpose would be served by entering into a discussion on other decisions taken by the Conference. One such decision was the invitation addressed by the Conference to national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity [OAU] or the League of Arab States, operating in their respective regions, to participate in the Conference proceedings as observers without the right to vote. In any discussion of the concept of the common heritage of mankind, it is our duty to ensure that the interests of all mankind are properly represented. Such an imperative requirement should transcend all political differences. In the face of such a gigantic task as the Conference has had to assume, the successful accomplishment of which is of supreme importance to peace and well-being throughout the world, I am confident that the voice of political controversy will be stilled.

13. In accordance with the principle of universality of representation, the Conference decided to recommend to the General Assembly that Papua New Guinea, which is already conducting its own relations as an independent State, should be invited, if independent, to attend any future session of the Conference as a participating State or, if not yet independent, to attend as an observer. By the same token, the Conference decided to recommend similar treatment for the Cook Islands, Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and the West Indies Associated States.

14. All those decisions have been incorporated in an appropriate form in draft resolution A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2, which has been sponsored by 19 members. I welcome the proposal in operative paragraph 3 (c) of that draft resolution that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be also invited to attend any future session of the Conference as an observer.

15. Through the co-operation of the Director-General of WHO and the members of the Executive Board of that organization, it has been possible to allow for the extension of the Conference up to 10 May 1975.

16. I should like here once more to express, on behalf of the Conference, our deep sense of gratitude to the Director-General of WHO and to the members of its Executive Board for adjusting the programme of the twenty-eighth World Health Assembly in order to accommodate the Conference.

17. It is my hope that the informal consultations which have already been initiated with the object of narrowing differences and reducing the number of alternative texts will continue and gather momentum as we approach the date for the commencement of the Geneva session. The progress made in these consultations, which I trust will bring together representatives of all shades of opinion and all schools of thought, will have a beneficial effect on the work of the Geneva session and contribute to speedy progress there.

18. I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my sincere thanks to Mr. Constantin Stavropoulos, who a short while ago relinquished the office of Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. His tenure of that office was a fitting climax to a long and distinguished career as an international civil servant in a field in which his experience was almost unrivalled.

19. At the same time, I should like to congratulate his successor, Mr. Bernardo Zuleta of Colombia, who has participated actively in the work of the Conference and brings to his new duties not only vast experience and outstanding ability as a negotiator but a deep and penetrating insight into the problems that we have to solve.

20. In regard to both Mr. Stavropoulos and Mr. Zuleta, I am sure my sentiments are shared by all who know them and have worked with them.

21. Finally, I can assure the General Assembly that we move on to Geneva determined to succeed, if for no other reason than that, as I have stated before, the price of failure is beyond our means.

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Assembly, I wish to thank the representative of Sri Lanka, who presided over the work of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

23. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

24. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): It is well known that my Government attaches great importance to a successful law of the sea treaty and to the achievement of that goal before the pressure of events and the erosion of momentum place it beyond our reach.

25. A few weeks ago, in an extensive interview published in *The New York Times*, the Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, stressed that our interdependent world has approached a time when we must find creative solutions to mutual problems, or face chaos. Similar thoughts were expressed by many speakers from all regions during the general debate in this body.

26. There are few problems so uniquely expressive of our global interdependence as that of the legal order of the oceans. We have made a good beginning at Caracas. Like many others, I am disappointed that our accomplishments were not greater, but I am not discouraged about our capacity to achieve a treaty, given the will and the devotion to the task that are necessary to meet the time-table set by this Assembly in its resolution last year. That resolution—wisely, as it turned out—envisaged the possibility that in addition to the Caracas session we would, if necessary, “convene not later than 1975 any subsequent session or sessions as may be decided upon by the Conference and approved by the General Assembly” [*resolution 3067 (XXVIII), para. 4*].

27. It seems to my delegation that that resolution was a clear mandate to complete our work in 1975. I do not believe there is any fundamental disagreement among us about the magnitude of that task. It is not merely the process of political decision by Governments on difficult issues, frequently involving impor-

tant domestic interests and the process of negotiation of the precise details of the many individual issues that must be written into final texts. It is also the sheer weight of the management problem of so many nations negotiating so many issues, and the time that is inevitably required, after detailed texts of individual articles are negotiated, to construct their final place in the overall treaty.

28. No Government will be more pleased than mine if we can complete that task during the time allotted to our meeting at Geneva, but I do not believe that we should foreclose the possibility of further work during 1975 if that is necessary to complete the treaty.

29. Time-tables, of course, are not immutable. I am well aware of the many understandable concerns and, in some cases, genuine personal and governmental hardships that have been reflected in the negotiation of the draft resolution now before the Assembly. Nevertheless, these should be measured against the probability that, with more delay, the passage of time and not our own efforts may well determine the outcome of our negotiations.

30. My Government reluctantly supports the draft resolution before this Assembly. I say "reluctantly" because we would strongly prefer that the Secretary-General be given specific authority to schedule a second substantive session in 1975, if necessary, and to begin making the arrangements that cannot be satisfactorily made in a few weeks or a few months. However, we believe that the draft resolution as it stands would not preclude the possibility of additional intersessional work in 1975. It would be our understanding that the Secretariat could proceed to do the best it could to ensure that if the Conference determined such work was necessary, appropriate arrangements would be forthcoming.

31. We welcome in particular the reference to the acceptance by the Conference of the invitation of the Government of Venezuela to return to Caracas to sign the Final Act and related instruments and the authorization to the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements to that end.

32. This Conference has been called one of the most important held since the creation of the United Nations. This is true not only because of the importance of the oceans to the future well-being of all nations, but also because its outcome may well determine whether we have the will and the institutional structure to achieve co-operative solutions for important global problems.

33. As the many experienced negotiators in this room well know, there comes a time in any negotiation when its course moves rapidly forward toward perceived solutions or a breakdown occurs. It seems to me evident that that moment must come at Geneva. If the will is there to make the decisions and the accommodations that are necessary, we shall have the momentum to move to a successful conclusion.

34. Though my Government is second to none in pressing for a timely solution by the Conference and in seeking a work programme to that end, our support for a timely Conference should not be misread as a willingness to sacrifice essential national interests. My nation will go to Geneva to negotiate. Geneva can succeed, however, only if all nations approach our work in that spirit; and it can succeed only if all nations

identify their essential national interests and realize, in turn, that others have essential interests that must be accommodated.

35. I should also like to state our gratification at the willingness of the General Assembly to invite the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to participate as an observer in the work of the Conference. While we have always taken into account Micronesia's views and interests in formulating our positions, we think it advisable that Micronesia should be able to state its own views with regard to the law of the sea issues.

36. Like the representative of Sri Lanka, I should like to state the appreciation of my country for the role played by Constantin Stavropoulos, who until November of this year contributed much and wisely as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the Conference.

37. When we recall Mr. Stavropoulos' 20 years of service as Legal Counsel of the United Nations, it is only appropriate that we acknowledge with profound gratitude his intelligence, his insight, his wisdom, his humanity and his friendship. Our loss is the gain of his homeland, Greece, to which he has now returned.

38. We also applaud the decision of the Secretary-General to appoint as his new Special Representative Mr. Bernardo Zuleta, a distinguished lawyer-diplomat, and the Alternate Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations. We have known and admired Mr. Zuleta for a number of years. Both the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea have benefited from his qualities of leadership, tolerance, industry and wit. In this case, the loss to Colombia is the gain of the international community.

39. Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom): Before explaining my delegation's vote, I wish to express our serious concern at the prolonged and unexplained delay of the start of this meeting. It is, in our view, unacceptable that the Assembly has been kept waiting for two and a half hours without any reason being offered to us.

40. My delegation is happy to support the draft resolution contained in document A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2, the primary purpose of which is to authorize the future time-table of the Conference.

41. The time-table of the Conference does itself have important implications for the successful conclusion of the Conference, and most delegations are aware that the wording in the draft resolution before us has not been arrived at without a considerable amount of private consultation which reflects differing concerns on how the work of the Conference might most effectively be carried forward. I should therefore like to make a brief explanation of certain considerations underlying the positive vote which we shall cast on the draft resolution.

42. We are in a situation in which a great deal has already been achieved. Caracas saw substantial progress on a number of crucial issues—for example, on the extent of the territorial sea, on the concept of a 200-mile economic zone, on obligations of States

and on global and regional arrangements on scientific research, on procedures for the transfer of technology and on pollution control. Within these general agreements there still remain significant differences. But the Conference has gone a long way in clarifying the position of delegations and in defining the differences still to be resolved.

43. Equally important, the Conference was not used as a sounding-board for existing political differences and conflicts; there was give and take in debate, and determination to achieve a successful outcome. Delegations were unanimous in their wish to continue the process of active diplomacy and most countries showed an encouraging willingness to compromise for the sake of eventual agreement.

44. We therefore believe that there is an encouraging momentum towards agreement on a new convention on the law of the sea. Negotiation and compromise will be essential, for the law of the sea can be strengthened only by general agreement in order to meet present and future needs of the world community. We have strong hopes that very substantial progress can be made at the Geneva session of the Conference. We think also that if our expectations are realized and substantial progress is indeed achieved, it would be most unfortunate if this momentum was lost because of inflexibility with regard to the future time-table of the Conference after Geneva.

45. We recognize the heavy burden which the Conference places on the limited resources of expert manpower available to Governments. We understand why, at this stage, when it is still hard to see how close we are to the convention for which we are striving, some may be reluctant to commit themselves; but by May the position should be much clearer. If further work by the Conference seems desirable in 1975, we hope that delegations will not shrink from the demands which this would place upon them, thereby risking loss of the momentum which, we believe, the Conference now possesses.

46. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): With regard to draft resolution A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2, which is now before us, I should like to place on record the support of my delegation for the invitation contained in operative paragraph 3 to certain Territories which will be in a position to opt for independence in the near future to attend, as observers *casu quo* as States, any future session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

47. Among those Territories are listed Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, situated on the north coast of the South American continent and in the Caribbean area, respectively. At the moment, those two Territories, together with the Netherlands in Europe, form one State, namely, the Kingdom of the Netherlands. However, this situation will change fundamentally in the near future. Next year Surinam will become an independent, sovereign State, and at a later date the two remaining component parts of the Kingdom of the Netherlands will also come to constitute separate sovereign States.

48. In view of the future independence of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, while considering the importance of the matters which are being dealt with, my delegation deems it desirable that they be enabled

to participate as fully as possible in the work of the Conference.

49. Furthermore, as it may be assumed that these Territories, once independent, will be willing to apply for membership of the United Nations, it would be useful for them to have benefited from such earlier experience in the activities of the Organization.

50. The delegation of the Netherlands therefore wholeheartedly supports the recommendation of the Conference in this respect and expresses the wish that it will be endorsed by the General Assembly. Of course, my delegation can also support the draft resolution as a whole.

51. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connexion with draft resolution A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2, the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to make the following statement.

52. The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which held its second session at Caracas from June to August 1974 with the participation of 138 States, was, as is well known, an important international event. At that session, however, it was possible to take only the first steps towards the preparation of a new convention on a legal régime for the seas, because of the complexity of the problems dealt with and the fact that the session, as we have already stated, had not been properly prepared for. There was a positive element, however: the presentation of a whole series of new constructive proposals on key issues, as well as the settlement of a number of procedural questions.

53. In the rules of procedure, which were unanimously adopted, the gentleman's agreement reached in the General Assembly was confirmed. In accordance with that agreement, the decisions of the Conference on substantive matters were to be adopted by consensus, and votes were to be taken only in exceptional cases. There is no need to speak about the significance that the implementation of that gentleman's agreement on the part of all participants in the Conference has for the smooth functioning of the Conference and the settlement of the important problems of contemporary international law of the sea. It is obvious that the method of agreement, consensus, was the only realistic way of preparing at the Conference a document acceptable to all States, and consequently one which could be respected by them in the future.

54. It is a matter of common knowledge that the Conference has settled questions of great importance relating to co-operation among countries with different social systems. It should also be realized that the Conference is taking place at a time when international politics and the system of international relations have undergone a fundamental change in the direction of *détente* and in the direction of mutually advantageous and equitable co-operation. The favourable changes which have taken place on our planet should not fail to exercise a positive influence on the work of the Conference. The decisions of the Conference should be in line with the main development of present international relations, which are moving towards legal bases making it possible to bring about peace and to strengthen international *détente* further. Otherwise

the world's oceans might become an arena for competition among States, an arena for confrontations and clashes of various kinds.

55. The Soviet Union does not believe that things should happen in that way, and it believes that the necessary conditions exist to make it possible to settle the fundamental issues of the international law of the sea, in keeping with the interests and positions of States and groups of States and in a way not harmful to the legitimate interests of any group.

56. As regards the draft resolution before us, the Soviet delegation would like, first of all, to say that it is grateful to the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Mr. Amersinghe, for the initiatives he has taken and the efforts he has made and continues to make in dealing with questions relating to the work of the Conference and the preparation of the draft resolution. The Soviet delegation believes that this draft resolution is acceptable and that the General Assembly will be able to adopt it.

57. The Soviet delegation supports the recommendation adopted at the second session of the Conference that the next session of the Conference should take place from 17 March to 10 May at Geneva. The Soviet delegation assumes that at that session all States will make patient and careful efforts to eliminate the many divergencies which emerged at the Caracas session and will endeavour to arrive at a "package deal" by consensus on all the fundamental issues of the law of the sea.

58. Having said that, the Soviet delegation would like at the same time to state once again that it is regrettable that, in convening the Conference, the principle of universal participation of all States was not consistently applied, thus disregarding the urgings of the delegations of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam was not invited, and in view of that discriminatory measure the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam declared that it would be impossible for it to take part in the Conference. That discriminatory approach is particularly inadmissible and unfounded at the present time, because in fact the famous Vienna formula on the participation of States in international conferences is no longer applied.¹

59. The Conference must solve problems relating to the rational use of the wealth of the world's oceans in the interests of mankind, which means that the Conference affects the vital interests of all States. It is therefore inadmissible to exclude any State from the Conference.

60. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation wishes once again to confirm its position of principle set forth at the Conference here in New York in 1973 and last summer at Caracas. Our position is that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam has the legitimate right to take part in the Conference, and that the Saigon administration is not authorized to speak on behalf of South Viet Nam.

61. With respect to the financial implications of the adoption of this draft resolution, as they emerge from the report of the Fifth Committee [A/9977], which we have just received, and from the report of the

Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/9608/Add.20], the estimated expenditure for the Geneva session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea does not take sufficiently into account considerations of economy in the use of United Nations resources. It is possible to establish this fact from even a cursory reading of the report. Therefore, the cost of the Conference would be unprecedented and that most definitely would be harmful to the codification of the law of the sea and would compromise that idea. The delegation of the Soviet Union believes that those responsible for the preparation of these financial implications should draw the appropriate conclusions.

62. Paragraph 6 of the report of the Fifth Committee is also noteworthy. It mentions additional sums for the very problematical possibility of holding the final session of the Conference in 1975. In our view, artificial attempts to force through the final stage of the work of the Conference and to establish any time-limits for it are tantamount to a call to renounce agreed decisions. We can neither approve nor support such an approach, even when it appears in auxiliary documents of a financial character.

63. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea held at Caracas from 20 June to 29 August 1974 was a conference of great importance in the present international relations. Despite the failure of the Conference to adopt decisions on a number of major issues pertaining to the law of the sea as a result of the obstruction by the super-Powers, the general trend of the Conference was good. The numerous developing countries forcefully exposed and repudiated the maritime hegemony of the super-Powers, which found themselves in still greater passivity and isolation. In order to safeguard State sovereignty and develop national economy, the third-world countries resolutely demand the abrogation of the old law of the sea which serves imperialism and the formulation of a new law of the sea which will reflect the legitimate interests of the numerous developing countries. At present, the call for defending the 200-nautical-mile zone of maritime rights has become ever stronger and has formed a mighty current. China firmly supports the just position of the third-world countries.

64. Confronted with the struggle of the numerous small and medium-sized countries against maritime hegemony in defence of the 200-nautical-mile zone of maritime rights, the super-Powers have been forced by the circumstances to change their tactics and alter their tone. Their superficial recognition of the 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone coupled with many restrictions and conditions is intended to emasculate the exclusive economic zone, a demand of the small and medium-sized countries, so that it will become something nominal, devoid of any substance, while the rights of various countries will be subjected to continued violation. In particular, that super-Power which styles itself "a natural ally" of the third world has unreasonably insisted on the fishing rights of foreign countries and their so-called freedom of scientific research in the economic zone of another country. In concert with the other super-Power, it has been advertising a "package agreement" in an attempt

to exchange this empty "non-exclusive economic zone" for the free passage through straits.

65. However, fish eyes cannot be palmed off as pearls. No flamboyant words and changeable tactics can cover up the true features of super-Power maritime hegemony, nor will pressure and blackmail shake the confidence and determination of the third-world countries to defend state sovereignty and develop national economy. At the Caracas Conference, the numerous third-world countries came to realize more deeply that in desperately trying to preserve their "freedom of passage" through the straits within the territorial waters of other countries and their "freedom of fishing and scientific research" in the exclusive economic zone, the ultimate purpose of the super-Powers is to guarantee their freedom to plunder the developing countries and practise hegemony.

66. At present, the spirits of the third-world countries are soaring in their struggle against maritime hegemony, while the super-Powers are becoming increasingly isolated. The situation is growing better and better. Yet one must be aware that the super-Powers will never abandon their original position of their own accord and that they are bound to continue their repeated trials of strength with the numerous small and medium-sized countries. So long as we maintain high vigilance, strengthen our unity and uphold a just position, we will certainly win victory in the struggle to defend maritime rights and formulate a new law of the sea.

67. The Chinese delegation endorses and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2. We support the proposal for the convening of the next session of the Conference in 1975 at Geneva to discuss the substantive questions relating to the law of the sea. We should welcome the participation of the national liberation movements recognized by the OAU and the League of Arab States in the Conference as observers. At the same time, we should like to reiterate China's consistent position that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam is the authentic representative of the South Vietnamese people and that it should be invited to attend the Conference as a full member.

68. Mr. SCALABRE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation took an active part in the work at Caracas and is ready to do everything that it can at Geneva to produce substantial results. Of course, it is possible that we shall not be able to finish our work in the time allotted for the Conference at Geneva.

69. However, my delegation still has reservations about the advisability of continuing the work, one way or another, after 10 May 1975. What could not be attained in 50 days of negotiations has very little chance of being successful after that, unless we first of all have a certain amount of time for reflection.

70. Like previous speakers, my delegation hopes that there will be some momentum created and that we shall then have the possibility of actually concluding our work. Obviously, we shall not create any obstacles. A decision on this could be taken in the best possible circumstances after the next session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to announce that the Ivory Coast and Yemen have become sponsors of draft resolution A/L.747 and Add.1 and 2.

72. I now put the draft resolution to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none (resolution 3334 (XXIX)).

AGENDA ITEM 12

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

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PARTS I AND II) (A/9886 AND ADD.1)

73. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before we consider the report of the Second Committee [A/9886 and Add.1], I should like to draw the attention of members to an amendment to draft resolution IV in part I of the report, which has been submitted by Argentina, Bahrain, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela [A/L.752].

74. I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, who wishes to introduce the amendment.

75. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I take pleasure in introducing the amendment in document A/L.752 on behalf of Argentina, Bahrain, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. The amendment relates to draft resolution IV in the report of the Second Committee [A/9886, para. 21].

76. This draft resolution was adopted by the Second Committee, and it had been my delegation's intention to submit the amendment to that Committee. However, because we feared that the Second Committee might reject it as a result of the position of certain delegations on the draft resolution as a whole, and in particular operative paragraph 3, and of their attempts to undermine the significance of the draft resolution, we deemed it advisable to postpone introducing the amendment until the item reached the General Assembly.

77. We recognize the importance of this draft resolution and we whole-heartedly support it. We share the anxiety of those countries which seek to overcome the obstacles and difficulties in the way of expanding their transportation and communication facilities and developing their marine resources. My delegation and the other delegations sponsoring this amendment have based themselves on their conviction that all possible assistance must be provided to all countries in need of such assistance, particularly the developing countries. Accordingly, we agreed that such assistance should be extended provided, first, that everybody was included; secondly, that no distinction was made between one developing country and another; and thirdly, that the request would be addressed directly to advanced and developed countries since they are the only ones capable of paying. Some developed countries advocate drawing distinctions between the various developing countries in order to evade their responsibility to extend assistance to the developing

* Resumed from the 2319th meeting.

countries, the resources and riches of which have often been plundered and exploited by developed countries. We consider that only the developed and advanced countries are capable of providing those funds. I need not explain any further.

78. The present text of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution IV is not satisfactory to my delegation since we consider that a distinction has been made which results in two categories of States—that is, the developed countries and the countries capable of paying. That is neither logical nor acceptable. Which countries are capable of paying if not the developed countries? Therefore, there is no need for that repetition. That is the logical and feasible explanation and justification for our proposed amendment [A/L.752]. Accordingly, we should like to submit the following amended text of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution IV to the Assembly for its consideration:

[The speaker continued in English.]

“Urges all Governments, in particular those of the developed countries, within the context of their assistance programmes, to consider extending appropriate financial and technical assistance to developing island countries, especially for the expansion of their transportation and communication facilities and the development of their marine resources.”

We ask that a recorded vote be taken.

[The speaker resumed in Arabic.]

79. Finally, I should like to state formally here on behalf of my delegation and the other delegations submitting this proposed amendment that we are not against the interests of either the developing countries or the developed and advanced countries, but we always seek to serve the interests of the developing countries and their peoples. Our Governments will spare no effort to extend the greatest possible assistance to all the developing countries, particularly the least developed and also the newly established States. We can assure the Assembly that this will be the pattern we shall follow in the future as well.

80. Mr. LASCARRO (Colombia), Rapporteur of the Second Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration the report of the Second Committee on item 12 of the agenda entitled “Report of the Economic and Social Council”. The report of the Committee appears in two parts, in documents A/9886 and A/9886/Add.1, respectively.

81. In connexion with this agenda item the Committee approved 14 draft resolutions and four draft decisions. Of the four draft resolutions in paragraph 21 of part I [A/9886] of the report, draft resolutions II and IV, entitled respectively “Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories” and “Developing island countries”, were adopted after having been put to the vote. Draft resolutions I and III, entitled “Role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries” and “International co-operation to combat desertification”, respectively, were adopted without a vote. Of the 10 draft resolutions in paragraph 58 of part II [A/9886/Add.1], draft resolution VI, entitled “World Population Conference”, was adopted after

having been put to the vote. The remaining draft resolutions, that is, draft resolution I, entitled “Economic, financial and technical assistance to the Government of Guinea-Bissau”, draft resolution II, entitled “Economic, financial and technical assistance to the Territories still under Portuguese domination”, draft resolution III, entitled “Organization of the work of the Economic and Social Council”, draft resolution IV, entitled “Women and development”, draft resolution V, entitled “Special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation”, draft resolution VII, entitled “Research on the interrelationships between population, resources, environment and development”, draft resolution VIII, entitled “Agreement between the United Nations and the World Intellectual Property Organization”, draft resolution IX, entitled “Reform of the international monetary system”, and draft resolution X, entitled “World Food Conference”, were adopted without a vote. I need not add that the consensus achieved on these draft resolutions relating to vital questions faced by the world community was the result of long unofficial consultations and negotiations and the good will of all delegations.

82. Apart from the draft resolutions presented to the General Assembly for its consideration, the report of the Committee also recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of four draft decisions, I to IV, adopted by the Committee without a vote. They appear in paragraph 59 of part II of the Committee’s report.

83. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom): I should like to speak on the amendment that has just been introduced [A/L.752] and explain the position of my delegation.

84. Draft resolution IV in document A/9886, on the position of developing island countries, to which this amendment refers, is one with which my delegation has great sympathy. We have long associations with many developing island countries and are therefore keen that they should get the help that they need and deserve. For that reason, I regret the amendment that has been introduced this afternoon. I regret it on two grounds. First, we feel that all potential donors should be ready to help in this matter of the developing island countries, and we regret the confining effect of the amendment that was proposed to us just now. Secondly, the draft resolution as it is before us in document A/9886 is the product of long negotiation in the Committee, as the Rapporteur himself has just reminded us; it resulted in a consensus, and I find it very regrettable that now, after all that work, the consensus should be reopened and brought into question. My delegation will have to oppose the amendment despite our sympathy with the draft resolution.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall first hear explanations of vote on the draft resolutions in part I of the report. Then we shall vote on those draft resolutions and hear explanations of vote after the vote. The same procedure will be followed in respect of part II of the report.

86. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any or all of the four draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in part I of its report.

87. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel): I wish to address myself to draft resolution II recommended by the Second Committee in document A/9886 now before the Assembly. It is indeed regrettable that those who have inspired and initiated the draft resolution, and their supporters, have once more involved the Second Committee in highly sensitive political subjects which not only are extraneous to it but have been fully dealt with elsewhere in this Assembly, thus establishing a very negative and unproductive pattern of work for the Second Committee by engaging it in bilateral political disputes. Furthermore, the specific questions referred to in the draft resolution relate to the areas administered by Israel since 1967, and these questions have been fully discussed in the Special Political Committee and in the plenary Assembly. There we have given a very full statement of the factual situation and of our position, and I do not intend to repeat all that.

88. At the twenty-eighth session, a very similar proposal was initiated by the same delegation. Its purpose was clear: by the constant repetition of spurious charges, to try and rewrite history. The draft resolution now before us continues in that vein. It singles out one so-called economic issue, which cannot be divorced from that of the whole complex Middle East problem. The motives behind this draft resolution are essentially political in character. They attempt to attribute to Israel exclusive responsibility for all the consequences of the continuous aggression committed by Arab States against it ever since 1948, ignoring the responsibility of the Arab States which cannot escape the consequences of their own aggression against Israel.

89. As is well known, only a few hours after the proclamation of Israel's independence in 1948, Arab States proclaimed war against Israel and marched their armies across the borders to crush it at birth. The telegrams sent by Arab Governments and by the Secretary-General of the Arab League on 14 May 1948, brazenly informing the Secretary-General of the United Nations of their planned invasion of our country, bear testimony to that fact. I refer to documents S/743,² S/745 and S/748.³

90. For more than 26 years Israel has been subjected to constant aggression and belligerency by Arab Governments in defiance of the United Nations Charter and resolutions. This aggression included economic boycott, blockade of international waterways, armed raids and sabotage, political warfare and terror, designed, in the words of the late President Nasser, to strike the death blow at Israel.

91. The culmination of the Arab aggression was their assault on 6 October 1973, when Egypt and Syria launched a massive premeditated and unprovoked attack against Israel, as fully described in the reports of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and clearly admitted by the President of Egypt and other Arab leaders. In 1967 Israel, embattled and besieged, and in the face of the avowed aggression of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, was compelled to defend itself, and the occupation of the areas administered by Israel since then is the outcome of that situation.

92. The continuation of that occupation is a direct consequence of the refusal of the Arab States since

then to enter into negotiations with Israel to establish a firm and just peace in the area. To refer to Israeli presence in the occupied areas while ignoring that Israel arrived there in the course of a war of Arab making is to pervert fundamental truth. International law and the specific United Nations resolutions have entrusted Israel with the responsibility for the security of the territories and the safety of their population.

93. No amount of fanciful allegations and distorted reports will deter Israel from pursuing its policy of maintaining the law in force in the territories and to conduct its administration in accordance with the relevant rules of international law and binding international conventions, to promote social and economic development, to foster good-neighbourly relations and to maintain options open for future peace negotiations.

94. We reject all the baseless allegations aimed at the creation of confusion and exploitation of fake issues for political purposes.

95. I would also recall that the Special Committee, whose report [A/9817] the proponents of this draft resolution relied on so heavily, was established in an entirely irregular and unconstitutional manner. Furthermore, as our delegation has previously shown in detail when discussing the Special Committee's report, no validity whatsoever can be attached to the findings and conclusions of that Committee. Anyone who carefully scrutinizes its report must reach the unavoidable conclusion that it is based on preconceived ideas, irrelevant assertions, baseless allegations, selective quotations, and so-called findings that have no foundation whatever.

96. With reference to the issue of the so-called exploitation of natural resources, I fully explained our position during the debate in the Second Committee⁴ and I shall reiterate only that it is our view that there is no rule of international law which could have the effect of barring Israel from the use of natural resources available in the area. Israel has acted in complete and absolute accord with international law and practice in this matter.

97. In conclusion, the draft resolution before us is completely uncalled for. It is one-sided and biased. It passes over in utter silence the fact that Israel has endured extremely adverse economic effects as a result of continuing Arab aggression against it since 1948 in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and resolutions. It is based on utterly false legal premises. It seeks to prejudice any forthcoming negotiations and will serve no purpose in the quest for peace in the Middle East.

98. For the reasons presented by my delegation in the Second Committee and here in the General Assembly, we utterly reject the draft resolution and will vote against it.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now vote on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 21 of part I of its report [A/9886].

100. Draft resolution I is entitled "Role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May

I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 3335 (XXIX)).

101. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution II is entitled "Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/9978/Add.1. A separate roll-call vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution. As I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Syrian Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland.

Against: United States of America, Israel.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Sweden.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II was adopted by 97 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.⁵

102. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution II as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic,

Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium.

Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions (resolution 3336 (XXIX)).

103. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution III deals with international co-operation to combat desertification. The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 3337 (XXIX)).

104. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution IV is entitled "Developing island countries". An amendment to that draft resolution has been submitted in document A/L.752. In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, I shall put to the vote first the amendment and then draft resolution IV.

105. We shall now vote on the amendment contained in document A/L.752. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Bolivia, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Finland, Guatemala, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia.

The amendment was adopted by 79 votes to 22, with 29 abstentions.

106. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put to the vote draft resolution IV, as amended.

Draft resolution IV, as amended, was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 3338 (XXIX)).

107. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

108. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): I should like very briefly to explain the vote of the Romanian delegation on draft resolution II, just adopted by the General Assembly.

109. The Romanian Government has repeatedly expressed its resolute position to the effect that the maintenance of the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories following the 1967 conflict constitutes a permanent source of tension in the area. As contemporary facts demonstrate, the security of a State cannot be achieved through territorial acquisitions but rather through renunciation of the use or threat of force and through relations of good will.

110. On the basis of these positions of principle, my delegation voted, as it did at the twenty-eighth session, in favour of the draft resolution on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories.

111. We should like to take this opportunity of reaffirming the resolute position of Romania in regard to the situation in the Middle East. The major interests of the peoples in the region, as well as the interests of peace and international co-operation, require the most urgent withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories, and the guarantee of the right to existence and to development of all sovereign States in the region as well as the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and the creation of an independent Palestinian State.

112. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution II because Egypt is a country against which aggression has been committed and whose territories are occupied. We are all well aware of the fact that Israel was established on the remains of Zionist massacres committed by the terrorist gangs of the

Haganah, Stern, Irgun Tzeva'i Leumi and Palmach, which some of the present and past rulers of Israel boast of having been members of, just as they boast of having participated in the massacres staged by those gangs against Arab civilians, including old men, women and children. We are also all aware of the fact that Israel is perpetuating its aggression against Arab countries and peoples, its occupation of their territories and usurpation of their riches, as well as their human resources. Israel is subjecting the Arab inhabitants to racial discrimination and persecution in a State where citizens are divided into first-class citizens, who are citizens of European origin; second-class citizens, that is, Jews emigrating from eastern countries; and third-class citizens, comprising the Arab inhabitants, who are subjected to the worst kind of persecution and oppression.

113. Members of this General Assembly can refer to the report circulated by the Secretariat of the United Nations in document A/9844, entitled "Israel and South Africa". This report includes facts about Israeli racism and a record of its alliance with the racist régime in South Africa.

114. If we refer to the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Arab Territories [A/9817], we find numerous and repeated examples of Israeli terrorism and persecution of Arab civilians. There is a wide-ranging campaign of daily mass arrests on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza Strip, as mentioned in paragraphs 81 to 107 of the report. There are other paragraphs of the report of the Special Committee concerning the demolition of houses of Arab inhabitants and not permitting the owners to return to their homes. The report cites some examples of Israel's usurpation of the resources of occupied Arab territories and its employment of Arab workers at discriminatory rates far less than those paid to first-class and second-class citizens. Using Israeli sources themselves, paragraph 131 of the report quotes a statement from the *Jerusalem Post* that Israel has usurped \$400 million per year in oil revenues from Egyptian Sinai oil fields.

115. The report also refers to the demolition of the Syrian city of Quneitra. In paragraphs 156 and 157 we read:

"All relevant factors, taken together, created in the Special Committee the certainty that the devastation of Quneitra was predominantly a single and deliberately executed operation, that it was recent and that it took place from the ground, nearly always by the application of heavy equipment and sometimes by the use of explosives. Even a layman without any expert knowledge of ballistics or explosives could say that for the most part the destruction had not been caused either by aerial bombardment or by ground-fire or in the course of hostilities. It was too systematic and orderly to have been the result of the indiscriminate shelling and bombardment which occur in the course of hostilities.

"For those reasons, the Special Committee felt a deep-seated conviction that the total devastation could not but have taken place recently and systematically and prior to the withdrawal of the Israeli forces and that the Israeli occupying authorities were responsible for the devastation of Quneitra.

This constitutes a violation of article 53 of the Fourth Geneva Convention and falls within the scope of article 147 of the same Convention.”*

116. The report referred to the destruction of the Suez Canal cities of Port Said, Ismailia and Suez, where 85 per cent of the buildings were destroyed in the repeated Israeli attacks on densely populated areas including schools, hospitals and Mother and Child Health centres.

117. That is the image of Israeli occupation, terrorism, usurpation and deliberate destruction of the culture and civilization. It is a plundering of riches, a deliberate destruction of cities, and the organization of gangs to massacre Arab civilians, including women and children, such as took place in Beirut, Paris and Oslo, at the hands of the special Israeli forces, a unit belonging to the Israeli armed forces and under the direct control of the Israeli Prime Minister.

118. The substance of the draft resolution just adopted by the General Assembly cannot be considered to be a question outside the competence of the General Assembly; nor can it be considered a question of no concern to the whole international community. Perhaps the Israeli representative would like us to rule that the oppression of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe are matters with which we should not concern ourselves and that those oppressed peoples should be left to solve their problems alone, without assistance from the international community in their struggle against the illegal racist régime of Johannesburg and the régime headed by Ian Smith in Salisbury. For Israel's votes on the problems of those militant and struggling peoples are a clear indication of its close alliance with the racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia—régimes which are resisted and fought by all struggling peoples and countries of the world in solidarity with their struggling, militant brothers in Namibia and Zimbabwe and with the Arab peoples under Israeli occupation.

119. Among the numerous examples of Zionist-Israeli terrorism during a single period, that following the Israeli aggression of June 1967, which is known as the period of the “long-arm policy”, are attacks on the Abuzabal factory near Cairo in February 1970, which led to the deaths of 70 civilian workers and the injury of 98 others; the bombardment of schoolchildren in the Bahr El Baqar school in an agricultural area in the Sharkeya governate on 8 April 1972, which led to the deaths of 46 schoolchildren; and the shooting down of a Libyan civilian aircraft in Egyptian Sinai on 22 February 1973, which resulted in the deaths of 113 innocent passengers and the crew.

120. The period of Zionist-Israeli terrorism and aggression that followed the glorious October war was characterized by hysteria as well as ruthlessness. This is shown by the burning of the bodies of Arabs and Israelis as well, after massacring them and then stepping on their bodies, and the ruthless flogging of Arab schoolchildren, including girls, some of whom were no more than 12 years old—something we have seen on television during the past few weeks.

121. That is the kind of treatment that is inflicted on the Arab inhabitants of the Israeli-occupied terri-

tories. What we have seen on television clearly refutes the allegations and claims made by Israeli leaders to the effect that the inhabitants of those Arab territories enjoy the occupation and are satisfied and content with it. If that is the case, why do the Israeli authorities make daily arrests of children of both sexes, women and old men, without distinction?

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now invite the members of the General Assembly to turn their attention to part II of the report of the Second Committee [A/9886/Add.1]. We shall first take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 58.

123. Draft resolution I relates to economic, financial and technical assistance to the Government of Guinea-Bissau. The Second Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 3339 (XXIX)).

124. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution II concerns economic, financial and technical assistance to the Territories still under Portuguese domination. The second Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 3340 (XXIX)).

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution III concerns the organization of the work of the Economic and Social Council. The Second Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 3341 (XXIX)).

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution IV, entitled “Women and development”, was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 3342 (XXIX)).

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution V relates to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9978. The Second Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 3343 (XXIX)).

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Draft resolution VI relates to the World Population Conference. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9978.

129. I shall now put to the vote draft resolution VI.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 131 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 3344 (XXIX)).

* Quoted in English by the speaker

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to draft resolution VII, which deals with research on the interrelationships between population, resources, environment and development. The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 3345 (XXIX)).

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to draft resolution VIII, entitled "Agreement between the United Nations and the World Intellectual Property Organization". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 3346 (XXIX)).

132. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): With the adoption of that draft resolution, the Agreement between the United Nations and the World Intellectual Property Organization enters into force. The World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO] has thus become the fourteenth specialized agency of the United Nations under Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter. I am happy that the Director-General of WIPO is in our midst and I am sure that the Assembly would wish me to extend to him its best wishes and to express its confidence that our two organizations are beginning what will be a long and fruitful association in the years ahead.

133. The next draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee, draft resolution IX, deals with the reform of the international monetary system. The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 3347 (XXIX)).

134. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We come now to draft resolution X, relating to the World Food Conference. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9978. The Second Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 3348 (XXIX)).

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Under operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of the resolution just adopted the General Assembly has decided to establish a World Food Council whose membership shall consist of 36 members nominated by the Economic and Social Council and elected by the General Assembly. Since the election will take some time, I suggest that we take up that matter after we have completed our consideration of part II of the report of the Second Committee. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

136. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We come now to the draft decisions, numbered I

to IV, recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 59 of part II of its report [A/9886/Add.1].

137. Draft decision I was adopted without a vote by the Second Committee. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision I was adopted.

138. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to draft decision II. The Second Committee adopted that decision without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision II was adopted.

139. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now invite the Assembly to take up draft decision III. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft decision is contained in document A/9978. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision III?

Draft decision III was adopted.

140. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Finally, we take up draft decision IV. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt that draft decision?

Draft decision IV was adopted.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Several representatives have asked to explain their votes after the vote. In order to save time, I suggest that we now proceed to the election of the members of the World Food Council and that we hear explanations of vote while the ballots are being counted. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Assembly agrees with this suggestion.

It was so decided.

142. We shall now therefore proceed to elect the 36 members of the World Food Council. Under paragraph 8 of the resolution that the Assembly has just adopted, the members of the Council are to be nominated by the Economic and Social Council and elected by the General Assembly at its present session.

143. This will be in accordance with the following distribution: nine members to be chosen from among the African States; eight members to be chosen from among the Asian States; seven members to be chosen from among the Latin American States; eight members to be chosen from among the Western Europe and other States; and finally, four members to be chosen from among the socialist States of Eastern Europe.

144. I should like to inform Members of the Assembly that the Economic and Social Council has nominated the following States. Among the African States, the Council has nominated Chad, Egypt, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Togo and Zambia. Among the Asian States, the Council has nominated Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Sri Lanka and Thailand. In this connexion, I should inform the Assembly that Malaysia has withdrawn from the list. Among the Latin American States, the Council has nominated Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela. Among the Western European and other States, the Council has nominated Australia, Canada, France, Germany

(Federal Republic of), Italy, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Among the socialist States of Eastern Europe, the Council has nominated Hungary, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia.

145. The number of States nominated from among the African States, the Western European and other States and the socialist States of Eastern Europe is equal to the number of seats allocated to each of those groups. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to declare those States elected members of the World Food Council?

It was so decided.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since the number of States nominated from among the Asian States and the Latin American States is higher than the number envisaged for each of these groups, we shall have to proceed to an election for these two groups.

147. Ballots indicating the number of States to be elected for each group are being distributed. Only the countries nominated by the Economic and Social Council are eligible for election. I should like to recall that, from among the Latin American States, the Council nominated Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela; and from among the Asian States, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Sri Lanka and Thailand. I have already mentioned that Malaysia has withdrawn from the list.

148. I should like to stress that only the names of these countries should be written on the ballots.

149. In accordance with existing practice, the countries in each group that receive the largest number of votes and not less than the majority required will be declared elected. In the case of a tie for the last place, there will be a restricted ballot, limited to those countries that have obtained an equal number of votes. May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to this procedure?

It was so decided.

150. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I request representatives to use only the ballot papers that are being distributed and to write the names of the countries for which they wish to vote in each group. Ballot papers containing more names than are assigned to that group will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, the following representatives acted as tellers: Group A, Mr. Wright (Canada); group B, Mr. Cato (Ghana).

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): While the tellers are counting the votes, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote on part II of the report of the Second Committee [A/9886/Add.1].

152. Mr. ZAIMI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): By its adoption of the important draft resolution on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation [draft resolution V], the international

community has once more eloquently expressed its firm resolve to see further progress in international economic co-operation and development as well as the establishment of a new international economic order. This resolution is the natural complement to General Assembly resolution 3172 (XXVIII), because it established the calendar for the sessions of the Preparatory Committee and the means of promoting the restructuring of the United Nations system. With regard to the latter, paragraph 5 of the resolution should be interpreted in a timely and appropriate manner so that it can be implemented in accordance with both the spirit and the letter of the resolution.

153. First, by "a small group of high-level experts", we understand that it will be limited to a maximum number of 15. Secondly, the underlying principle for the nomination of members of the group should be the guarantee of their absolute independence in the high mission they will be called upon to discharge. Thirdly, the procedure for their appointment under paragraph 5 should be as follows: the Secretary-General of the United Nations in consultation with the chairmen of the regional groups, and on the basis of geographical distribution, should draw up a list of countries likely to designate experts. Once that list has been drawn up, the countries concerned should be approached to put forward their candidates who, at the final stage, will be appointed by the Secretary-General, who will have been duly informed of their *curricula vitae*. Fourthly, the list should be carefully prepared and circulated among Member States within the established time-limit so that the work of the Preparatory Committee can proceed in the best possible manner.

154. Miss COURSON (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already had an opportunity in the Second Committee to express its views concerning draft resolution IV, entitled "Women and development". It understands the reasons that motivated the sponsors of that draft resolution. It is unquestionable that women in our society do not occupy the place to which their talent, their natural vocation and their natural devotion to the good of the international community entitles them.

155. However, a reading of this draft resolution gives the impression that women as "human resources" are considered rather as the instrument of development than as beings responsible for their own destinies. My delegation does not share that idea of the role of women in our society. That is why we formally proposed to the sponsors in the Second Committee an amendment [A/9886/Add.1, para. 13] aimed at affirming that women should be responsible for their own destinies in order to integrate them into the process of development and to permit them to assume responsibilities that would further their aspirations and allow them to realize their potential. The sponsors did not deem fit to retain that amendment. My delegation regrets that because we are convinced that it is only through realizing their profound aspirations that women will be able to participate fully in development. If that amendment was not adopted in the Second Committee it was because there were very few women there and men have not been responsive to that amendment. My delegation hopes

that it will be taken up again during the Conference of the International Women's Year in 1975.

156. Mr. FERGUSON (United States of America): My delegation, with deep regret, abstained on draft resolution VI, this despite the fact that, as is well known, my delegation and my Government have been committed to the study of world population questions for some time. We regret it very much, but the presence of a single paragraph, operative paragraph 5, in the draft resolution, which reads:

“Stresses that the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action should take full account of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order, and thus contribute to its implementation”.

is the sole reason my delegation abstained. We object to the substance of the paragraph and I must state on behalf of my delegation that we also very much regret the manner in which, procedurally, that paragraph was negotiated.

157. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The result of the voting for the election of members of the World Food Council from Asian States and Latin American States is as follows:

Group A

Number of ballot papers:	135
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	135
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	135
Required majority:	68
Number of votes obtained:	
Bangladesh	120
Pakistan	115
India	114
Iran	110
Indonesia	107
Japan	103
Sri Lanka	94
Iraq	88
Syrian Arab Republic	75
Thailand	67

Group B

Number of ballot papers:	135
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	135
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	135
Required majority:	68
Number of votes obtained:	
Argentina	133
Mexico	127
Venezuela	127
Trinidad and Tobago	125
Colombia	115
Guatemala	108
Cuba	99
Chile	50

Having obtained the required majority, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Chad, Colombia,

Cuba, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia were elected members of the World Food Council.

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Assembly, I wish to congratulate the countries which have been elected members of the World Food Council and I should like to thank the tellers for their assistance in this election.

159. With regard to the terms of office of the members of the Council, paragraph 8 of the resolution provides that the members of the Council shall be elected for a term of three years, “with one third of the members retiring each year”.

160. With reference to the procedure to be followed for choosing among the elected members the 12 members to serve for three years, the 12 members to serve for two years and the 12 members to serve for one year, I should like to inform Members of the Assembly that the procedure of drawing lots has been used in respect of other bodies of the United Nations when a similar choice has had to be made. Therefore, I propose that the Assembly draw lots to select the members to serve terms of three years, two years and one year, respectively.

161. After consultations with the chairmen of the various regional groups, it has been decided to allocate seats as follows: from the nine African States elected, three members will serve for a term of three years, three for two years and three for one year; from the eight Asian States elected, three members will serve for a term of three years, two for two years, and three for one year; from the seven Latin American States elected, two members will serve for a term of three years, three for two years, and two for one year; from the eight Western European and other States elected, three members will serve for a term of three years, two for two years, and three for one year; from the four socialist States of Eastern Europe elected, one member will serve for a term of three years, two for two years, and one for one year. May I take it that the General Assembly accepts that distribution?

It was so decided.

162. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now draw lots.

163. The result of the drawing is as follows: the 12 Member States to serve for a period of three years on the World Food Council are Chad, Egypt, Hungary, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela. The 12 Member States to serve for a period of two years on the Council are Australia, Colombia, Cuba, France, Guatemala, Guinea, India, the Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Pakistan, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Therefore, the following will each serve for a period of one year: Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of),

Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Togo, the United States of America, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

AGENDA ITEM 95

Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (A/9950)

164. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite members of the Assembly to consider the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 95, contained in document A/9950. An amendment has been submitted in document A/L.759.

165. Mr. SANDERS (Guyana), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: I have the honour to submit the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 95. The Committee considered this item during 10 of its meetings and recommends to the General Assembly for adoption the draft resolution in paragraph 15 of the report. This draft resolution provides, among other things, for establishment of a 32-member *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Charter of the United Nations. The aims of the proposed *Ad Hoc* Committee are set out in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

166. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on the representative of Colombia, who wishes to introduce an amendment [A/L.759].

167. Mr. CAICEDO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Sixth Committee has taken a crucially important step in adopting the draft resolution aimed at the consideration of proposals to review the Charter of the United Nations under item 95, now being considered by the plenary Assembly. Colombia wishes to introduce an amendment at this time to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution appearing in the report of the Committee [A/9950]. This amendment would raise from 32 to 42 the number of members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee established by the same paragraph. Colombia hopes, in this way, to respond to the interest that exists in participation in this new body that we are today creating, and in a way that will allow appropriate regional representation.

168. Ever since the establishment of this Organization, voices have been raised in warning, advising periodical revisions of our basic legal instrument. The world had just emerged from the Second World War and its immediate future was neither clear nor easy. The sudden appearance of two great focuses of power incomparably greater than any other Powers in history brought forth the tensions of the cold war and the disadvantages of a planet divided by ideological walls and chasms.

169. The old colonialism came to an end in due course. The winds of independence and freedom stirred up peoples until then regarded as incapable of ruling themselves. In Asia and Africa, the liberation movements revealed themselves as powerful and their ideas were instantly contagious. The political maps of those continents were radically altered, and a similar phenomenon occurred in the Caribbean region, completing the coming-of-age of Latin America.

170. All this occurred in the midst of a great technological and scientific revolution, one of the features of which was that distances were eliminated and contrasting situations placed side by side; the man in the automobile next to the man on the camel, the most efficient industrial societies next to archaic and rudimentary ones.

171. Events occurred at a hitherto unknown speed, and the philosophers and sociologists began to speak of an acceleration of history and to remind us that each of the decades of this century was more filled with events than any single previous century.

172. We who have lived through recent years have seen how in every society, regardless of its political character, fundamental changes have occurred in customs, in labour relations, in the role of women, in the family, and in thought, which has become bolder, more inquisitive, more universal. All this has contributed to rendering more impatient, more pressing and more urgent the need for change in the material and psychological conditions of poor and weak peoples. That broad group of nations known as the third world is nothing but a common awareness of similar limitations, challenges and difficulties that have given rise to a sudden feeling of sympathy and solidarity among nations widely separated and differing in culture, religion and ethnic characteristics. Those who drafted the San Francisco Charter could not foresee the emergence of that great proletariat of nations united by convergent aspirations, nor did they foresee the geopolitical developments through which we are living. In this very year, during the sixth special session of the General Assembly, we have seen this new type of collective aspiration and a different form of dialogue.

173. There is, therefore, a whole series of political phenomena and interrelationships that find no adequate expression in the language of the San Francisco Charter. Furthermore, it is evident that a large number of the founding members of the United Nations have had to adhere many times to the Charter while being well aware of its limitations. They can and should make a great contribution, in such a revision, on the basis of their national character and their genuine aspirations. And all of us, with the experience and in the perspective of these years, can approach that monument of hope, the Charter, with the aim of strengthening its purposes and rendering them more effective in practice. Nothing could be more wrong than to suppose that we are putting something at risk or that we are not being faithful to the spirit of the founders or to the great political accord that that spirit represents. The establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee will direct and bring order to the need for revising the Charter. The same Committee will serve to crystallize all that is lasting and all that needs no modification in the San Francisco achievement, and to enrich it with new elements.

174. What is involved here is not a silent conspiracy of the many against the few, since there does exist a spirit of realism that protects us against the excesses of so-called mechanical majorities. This is indeed a collective, a world-wide proposal, which brings together States both large and small, countries of the most ancient culture and others that have just attained a national identity. In drawing up this draft resolution, countries of the most diverse ethnic and religious

characteristics have joined countries with differing political systems and standards of living. It can never be claimed that this initiative is exclusionary or the work of a closed group, nor that it has the weakness of being of a pronounced regional or ideological origin. It represents the broadest and most popular of the permanent underlying aspirations of our Organization.

175. We are striving to reach the broadest possible agreement by means of give and take and dialogue. Both the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the Secretariat will be entrusted with the mission of conducting a widespread inquiry and gathering together and organizing ideas as to what this Organization should be. Then will come the debates and compromises. It is obvious that in a matter of this nature, we cannot jeopardize a successful final result by hasty decisions and impositions that are completely unrealistic in intention and incapable of being carried out in practice.

176. This Assembly is coming to a close with the debate on the progress of our Organization. We have heard opposing views regarding the role of States in relation to their equal sovereignty and their unequal capabilities and responsibilities; regarding the use of majorities; and regarding the relationship of the United Nations with political and regional entities. In this debate, various representatives have pointed out the relationship that exists between the criticisms levelled against the working of our Organization and the legal means at its disposal, expressing the hope that a new structure will enable us to work better collectively.

177. It is necessary to recognize that any institution that remains rigid in a world of change is going contrary to the laws of dialectic and history. Organizations are living organisms that must renew their component parts and render them adequate to the needs of the day. The United Nations is no exception to this principle, but rather the best example of it.

178. By voting today to adopt this measure, which comes here with the support of such a large majority, the Assembly will be undertaking a noble task: that of remoulding the tradition and the spirit of the founders of the United Nations so that they may better express the urgent needs of the day. This is just the first stage on our path; this is a stage of research, information and collation of ideas.

179. We may perhaps be surprised to find ourselves much closer to each other and to a consensus. I am not claiming to speak only on behalf of my country or of the sponsors of this proposal. I am interpreting, as broadly as possible, the aspirations of all those who will vote. And I approach those who are hesitating or who are opposing this to assure them that we shall reap only positive results from the enterprise that we are undertaking today.

180. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): Now that the Assembly is asked to pronounce itself on the draft resolution concerning the review of the Charter, as recommended by the Sixth Committee, I should like to draw the attention of this Assembly to two dangerous paragraphs in the draft resolution. I shall repeat what I said in the Sixth Committee regarding operative paragraph 3, which reads as follows:

“Invites the Secretary-General to submit to the *Ad Hoc* Committee his views, as appropriate, on

the experience acquired in the application of the provisions of the Charter with regard to the Secretariat.”

181. I think it is not permissible for this Assembly to burden the Secretary-General with such a request. The Charter was written by sovereign States and approved by sovereign States at San Francisco. With all due respect to the office of the Secretary-General, by such a request we are politicizing the Secretariat, which is not permissible.

182. The Secretary-General should not be embroiled or entangled in such a request, and I warn this Assembly that, if the Secretary-General is compelled to fulfil such a request, we will get the Secretary-General and the Secretariat into trouble with the States, which will have to scrutinize any analysis or study he may be called upon to submit. Therefore, the Secretary-General and the Secretariat should be left out of this draft resolution, which is in effect controversial—I need not adduce the arguments that we have given against a sudden review of the Charter.

183. If it is too late to ask the sponsors of that draft resolution to eliminate that paragraph, I request that the Assembly take a separate vote on it and urge even those who have voted for the draft resolution to eliminate operative paragraph 3. Furthermore, what is meant by “as appropriate”? Who is the judge of what is appropriate and what is inappropriate when major Powers and many of us smaller Powers thought that the Charter should not be tampered with? Would they come out and tell us what is appropriate and what is not?

184. The Secretary-General should therefore not be burdened with such a request, and I urge him to stand aloof—because, after all, his office should not be embroiled in political issues, and the review of the Charter is a highly political issue.

185. The other comments that I should like to make concern operative paragraph 4, which reads:

“Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, for the use of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, an analytical paper containing the observations received from Governments and the views expressed at the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth sessions.”

186. Here, again, we are embroiling the Secretary-General by asking him to engage in some analysis of the replies that he may receive from our respective Governments. What about those who do not wish to comment? How would his analysis touch upon the silence of people who think that this question is premature and should not elicit any reply from their Governments—not out of contempt but because they need more time to see whether it is wise to review the Charter, not to mention amending it?

187. Many of us need time. Why are you in such hurry? Tell us; come out with it. If there are special interests, spell them out. We cannot accept that the Secretary-General should be embroiled in an analysis that may make him the target of criticism by some of the representatives who speak on behalf of their sovereign States when it comes to the Charter.

188. Therefore I should like to submit now an amendment, so that if this draft resolution is adopted this paragraph would read as follows:

“Requests the Secretary-General to transmit”
—instead of “prepare”—the observations received from Governments and the views expressed at the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth sessions”

—but not to engage in analysis. We do not want to embroil our beloved Secretary-General, and I hope he will refuse to be embroiled—he has that right—so that his office may not get into trouble. How can the Secretary-General be experienced in this when he is handling so many issues? He has no time to concentrate on whether it is wise or unwise to review the Charter. Therefore he has to delegate powers. To whom? To under-secretaries and to many others. How do we know they have experience of that particular issue? How dare the Assembly embroil the Secretary-General in such a request?

189. I believe that these paragraphs were incorporated in the draft resolution in haste, without any pondering over the dangerous implications. Remember that the Charter was not written by a secretariat but by the representatives of sovereign States, and it should not have been submitted now for review and for amendment, unless sufficient time had been given to every Member State of the United Nations.

190. To recapitulate, I would ask the original sponsors or the protagonists of that draft resolution to delete from it operative paragraph 3. If it is not deleted, I would ask that it be put to a separate vote. Secondly, I formally ask the house kindly to consider amending operative paragraph 4 so that the word “prepare” could be replaced by the word “transmit”, and I think the Under-Secretary-General will read the text as I want it to be amended so that everybody will know what he is voting for when it comes to the vote on operative paragraph 4.

191. Then I would in all fairness draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that it is embarking on a very dangerous course, because there is nothing wrong with the Preamble and the purposes and principles of the Charter, which fill only two or two and a half pages. The rest of the Charter is structural and organizational. If this house is not almost unanimous that something should be done, I think it would be dangerous to vote for a review with the ultimate purpose of amending the Charter unless there is a consensus, as happened with regard to increasing the number of members of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. But there is a temptation to tamper with other matters that are matters of principle. The fault does not lie in the Charter. The fault lies in the Member States of the United Nations, when they manoeuvre, when they rationalize and when they interpret things in their own way in order to save petty national interests or in order to make sure that by coalition they may attain their goals, as has happened on this same subject. This Organization cannot thrive if certain goals are attained by coalition at the expense of the purposes and principles of the Charter and of its Preamble, which lays down the moral code for this Organization.

192. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

193. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union has already had an opportunity, in the Sixth Committee,⁶ to express its attitude of principle to the question of the undesirability of reviewing the United Nations Charter and hence the pointlessness of establishing a committee for that purpose.

194. We continue to consider that the idea of a Charter review in the present situation would be a pointless exercise, dangerous for the United Nations and detrimental to the performance of its main task, the maintenance of international peace and security with the participation of all Member States. This latest campaign for a review of the United Nations Charter, which has been instigated by certain countries in pursuance of their own narrow purposes, can only distract the attention of the world community of States and of the United Nations itself from urgent and genuinely important problems, such as the strengthening of *détente* and its extension to all regions of the world; solving the problems of disarmament and convening a world disarmament conference; reducing military budgets and, first and foremost, those of the great Powers; ensuring the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; producing a settlement in the Middle East; solving the Cyprus question; eliminating racism and *apartheid* in the south of Africa; solving the problems of economic and social development and many other major issues. Attempts to begin a general review of the United Nations Charter may set off a chain of events all the adverse consequences of which it would be difficult to divine at this time.

195. Neither can we pass over the fact that in the front ranks of the noisiest advocates of the review of the Charter, in obvious pursuit of demagogic and hegemonic purposes, we find those who are doing everything possible to impede the easing of international tensions, attempting to undermine all the efforts of the United Nations to strengthen peace and security and bring about disarmament and, consequently, to further development, and so attempting to reverse the process of *détente* and return to the dark times of the cold war.

196. Neither can we agree with the argument that a review of the Charter is supposedly necessary in order to give a hearing to the views of those countries that did not take part in drafting the United Nations Charter in 1945 and to ensure that those views are taken into account. For it is a fact that those countries, having thoroughly studied the Charter, having adopted it without reservations, and having entered the United Nations, have indeed become full-fledged Members of the United Nations and now occupy decisive positions in this Organization, influencing all aspects of United Nations activity. Is it not their voices that may be heard in almost every resolution and is it not they that prepare those draft resolutions, which, for instance, have been adopted at this session of the General Assembly, resolutions on the convening of a world disarmament conference, on the strength-

ening of international security, on all matters relating to disarmament, on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, on the Definition of Aggression, on decolonization, on the struggle against racism and on many other subjects? Is it not through the efforts of the non-aligned countries and thanks to their tremendous contribution that earlier sessions of the General Assembly adopted such fundamental documents, actually drafted on the basis of the Charter, as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and many others?

197. The great strength of the United Nations Charter lies precisely in the fact that its principles and its provisions are interpreted and implemented in the light of the practical work of the United Nations and the realities of contemporary international life, and also in conditions of the practical implementation of the many fundamental documents and declarations of the United Nations which develop and give concrete expression to the principles and provisions of the Charter.

198. This continuing process reflects and gives effect to the positive role of all Member States of the United Nations, great as well as small and medium-sized, both developing and developed, both non-aligned and those belonging to the various blocs, both socialist and capitalist States.

199. The impassioned discussion that has arisen at this twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly between those that now call themselves "the minority" in the United Nations and those that are now called "the majority" is the most convincing testimony of the fact that the United Nations Charter, in its present form, fully ensures the rights and privileges and defends the international political positions and interests of all those countries that were not founders of the United Nations but that joined the Organization and became full-fledged Members in subsequent years.

200. All this is a most striking and convincing confirmation of the undesirability and inappropriateness of embarking on an exercise which is not only pointless, but also dangerous and harmful, namely, a discussion of the review of the United Nations Charter.

201. In putting forward arguments in support of a review of the Charter, the representative of Colombia tried to justify his country's desire to review the Charter by making references to scientific and technical progress. However, he omitted to mention that one of the most important consequences of the scientific and technical revolution has been man's entry into the thermonuclear age. This is not only a boon. It also threatens mankind with thermonuclear catastrophe. Even the representative of Colombia could not deny this. The principal task of the United Nations, therefore, is to strengthen peace and security, to save the present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and from the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. Thus, it would be far more useful for Colombia and all the other countries that want to see a review of the United Nations Charter to focus their attention on the cause of strengthening peace and delivering mankind from the threat of thermonuclear war, to concentrate on problems of disarmament and

development, and not draw the United Nations into something that would be dangerous in the conditions of scientific and technical revolution, namely, the destruction of the United Nations Charter, the very main purpose of which, after all, is to strengthen peace and to save mankind from the threat and disaster of thermonuclear war.

202. The history of the United Nations and of its activities shows that those who oppose the positions and proposals of the socialist countries have found, and continue not infrequently to find, support from those countries that now represent the "majority" in the United Nations. The most striking confirmation of this, as has already been noted, was the discussion of the question of Korea at this session of the General Assembly and the adoption of an unjust resolution on that subject. Those who now complain that they are among the minority in the United Nations succeeded, as they did in the years of the cold war, in enlisting the support of a number of "third-world" countries and imposing a resolution useful for themselves. One cannot but express regret that some of these countries—about 40—that are on the list of third-world countries, sponsored and voted for that unjust resolution, making possible the further maintenance of foreign troops in South Korea under the illegal cover of the United Nations flag, and permitting those troops to continue to be directed against a socialist State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and indeed against all other socialist countries, which for over 20 years have been carrying on a just struggle in the United Nations to combat this particular injustice against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

203. We in the socialist countries draw the only correct conclusion from this, namely, that we can never rely on the objectivity or the just judgement of some countries that now call themselves "non-aligned" or "developing", since they continue in the United Nations to vote together with the developed capitalist countries on questions affecting the vital interests of the socialist countries.

204. Accordingly, as far as we are concerned, in the light of history and the difficulties we experienced in the years of the cold war, anyone who votes for a review of the United Nations Charter is providing grist for the mills of those who try actively to undermine the Charter in the pursuit of their own narrow and selfish interests for purposes of prestige, and to the detriment of the interests of the socialist countries.

205. We are firmly convinced that the efforts of all peace-loving countries, and in particular of the socialist, non-aligned and developing countries, must continue to be directed not towards the destruction of the Charter but towards implementing its high purposes and principles and to the undertaking of joint efforts to implement the fundamental decisions of the United Nations on the basis of the Charter, which is an enduring foundation for the strengthening of international law and which has stood the test of time. It is only in accordance with the Charter that it is possible to establish relations of peace, friendship and co-operation among States with different social systems. The Charter ensures equality and equal rights in the United Nations to the two contemporary social systems—socialism and capitalism. The socialist countries

cannot entrust their fate and their future to the capitalist majority in the United Nations, any more than the capitalist countries intend to entrust their fate and their interest in the United Nations to the socialist countries.

206. That is the wisdom of the Charter, and it is for that reason that it is impossible and unthinkable to destroy it. Anyone who does not intend or does not wish to understand this should give most serious thought to the reality of the world of today and should abandon this quixotic position as regards the Charter. No matter what efforts may be made to play down the importance of the Charter, to declare the Charter an anachronism and to spread doubt about the unshakable nature of its fundamental purposes and principles, it must be clearly and soberly recognized that the way to the attainment of the main purpose of the United Nations, a world free from armaments and war, and the deliverance of succeeding generations from the scourge of war, lies not in scrapping the Charter but rather in unswerving and universal implementation and observance of its fundamental purposes and principles.

207. It is for these considerations of a broad political nature, dictated by the urgent and sincere concern for the United Nations and for the peace and security of all peoples, that the Soviet delegation considers it impossible to support the draft resolution on the review of the United Nations Charter [A/9950, para. 15] and will vote against it in the plenary Assembly, just as it voted against it in the Sixth Committee. There is no need at this point to expatiate on the international, legal and other aspects of the arguments against scrapping the Charter. They were put forward in sufficient detail by the Soviet delegation in the course of the debate on this item in the Sixth Committee.

208. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Nobody in this Assembly will be surprised that France is once again taking a firm stand against the draft resolution submitted to us by the Sixth Committee. We have said and we repeat that any review of the Charter would seem to us to be untimely, dangerous, and I would even say unrealistic.

209. It would be untimely because the very wide measure of agreement, the quasi-unanimity, which alone would justify it does not exist on this matter among the Member States of the United Nations. Certain of them—most of those which participated in the Secretary-General's inquiry⁷—are against the review and believe that, in the flexibility of the present provisions, means can be found of adapting our Organization to our changing world. Among those who support the principle of a review, divergent and often contradictory trends of thought appear on the most important questions.

210. The review would be dangerous because the equilibrium of our Organization cannot be called into question without jeopardizing the structure as a whole: the balance among the Powers, large, medium-sized and small, the balance between the Security Council and the General Assembly; and, finally, the balance within those very bodies. Let us not forget that the structure developed in San Francisco has enabled our Organization to carry out a considerable task already. Nobody will dispute the fact that it has played an

essential role in promoting *détente*, in helping many nations to achieve independence, in assisting the development of the least-favoured nations and in arousing awareness of new economic realities.

211. Finally, the review would be unrealistic if it were to encroach upon the full sovereignty of States, which most of them are not prepared to renounce. The full exercise of that sovereignty is the fundamental principle of the United Nations, and the Organization limits its exercise only in the area of peace and international security. The structure and the competence of the Security Council, the only organ empowered to take decisions in this area, attest to the wisdom of the founders of our Organization. That wisdom has yielded fruit. As it functions at present, the United Nations has been able to face grave crises and put an end to hostilities which could have created the conditions for a world conflict.

212. It is true that the decisions of the Security Council have not all been fully implemented. However, it is useless to think that by amending the provisions on which it is based we could give the Council more authority. If decisions taken with the agreement of the Powers that exercise special responsibilities for the maintenance of peace sometimes meet with obstacles, what would happen to decisions to which those Powers had not subscribed? The problem before us is not to set up new limiting machinery but rather to use all the possibilities provided by the Charter and, by responsible action on the basis of those possibilities, to forge the means for dialogue and co-ordination, which alone can enable an organization of sovereign States to give practical effect to their growing interdependence and their necessary solidarity. In this our Assembly has, through the years, increasingly played a role, in which France wishes to participate. A few days ago I indicated here the constructive spirit in which we propose to exercise our efforts. It is in that direction that we shall be able to make progress, rather than by embarking on an adventure which from the beginning would profoundly divide us.

213. I have already recalled that, in the communiqué issued at the conclusion of the recent talks between President Giscard d'Estaing and Mr. Brezhnev, France reaffirmed its faith in the United Nations. I think it is worth quoting here the terms of that communiqué, published in Paris on 9 December:

"In their devotion to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of which they are both founding Members, France and the Soviet Union confirm the importance of the role entrusted to that Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. They also reaffirm their attachment to the United Nations Charter, whose foundation is universally recognized and just and which retains its full value."

214. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic will vote against the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee [A/9950, para. 15]. Our delegation is deeply convinced that the United Nations Charter, which is the embodiment of the international law of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, continues to provide a response to the dynamics of international

relations. Both the basic principles and the structure of the United Nations correspond to the reality of our time, namely, the fact that States with differing social systems face one another across the international arena.

215. We should also like to recall that the changes in international relations which have taken place since the adoption of the United Nations Charter took place thanks to the Charter and not in spite of it. Accordingly, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic considers that there is no necessity for a review of the United Nations Charter. The Charter is good or bad to the extent that Member States are truly resolved to abide by its purposes and principles.

216. We do not regard the draft resolution as being in any way a procedural one. The very attempt to review the United Nations Charter—and that is what we are talking about; that is what is at issue when, for example, the principle of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council is questioned—could undermine the foundations of the United Nations, destroy confidence in it and do it immeasurable harm.

217. In conclusion, my delegation expresses its confidence that the only real way to strengthen the effectiveness of the Organization lies in taking full advantage of the possibilities offered by the United Nations Charter.

218. Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom): My delegation expressed its views in the Sixth Committee on the proposal which is now embodied in the draft resolution before us.⁸ Nothing that was said in the course of the long discussions on this item in the Sixth Committee and nothing we have heard in our more informal discussions in the corridors and in private consultations has given us any reason to alter those views. My delegation is not unsympathetic to the idea of change as such and we do not have a closed mind to any proposal for a specific change to meet a specific need, if that change would not involve tinkering with the basic structure and basic mode of operation of the United Nations. The road that way is not closed and never has been closed, but we do believe very strongly that the adoption of the draft resolution before us would be committing the United Nations to a very unprofitable course. To the extent that it encourages, as it surely will, the inception of a wide-ranging and wholesale review of all the ideas, good, bad and indifferent, for the amendment of the Charter that have from time to time occurred to one or more Members of this Organization or to one or more factions among the membership, to that extent it will be dangerously divisive and will serve no useful purpose that could not be better served, without any of the attendant risks, if the delegations concerned came forward, after they had first sounded out the membership at large, with well-thought-out and carefully prepared suggestions for specific changes. In short, to the extent that it leads to such a wide-ranging review, the draft resolution is both dangerous and unnecessary and merely distracts our attention from the real problems that face us. To the extent that it encourages some delegations—as I fear it certainly would, whatever protestations to the contrary we may hear today—to press for changes that would indeed alter the basic structure and operating methods of the United Nations

or that would otherwise fail to command the necessary support, it is an exercise in futility that will bring nothing but frustration to those who make the proposals and provide for all of us a fruitful source of dissension and confrontation, instead of the partnership and co-operation that we badly need.

219. One way or another, therefore, this draft resolution seems to my delegation to be unwise and unhelpful and, indeed, potentially very harmful to the United Nations. We made it very clear in the Sixth Committee that that was our assessment, and we therefore voted against the draft resolution in the Committee. As I have said, nothing has happened since to justify our changing that assessment and, in view of the importance of what is involved, it seems to us to be wrong and irresponsible to cast our vote in any other way in the plenary Assembly.

220. For these reasons, my delegation will vote against the adoption of the draft resolution.

221. Mr. FERGUSON (United States of America): My delegation is not able to support this draft resolution. We believe it is not a wise proposal. We have problems with the preambular paragraphs and, indeed, believe we cannot too often reaffirm support for the purposes and principles of the Charter. These, then, should not be the subject of review. We also believe Governments are obliged to consider ways and means of facilitating the more effective functioning of the United Nations.

222. We recognize that the mandate of the proposed *ad hoc* committee permits us to examine ways of strengthening the functioning of the Organization other than by way of changes to the Charter. We recognize further that what is proposed is an *ad hoc* committee with a one-year mandate to make a report to the thirtieth session of the Assembly. We would regard these facts as constructive if we did not regard the basic purpose of the draft resolution as one-sided and even potentially dangerous. It is our belief that the Assembly is unwise to embark on such an exercise at this time.

223. As we have stated on numerous occasions, we are prepared to approach specific broadly based proposals for change with an open mind. We are also prepared to support the continued evolution of the Charter. The Charter has proven a flexible document which has evolved to meet the changing needs of the international community. Where more than evolution has been required and there has been very broad support for particular changes, we have supported them. What we do not support and what we consider potentially dangerous is simply review for review's sake. There are considerable risks in embarking on such a wide-ranging review. One very serious risk is that we could unwittingly decrease confidence in the institution by precipitating ourselves into needless disagreements and confrontations. Another equally serious risk is that pressing for changes before the time is ripe will inevitably force States to take fixed, perhaps even inflexible, public positions. Fixed public positions of this sort can only prove the enemy of the gradual evolutionary change which is the fundamental key to the survival of any basic constitutional document.

224. We believe that the risks have not been adequately considered and that they should be very carefully measured before deciding to review the Charter. In our view, the risks on one side are not balanced by any potential gain from such an exercise.

225. For all of these reasons, my delegation will vote against the establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to review the Charter.

226. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): It appears to my delegation that the only consistent thing these days is inconsistency itself, for otherwise how could one expect that, apart from the apparent and so much proclaimed *détente* in remote parts of the world, one would find the otherwise very sympathetic delegation of the USSR in the same company as the United States and France on the question of the review of the Charter, which in effect is the constitution of this Organization?

227. We accept the Charter as being sacred and so, in fact, do the Christians regard the Bible as sacred. Yet those Christians themselves know that there have been revisions of the Bible, and the representative of the United States knows that the United States Constitution has been revised and amended several times.

228. The Charter is the constitution of this Organization. Another inconsistency appears in the fact that the United States delegation a few days ago informed this Organization of the growing disenchantment with the Organization amongst the United States public and Congress. And yet when a group of delegations says, "Let us re-examine ourselves with a view to seeing what is wrong and what might be causing this disenchantment", we are faced with great opposition.

229. My delegation feels that, in fact, there is something that those who oppose the idea and the concept of a review—not necessarily a revision—have not told the august Assembly. We are told that in one or perhaps more languages there is a difference between the two words. In other languages perhaps "review" and "revision" mean the same thing. Perhaps my delegation would benefit from such explanations, because we should hate to misunderstand some of the very friendly delegations that have co-operated in many other areas—delegations with which we would wish to continue our co-operation—if there is a question either of semantics or just of the definition of words.

230. My delegation feels that if this *Ad Hoc* Committee finds that after a thorough examination there is no need for a revision, it should report accordingly. If, however, as I have had occasion to say elsewhere, after 29 years of existence, even an individual who is not afraid that he might have a cancerous or other malignant tumour is asked to consult a medical doctor, he should have no cause for fear but should willingly submit to an examination. Similarly, I know that there are a number of practices in many Member States where individuals serving in the foreign service, for instance, are submitted to periodic medical examinations. Some have periodic check-ups; some are forced to take leave, including sabbaticals. So, if human beings are subjected to checks of this kind, how much less can be the need for them in the case of a man-made instrument?

231. We recognize the fact that there are instances where there are self-vested interests, but we would be remiss if we did not point out that there have been changes in the past 29 years which the founding fathers of this Organization could not possibly have foreseen, and not to reflect these changes and not to take them into account will only lay this Organization open to continued unwise criticisms and attacks that are not necessarily justified.

232. We therefore strongly support the idea of a review.

233. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 15 of its report [A/9950]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications is before the Assembly in document A/9970.

234. First, we shall take a vote on the amendment submitted by Colombia, which is contained in document A/L.759. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen.

The amendment was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 58 abstentions.

235. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now vote on the amendment proposed by

Saudi Arabia to delete operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iceland, India, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Albania, Argentina, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Dahomey, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

The amendment was rejected by 57 votes to 32, with 45 abstentions.

236. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the other amendment, also submitted by Saudi Arabia, concerning operative paragraph 4.

The amendment was rejected by 57 votes to 34, with 42 abstentions.

237. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Trinidad and Tobago, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia,

Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Abstaining: Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 82 votes to 15, with 36 abstentions (resolution 3349 (XXIX)).

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of China, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

239. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in the report of the Sixth Committee [A/9950]. The decision to establish an *ad hoc* committee on the Charter of the United Nations is an important event of the current session of the General Assembly. The adoption of this draft resolution is an outcome of the firm struggle waged by many small and medium-sized countries against super-Power hegemony.

240. At the recent Sixth Committee meetings, we saw that small and medium-sized countries favoured a review of the United Nations Charter in order that the United Nations may adapt itself to the trend of our time, free itself from super-Power control and apply the principles of equality among all nations, big or small. Their demand is perfectly just. However, the super-Powers have vehemently opposed a review of the Charter in order to continue their power politics in the United Nations.

241. The representative of that super-Power which styles itself "a protector of small countries" has fiercely assailed the third-world countries which favour a review of the Charter both in the Sixth Committee and at the plenary meetings, even slanderously calling them "reactionary forces" and a "Trojan horse" for undermining the United Nations. In their speeches, quite a few representatives of the third-world countries have refuted his accusation and exposed the fact that the purpose of that super-Power in opposing a review of the Charter is to maintain its hegemonic status in the United Nations. The attacks and vilification made by the representative of that super-Power fully show the guilty conscience of the said super-Power, which is devoid of any reasoned argument and has been driven into a hopeless rage on the question of the review of the Charter. The facts have also given a forceful answer to this super-Power: there

are 82 countries which have voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/9950. Heading against the tide of history, the super-Powers will surely suffer ignominious defeat.

242. It should be pointed out that the super-Powers will continue their obstructions and sabotage on the question of the review of the Charter. However, their position is unjust. We are convinced that so long as the numerous small and medium-sized countries persist in unity and struggle, they are sure to realize gradually their legitimate desire to adapt the United Nations to the trend of our time.

243. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Under operative paragraph I of the draft resolution it has just adopted, the General Assembly

"Decides to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on the Charter of the United Nations, consisting of forty-two members to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly with due regard for the principle of equitable geographical distribution."

At a later date I shall communicate to the Assembly the names of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

244. I shall now call in turn on those representatives who have indicated their desire to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

245. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to exercise my right of reply to the statement just made from this rostrum by the Chinese representative.

246. That statement by the representative of China completely confirms the statement made earlier today by the delegation of the Soviet Union here at this rostrum, addressed to the noisiest partisans of the destruction of the Charter. I will recall the terms of that statement. I stated [*para. 195 above*] that we could not pass over the fact that in the front ranks of the noisiest advocates of the review of the Charter, in obvious pursuit of demagogic and hegemonic purposes, we find those who are doing everything possible to impede the easing of international tensions, attempting to undermine all the efforts of the United Nations to strengthen peace and security and bring about disarmament and, consequently, to further development, and so attempting to reverse the process of *détente* and return to the dark times of the cold war.

247. That statement is fully applicable to the position of the Chinese delegation. That position aims first of all at demagogic purposes. It is to the liking of those who wish to review the Charter, but it is a deception for the gullible. In the Sixth Committee, during the discussion of this item, the question was put in more direct form: whether the Chinese delegation was parasitizing on the fact that other permanent members of the Security Council and the genuinely socialist countries would not agree to a review of the Charter.

248. The representative of China tried to impute to one of the super-Powers some allegedly privileged position in the United Nations and in the Security Council. But if he was referring to the Soviet Union, I would point out that the Soviet Union does not have one jot or tittle more privilege as a permanent member

of the Security Council than China. The Soviet Union and China are in exactly the same position. Both the Soviet Union and China are permanent members of the Security Council; they both exercise the so-called right of veto in the Security Council. We use that right of veto to defend the interests of the socialist countries and the developing countries. We have used the veto many times in order to get socialist countries admitted into the United Nations, and we used it successfully. Our veto helped to bring into membership Albania, Bulgaria, Romania and Mongolia, among others. This was a fierce and terrible struggle that went on for many years. They would not let them in because they were socialist countries. The Soviet Union's veto helped to settle this problem. We used the veto on a number of occasions to defend the interests of the developing countries. We have never used the veto for hegemonic purposes, and, accordingly, the statement of the Chinese representative alleging that the delegation of the Soviet Union supposedly uses the veto to serve hegemonic purposes is outright slander and fabrication.

249. If the Chinese representative will come to this rostrum to say that China renounces the right of veto, then I shall be happy to hear it. I challenge the representative of China to come here and declare that China, as a permanent member of the Security Council, supports the review of the Charter and declares officially from this rostrum, before the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, that China waives its right to the veto in the Security Council. I should like to hear that.

250. Mr. DORON (Israel): I wish to refer to two statements made here today by the representatives of Egypt. The statement made this morning [*2322nd meeting, paras. 21-25*] by the Egyptian representative, purportedly in explanation of his delegation's vote on agenda item 38, requires a few observations. He knows very well that there is no aggression by Israel against refugee camps and no design or intention to harm the population of those camps, let alone exterminate it. Israel only takes action against the bases and other installations of the Arab terror organizations, as has been confirmed again and again in the communiqués issued by the terror organizations themselves. Any State would do the same in similar circumstances to protect and defend its citizens from murderous attacks across the border by such organizations. The representative of Egypt knows all this as well as everybody else, but he chose to abuse the occasion of his explanation of vote to embark on yet another speech of vilification and thinly veiled threats against my country.

251. Israel has always held out the hand of peace to the Arab countries, yet Israel has been the subject of Arab, and in particular Egyptian, aggression since 1948.

252. The Egyptian representative mentioned his country's professed desire for peace, but he also mentioned in the same breath the statement of 13 December 1974 made by his Foreign Minister. The absurd and arrogant demand put forward by Egypt's Foreign Minister in that statement cast grave doubts on the sincerity of Egypt's desire for peace. Egypt should be among the very last to claim the right to preach acceptance of resolutions of the United Nations

when Egypt itself has been in constant violation of international law and of the Charter ever since its initial aggression against Israel in 1948.

253. This is the true situation. These are the real facts, and not as they are misrepresented and distorted by Egyptian spokesmen. It is international law and the Charter that count and that matter, and not resolutions adopted under the tyranny of the mechanical majority, which the Arabs can muster at the United Nations and about which some very pertinent observations have been made here quite recently.

254. The statement, also purportedly in explanation of a vote, this time on draft resolution II contained in document A/9886, made by another Egyptian representative this afternoon, contained so many ludicrous and irrelevant allegations that it would take too long at this late hour to deal with each and every one of them. Instead of doing this, I wish to reaffirm the statements made by my delegation in the Special Political Committee and other main Committees of the present session of the General Assembly in which we rejected, refuted and disproved all of these absurdities which have no foundation in either fact or law.

255. The latest statement of the Egyptian delegation today is yet another example of blatant propaganda of the crudest kind, to which it is the wont of that delegation to treat any forum of the United Nations. My delegation once again rejects most emphatically and categorically these unbridled exercises in atrocity propaganda.

256. At the same time, my delegation takes due note of this unabated and unrestrained expression of hostility which permeates every statement of representatives of Egypt in respect of my country.

257. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of Israel seems to believe that members of this august Assembly do not realize the facts of Zionist terrorism and Israeli aggression which are continuing against the Arab people and Arab countries. The delegation of my country does not deny that until very recently, and indeed even until now, some people have overlooked the real fact about Israeli aggression, blinded by their bias against all the countries of the third world or by the incorrect impression resulting from Zionist propaganda to the effect that Israel is considered by them an oppressed and persecuted country which is always in danger. Thus Israel has come to be treated like a spoiled child, allowed to play with the lives of innocent people and to go unpunished for the sole reason that it is a spoiled child.

258. What are the facts that have been overlooked by those who are blinded by their bias? The facts are that Israel was established on the basis of terrorism and continues to be based on terrorism. It was Israel that committed aggression against the countries of the Middle East and introduced terrorism into this area which was the cradle of civilization, peace and worship. I should like to refer to a few incidents from the long record of Israeli acts of aggression, atrocities, and armed attacks against Arab countries, and I shall be giving quotations from the annex to document A/9801, together with brief observations on some of those terrorist acts of aggression.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

259. In 1939, Haganah terrorists blew up the Iraqi oil pipeline near Haifa. Moshe Dayan was one of the participants in the act. This technique was used again in 1947 at least four times. We all know, of course, who Moshe Dayan is.

260. On 6 November 1944, Zionist terrorists of the Stern Gang assassinated the British Minister Resident in the Middle East, Lord Moyne, in Cairo.

261. During the years 1947 and 1948, over 700,000 Palestinian Arabs were uprooted from their homes and land. Since then, they have been denied the right to return or to be given compensation for their property. After their expulsion, the "Israeli forces" razed to the ground 385 Arab villages and towns out of a total of 475.

262. On 9 April 1948, a combined force of Irgun Tzeva'i Leumi and the Stern Gang, supported by the Palmach forces, captured the Arab village of Deir Yassin and killed more than 200 unarmed civilians, including countless women and children. Older men and young women were captured and paraded in chains in the Jewish quarters of Jerusalem. Twenty of the hostages were then shot in the quarry of Gevaat Shaul.

263. On 17 September 1948, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, the United Nations Mediator in Palestine, was assassinated by members of the Stern Gang in the Israeli-controlled sector of Jerusalem. Count Bernadotte's aide, Colonel Serot, was also killed.

264. The assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte was intended, of course, to serve as a message to any objective mediator that he also would be assassinated if he thought of following an objective neutral course such as that followed by Count Bernadotte.

265. Coming now to 1956—on 3 November, the town of Khan Yunis was occupied by Israeli forces; 275 persons were killed. On 12 November 1956, 111 civilians were killed by Israeli forces at Rafah refugee camp.

266. During the June 1967 war Israeli forces deliberately attacked the Indian staff of the United Nations Emergency Force on five occasions, killing 11 and wounding 24.

267. As a result of the June 1967 war, over 400,000 Palestinian Arabs living in Gaza and on the West Bank and over 100,000 Palestinians and Syrians living in the Quneitra area were uprooted from their homes and not allowed to return while the area was under Israeli occupation.

268. On 16 October 1972, Wael Zuaiter, a Palestinian scholar and artist, was gunned down by the Israeli Mosad at his apartment entrance in Rome, Italy. Mosad, of course, is the terrorist arm of the Israeli Government and its terrorist operations are directly under the supervision of the office of the Israeli Prime Minister.

269. On 25 October 1972, Mustafa Awad Zaid was blinded and paralysed in Tripoli and two Libyan passers-by were injured as he opened a letter bomb.

270. On 30 November 1972, Ahmed Awadallah, a Palestinian student leader in Copenhagen, lost his arm when a Mosad-dispatched letter bomb exploded.

271. Between 1967 and 1972, Israeli armed forces, in acts of collective punishment and reprisal, blew up or bulldozed more than 10,000 homes of Arab civilians in Gaza and on the West Bank.

272. On 8 December 1972, Mahmoud Hamshari, a Palestinian leader and intellectual, lost a leg and subsequently died, on 8 January, when an electronically-detonated bomb, installed by the Israeli Mosad, exploded in his house in Paris. Aharon Yariv, the present Israeli Minister of Information, supervised the execution of the operation as he was charged with special Israeli operations directed at the Palestinians.

273. On 6 April 1973, Dr. Bassel Kubaissy, an Iraqi political science professor, was gunned down and killed in a Paris street by the Israeli special forces.

274. On 21 July 1973, Ahmed Bouchiki was gunned down by Israeli agents in Oslo. The Israelis admitted responsibility for this incident, which was followed by a court case. In the proceedings, information was revealed linking the Israeli murderers to the killings of Zuaiter, Hamshari and other Palestinian leaders and intellectuals murdered in Europe.

[The speaker resumed in Arabic.]

275. Israeli Zionist terrorism, which is actually "state terrorism", has gone beyond the Palestinian people and has been extended to neighbouring Arab territories and other Arab countries. It has even been extended to European capitals and towns, as I have already shown. Is this a hand of peace or a hand of terrorism, racism and aggression? What I have referred to is not propaganda but facts that are recorded in United Nations records and registers.

276. I should like to refer also to the use of napalm against Palestinian refugees, and to make special reference to the resolution condemning the use of napalm [resolution 3255 (XXIX)] adopted during the present session of the General Assembly.

277. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China): Judging from the proceedings of the debate on the item on the review of the Charter of the United Nations and the result of the votes on that item both in the Sixth Committee and at this plenary meeting, a great number of small and medium-sized countries consider the review of the Charter a good thing which will help strengthen the role of the United Nations. China firmly supports this just demand. Yet the Soviet representative considers it a bad thing. It can thus be seen that this super-power, which is bent on pushing hegemony in the United Nations, stands in opposition to the small and medium-sized countries as well as to the trend of our time.

278. The Soviet representative has tried by all means to obstruct and sabotage the draft resolution on establishing an *ad hoc* committee on the Charter of the United Nations. Nevertheless, this draft resolution has been adopted by an overwhelming majority. Consequently, flying into a rage, the Soviet representative has fiercely assailed the small and medium-sized

countries and hurled false accusations at the Chinese delegation. However, no amount of sophistry can cover up the naked selfish intent of the Soviet delegation, nor can false accusation and vilification save it from its defeat; on the contrary, they will only reveal the extremely weak position of the Soviet Union on this question and further lay bare its ignominious features of hegemony.

279. We should like to ask the Soviet delegation: "If you really do not have any unsavoury selfish interest, why are you so afraid of a review of the Charter? This is already the third time that we have asked this question. Why have you never dared to answer it?"

280. Mr. NAÇO (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): I apologize for speaking at such a late hour but I must reply to what was said by the representative of the Soviet socio-imperialists regarding the admission of my country to the United Nations. I must make it clear before this Assembly that Albania became a Member of the United Nations thanks to the national liberation struggle it waged against the Fascist and Nazi forces side by side with the anti-fascist coalition. Twenty-eight thousand Albanians fell in that struggle, which is a very high percentage if one takes into account the population of Albania. If Albania did not become a Member at the very outset, as it should have, everybody knows that it was because of the obstacles raised at that time by the imperialist forces. Albania is the only country in Europe that liberated itself with its own forces. Not a single soldier of the anti-fascist coalition came to our country to contribute to the liberation of Albania. Albania was freed by its own forces. It was, therefore, a legitimate right of my country to become a Member of the United Nations, and we did not come here thanks to the assistance of this or that other country.

The meeting rose at 11.40 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (*Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, Documents of the Conference* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), document A/CONF.39/26, annex).

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 66*, 292nd meeting.

³ *Ibid.*, Supplement for May 1948, documents S/745 and S/748.

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Sixth Committee*, 1630th meeting, paras. 27-31.

⁵ The delegation of Honduras subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

⁶ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Sixth Committee*, 1514th meeting, paras. 22-39.

⁷ A/8746 and Corr.1 and Add.1-3 and A/9739.

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Sixth Committee*, 1516th meeting, paras. 23-29.