



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 26: Installation of mechanical means of voting: report of the Secretary-General	1
Agenda item 93: Amendment to Article 22 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (Seat of the Court) and consequential amendments to Articles 23 and 28 Note by the Secretary-General	2
Agenda item 25: Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (<i>continued</i>)	2
Agenda item 24: Special programme of activities in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Tenth Anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (<i>continued</i>)	9

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Philippe (Luxembourg), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 26

Installation of mechanical means of voting: report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The first item to be considered this morning is agenda item 26, on which the Secretary-General has submitted a report [A/7737]. The Fifth Committee has submitted a report [A/7771] on the administrative and financial implications of the proposal contained in the Secretary-General's report. The Assembly also has before it a draft resolution [A/L.578], submitted by Austria, Barbados, Denmark, India and the United Republic of Tanzania.

2. I call upon the representative of Austria, who wishes to introduce the draft resolution.

3. Mr. MATSCH (Austria): On behalf of the sponsors I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/L.578, regarding the installation of mechanical means of voting in one of the main committee rooms. The text of the draft resolution is self-explanatory. It is based on the report of the Secretary-General [A/7737], in which it was suggested that, for technical and financial reasons, the United Nations should develop its own system, a custom-made facility specially designed to meet the particular needs of the

United Nations, incorporating features which have proved to be desirable during the period when mechanical voting equipment was used in the General Assembly Hall.

4. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report [A/7755], has endorsed this plan suggested by the Secretary-General as the most economical and efficient solution to this matter. The report of the Fifth Committee [A/7771] relates to the estimated costs of installing such a system.

5. Since the experimental use of the mechanical voting system in the General Assembly Hall was successful, and since the General Assembly in resolution 1957 (XVIII) of 12 December 1963 has already authorized some preparatory work in one or two committee rooms, the sponsors recommend that the General Assembly should take the action provided for in the draft resolution.

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Austria for the additional explanations that he has given to the General Assembly with regard to draft resolution A/L.578.

7. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has made a careful study of the report of the Secretary-General [A/7737] and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/7755] on the item "Installation of mechanical means of voting", and has some comments to make on the subject.

8. First of all, we wish to express our appreciation of the Secretary-General's decision to use the engineering personnel of the United Nations for developing and installing the Organization's own mechanical voting system. In our opinion, this approach to the solution of the problem is reasonable and correct.

9. At the same time, it seems to us that there has been some haste in submitting estimates and that the request for appropriations for the installation of mechanical voting equipment in one of the main committee rooms is premature.

10. We have reached this conclusion because, as you know, the General Assembly at its twenty-second session merely took note of the report of the Secretary-General,¹ in which it was envisaged that he would proceed with the development of plans for the installation of mechanical voting equipment in one or two main committee rooms. It was further explained that, when those plans were submit-

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 25, document A/6870, para. 5.

ted, the General Assembly would still have to decide whether or not to install such a system in the committee rooms.

11. Accordingly the Soviet delegation considers that the model of a mechanical voting system now being developed should not be tested until the beginning of 1970, and that only then will it be possible to evaluate the efficiency of this voting system.

12. For all these reasons, the Soviet delegation considers that we should defer the adoption of a final decision on this question until the twenty-fifth session.

13. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Members of the General Assembly have heard the proposal just made by the representative of the Soviet Union, namely, that we should postpone a decision on the draft resolution before us. I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether the proposal he made at the end of his statement should be regarded as a formal proposal, on which he would like the General Assembly to take a decision, or merely as a personal suggestion which he wished to put forward and which would affect the vote of the Soviet delegation.

14. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I did not make a formal proposal but an oral suggestion which I wished to put forward at this meeting of the General Assembly.

15. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Then if there are no objections, we shall now vote on draft resolution A/L.578.

The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2519 (XXIV)).

AGENDA ITEM 93

Amendment to Article 22 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (Seat of the Court) and consequential amendments to Articles 23 and 28

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/7793)

16. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The note by the Secretary-General [A/7793] relates to a procedural question concerning the participation of States which are parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice but are not Members of the United Nations in the procedure for amending the Statute. In this connexion, the Security Council has recommended to the General Assembly the adoption of certain provisions which are embodied in the draft resolution contained in annex III to the Secretary-General's note.

17. I would remind representatives that the substantive aspects of item 93 are on the agenda of the Sixth Committee. At present the Assembly is concerned only with the procedural question raised by the Secretary-General in his note.

18. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in annex III to the Secretary-General's note [A/7793].

19. In the absence of any objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly can dispense with a formal vote and adopt this draft resolution unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 2520 (XXIV)).

AGENDA ITEM 25

Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (continued)*

20. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As the Members of the General Assembly are aware, the discussion of this item was concluded at the 1796th plenary meeting on 30 October 1969. At its 1797th plenary meeting on 31 October 1969, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2499 (XXIV) to which, with your permission, I should like to refer.

21. In paragraph 2 of that resolution, the General Assembly decided that the theme of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations should be "Peace, justice and progress". In this connexion, I have the following communication to make to the General Assembly with respect to the commemorative stamps and medallions to be issued for the anniversary celebrations.

22. The Members of the General Assembly will recall that, at the 1797th meeting, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking on behalf of the 37 sponsors of the revised draft resolution [A/L.571/Rev.1 and Add.1], explained that one of the difficulties in amending the theme from "Peace and progress" to "Peace, justice and progress" was the advanced stage already reached by the preparations relating to certain aspects of the anniversary, and particularly to the printing of commemorative stamps and the striking of commemorative medallions. The background of this matter is as follows.

23. At a meeting on 17 February 1969, the Preparatory Committee for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations decided to recommend *inter alia* to the General Assembly that the United Nations and its Member States should issue commemorative postage stamps on the occasion of the anniversary and that the period between 26 June and 24 October 1970 might be regarded as the most suitable time for such issues. The Preparatory Committee also recommended that the theme of the stamps should be "Peace and progress". A few days later, on 28 February 1969, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee wrote to the Director-General of the Universal Postal Union asking him to inform the Governments of States Members of the United Nations, through their national postal authorities, of the text of this recommendation so that they might consider the steps to be taken. A few days afterwards, on

* Resumed from the 1797th meeting.

4 March 1969, the Chairman addressed a note to all the Permanent Representatives of Member States, in which he referred to the above-mentioned recommendation of the Preparatory Committee concerning the issuance of commemorative stamps and expressed the hope that they would bring this matter to the attention of the postal authorities of their respective countries.

24. Representatives are no doubt aware that, in many countries, a good deal of time—often a year or even more—is needed to prepare for the issuance of special commemorative stamps in view of the various technical problems involved, particularly with regard to designing and printing. It was with this in mind and in the hope that as many States as possible would participate in issuing anniversary stamps, that the Preparatory Committee authorized the Secretariat to take the necessary steps to begin the designing and printing of United Nations commemorative stamps immediately. The Preparatory Committee had expected that this recommendation, which—and I wish to emphasize this fact—had been unanimously supported by the members of the Committee, would be endorsed by the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. Similar preliminary steps had been taken in the past with regard to other United Nations commemorative stamps, for example, in 1964 by the Preparatory Committee on the International Co-operation Year, without the slightest objection being raised.

25. It may be presumed that, in many Member States, preparations for the issuance of stamps are well advanced. So far as the United Nations itself is concerned, the commemorative stamps are in the process of being printed, several months having already been devoted to the preparation of designs.

26. In addition, in accordance with the specifications of the Preparatory Committee, the designs for the commemorative medallions were drawn up by the Secretariat and approved by the Preparatory Committee's officers. They are already in the hands of the engravers. If changes now have to be made in the design of the commemorative stamps or medallions, they could not be produced in time for the anniversary.

27. In these circumstances, if there are no objections, the theme "Peace, justice and progress" may be regarded as applicable to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations in general, while the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee may be accepted with regard to the commemorative stamps and medallions.

28. Mr. AYLWIN (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): With all due respect, my delegation cannot but express its surprise at the statement we have just heard. At its 1797th meeting on 31 October 1969, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2499 A (XXIV) on celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. In that resolution it was decided that the theme of the anniversary should be "Peace, justice and progress". What we are now being told means, in plain language, that the resolution will not be implemented as regards stamps and medallions, because the models or designs have already been prepared with a different inscription.

29. We believe that this raises a question which the General Assembly cannot allow to pass without giving some thought to its real implications. Putting aside any considerations of *amour propre* connected with the fact that Chile was among the sponsors of the draft resolution adopted [A/L.570/Rev.1] and without reverting to the undoubted importance and significance of the inclusion of the concept of justice in the motto for the twenty-fifth anniversary, we think it is our duty to draw attention to the gravity of the precedent involved.

30. Is there any authority in the United Nations which is competent to determine that decisions by the General Assembly shall not be implemented in whole or in part? No such authority is contemplated either in the Charter or in the General Assembly's rules of procedure, nor would it be logical for such authority to exist. This being so, once a resolution has been adopted by the General Assembly and as long as it remains in force, the administrative organs of the United Nations have an obligation to implement it in its entirety. If we are to understand that the statement we have just heard from the President entails a proposal to modify a decision adopted by the Assembly, I feel bound to point out that, in the opinion of many Latin American countries, rule 83 of the rules of procedure applies, namely that "When a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides." Since the Assembly has taken no such decision to reopen the debate on this question, it would not be proper for us to pronounce on it.

31. It is my sincere opinion that the argument put forward in this instance is most unfortunate. What reason is given for not implementing a General Assembly resolution? Is there any legal precedent? No. There is merely a *de facto* situation which has come about in an irregular manner.

32. We are told that, before the General Assembly adopted the resolution which determined the theme and motto of the twenty-fifth anniversary, practical steps had been taken to prepare designs for stamps and medallions bearing a different motto. The statement we have just heard has made it very clear that the Preparatory Committee agreed to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt a resolution along certain lines. If that was a recommendation, then obviously, until there was a General Assembly resolution, nobody was legally empowered, on behalf of the United Nations, to begin applying what was a draft resolution awaiting approval.

33. In my view, an argument of this type is not sufficient to persuade the Assembly to acquiesce in the non-implementation of its resolutions. To accept an argument of the kind that has been put to us, invoking material circumstances, the time needed to prepare the designs or models—and, with all due respect, I cannot believe that in these days of advanced technology a year would be needed to prepare the designs and make them available to States in sufficient time for stamps to be printed for next October—would be tantamount to stating that the General Assembly is superfluous, since any organ would only need to confront it with a *fait accompli* for its decisions to become a dead letter.

34. My delegation regrets that this situation has arisen. It does not wish to cause anyone difficulties for any reason, but it feels compelled to state that if this is a democratic organization of States—as indeed it is—and if the resolutions of this General Assembly have any value—as indeed they do—and are not mere scraps of paper, resolution 2499 A (XXIV), which was adopted by the General Assembly on 31 October 1969, must be carried out *in toto*. We regard this as a question of principle.

35. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil wishes to give its full, unqualified support to the words that have just been spoken by the head of the delegation of Chile.

36. The delegation of Brazil cannot allow to pass unnoticed the fact that we have before us an anomalous situation. We are in effect being told that a resolution of the General Assembly cannot be implemented because the Secretariat could not anticipate that the General Assembly would make a decision inconsonant with its provisions and assumptions. In other words, the whole difficulty stems from the fact that the General Assembly did not confine its action to a rubber-stamp role in this matter. Out of respect for the 126 States represented here, we feel bound to voice our concern regarding a trend which, if allowed to continue, would limit our proceedings to the maintenance of conformity with the assumptions, predictions and anticipations of an administrative body. That is an anomaly which cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed since it implies something that goes far beyond a decision on the insertion of a word on medallions and stamps. What is involved here is the whole important question of respect for the recommendations of the General Assembly.

37. It is obvious to us that any resolution of the General Assembly has to be implemented faithfully and scrupulously, whatever the opinion of the administrative body as to its merits or demerits. Furthermore, it is our earnest conviction that if any resolution of the General Assembly calls for reconsideration, a request for such reconsideration should be in accordance with the relevant rule of procedure, specifically rule 83.

38. We are confronted with an important question of principle and, with all due respect, we should be careful not to allow the establishment of an undesirable precedent which would be tantamount to the establishment of a new procedure for reconsideration of decisions of the General Assembly. My delegation therefore cannot contribute by silence or indifference to the establishment of such a precedent or to the acceptance of a *fait accompli*.

39. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation has decided to intervene in connexion with the statement you have just made on some aspects of resolution 2499 A (XXIV) adopted by the General Assembly on 31 October 1969. It is not doing so because it was among the sponsors of the amendment which led to the change in what is now operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. The representative of Chile and Brazil have put the position very clearly and precisely. My delegation too is disquieted by the use of procedures to impair decisions of the General Assembly, thus giving rise to the possibility that resolutions adopted

by this Assembly may not be put into effect and implemented.

40. We have no wish to dwell on the practical aspects of the matter. They are not our main concern. The legal and procedural aspects, however, concern us deeply and my delegation certainly takes the view that in this situation, which would be serious if it were allowed to take the course that has been described and would constitute a very dangerous precedent, any action by the General Assembly should conform to the appropriate rules of procedure.

41. As far as Venezuela is concerned, General Assembly resolution 2499 A (XXIV) remains valid and we are fully convinced that careful consideration should be given to the consequences of suspending the operation of General Assembly decisions by adopting procedures that are not in conformity with the rules of procedure with which the Assembly has equipped itself.

42. It is my delegation's concern over these aspects of the matter that has led it to address the General Assembly and to give firm support to the arguments, opinions and anxiety expressed by the delegations of Chile and Brazil.

43. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In the light of the statement made a few minutes ago by the representative of Chile, I think it is my duty to draw the attention of the General Assembly to one particular point. Reference has been made to rule 83 of the rules of procedure and it has been pointed out that a two-thirds majority is needed for the amendment of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at the same session.

44. In these circumstances, it seems to me useful to remind the Assembly that the provision in question is paragraph 2 of resolution 2499 A (XXIV). I would draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that this paragraph reads as follows:

“The General Assembly,

“... ”

“*Decides* that the theme of the anniversary should be ‘Peace, justice and progress’ and expresses the desire that the year 1970 will mark the beginning of an era of peace”.

45. In the statement made a moment ago, I think that there was absolutely nothing which violates the operative part of resolution 2499 A (XXIV); these provisions will be fully respected. There is only one special problem to which I would draw your attention, a problem which affects not only the United Nations but also a large number of Member States. If the idea of the United Nations and the ideals that we are expected to uphold here are to be disseminated among the public, individual Member States must take the necessary steps in good time. In the present case, a practical problem has unexpectedly arisen because of the material difficulties to which I drew your attention. That is why preparations had to be begun in many Member States. If we change those arrangements now, the issuance of postage stamps may be jeopardized in a number of Member States.

46. Consequently, I hesitate to bow to the arguments put forward by the representatives of Chile, Brazil and Venezuela, without first consulting the General Assembly and, in my capacity as President, I should like to ask Members of the Assembly to decide whether we should follow the suggestion made by the three representatives who have spoken and whether, consequently, we should request the Secretariat to adhere strictly to the motto specified in resolution 2499 A (XXIV) in respect of stamps and medallions, or whether the Assembly would prefer to follow the practical suggestion that I had the honour to submit to you just now in my introductory statement.

47. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the phraseology which has been adopted for use on medallions and stamps in connexion with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. From the President's statement it appears that there was a consensus that "peace, justice and progress", which are a few of the symbols of the United Nations, should be adopted as the theme. On the other hand, it seems that the word "justice" has been dropped by some. I do not know what the motive was for dropping the word "justice", even though it appears time and again in the Charter of the United Nations. Even in the Covenant of the League of Nations "justice" was the primary objective of that international organization.

48. The reason for the omission may be economy of space, or a matter of design, I do not know, or someone may have desired alliteration: "peace and progress"—two Ps. We are not dealing in the United Nations with rhetoric or with diction or with form but with substance, although we cannot altogether discard style.

49. It may be—and I am thinking aloud—that the word "justice" should be presented by another symbolic design, with "peace and progress" having priority over "justice".

50. I submit that we shall detract from the over-all symbolism that should be emphasized if we omit the word "justice". I shall now give you precise reasons why I think the word "justice" should be included.

51. Let me take first the word "peace". There is the peace—to go to extremes—of the grave. That is peace. There could be the peace of idleness, without rebellion. There is also the peace that is imposed on a people when it cannot achieve what it wants and some Power ensures that it has peace—by imposition. For example, there was peace for a century in the colonial Territories because the administering Powers knew how to lord it over the peoples and did not enlighten them about their right to self-determination. So there was peace. But what sort of peace? Do we want the peace of the grave? We are an Organization that should be alive. We do not want the peace of the grave. Do we want the peace of the erstwhile colonial peoples that did not know how to achieve their independence? No, we do not want that kind of peace.

52. In my part of the world, the region which gave the world three monotheistic religions, we have an invocation about peace to the dead: may God rest his soul in peace. That is not the peace we are seeking because we are very much alive.

53. I mentioned the peace of the ignorant who did not know what their rights were. We do not want that type of peace. There is still another type of peace to which I referred—the peace of those who can no longer resist. We do not want that type of peace. Therefore the use of the word "justice" is imperative as an adjunct to peace, so that it may fortify peace, so that it may give significance to peace, so that it may make peace dynamic rather than a dead letter, and so that peace may become not a fetish on a medallion or a stamp, not a mere symbol, but something to which the whole world may aspire, while we are still on this planet and not in the hereafter. Peace without justice is meaningless if we are to have real peace on this planet.

54. The word "justice" must also qualify the word "progress", in the sense that there is progress of evil. We know that gangsters in many parts of the world are combining into organizations; they are making progress. We know that amongst the political hierarchy there are demagogues, there are people who are corrupt and still they make progress. Instead of making progress with budgets of, say, 100 million of any currency placed in their trust, those in authority make progress with 20 million and the balance goes to those who want a slice of the pie—of the finances—of their country.

55. What kind of progress is that? That is progress *per se*, as such, devoid of the real significance of progress at which we aim in the United Nations.

56. Then there is the progress of the machine; there is the progress of sophisticated weapons; there is progress of many kinds. But that is not the progress we want. Therefore, justice is like the fulcrum of the scales: in between peace and progress, to give both peace and progress significance in so far as the objectives and the lofty principles of the United Nations are concerned. I repeat that justice is the fulcrum of the scales.

57. I can argue more on this phraseology which should appear as it was conceived, namely, "Peace, justice and progress". But I think that if I have not yet made my point, and if some of my colleagues have some other interpretation than mine I will invite them to convince me that, if it is left to the imagination of those who see the medallion or the stamp or the certificate, this "symbolology" of two words will imply in their minds that justice is meant.

58. Peace loses its character if it is not tempered with justice as well as mercy and compassion. But justice in the United Nations takes into account a reference to fundamental freedoms, fundamental human rights; it takes into account that aggression does not pay and should not be the order of the day; it takes into account a score of things which I need not enumerate, because my enumeration would not be exhaustive.

59. Then I come to progress. As I mentioned we live nowadays in a world where progress in the field of evil is on the increase, and to be apolitical and amoral I would say that there is the progress of technology which sometimes dehumanizes human beings. We are becoming chiphers and, in a word, we are losing our personality. But when one uses the word "justice" that takes into account individual rights. It creates a balance; it gives animation to peace and to

progress. And, therefore, pending any other remarks to the contrary, I reserve my right to take the floor and argue with any of my colleagues who thinks that the words “peace and progress” would be adequate.

60. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Mr. President, with all due respect, and referring to your latest suggestion, I cannot see how it is possible to put to the vote the question whether or not we should comply with a resolution of the General Assembly. It would be a rather shocking vote whether the result was negative or affirmative. Such a vote would, in our opinion, be void of any real meaning. It is obvious that the normal assumption for all of us should be that General Assembly resolutions are respected by all and particularly by the Secretariat, and that if any Member wishes to have a reconsideration of a resolution of the General Assembly it should move that reconsideration in conformity with the relevant rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

61. We should be prepared to pay a small price for justice and we should be vigilant when what is at stake is the right of self-determination of the General Assembly. Until a formal motion for reconsideration is approved, justice should be with us as a part of the commemorations of the twenty-fifth anniversary.

62. To sum up, and with all due respect, my delegation strongly objects to our taking a vote on whether we should respect or disrespect a resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

63. Mr. AYLWIN (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I apologize to the Assembly for speaking once again but I wish to raise a point of order which largely coincides with the remarks just made by the Brazilian representative. The President tells us that it is not a question of reviewing or amending the decision that the motto should be “Peace, justice and progress” but simply of giving permission for the stamps and medallions for the commemoration—the motto of which is “Peace, justice and progress”—to carry the words “Peace and progress” only.

64. I wonder, therefore, what the theme of a commemoration signifies? What does the motto mean? It is the symbol, the title under which the commemorative celebration is to be held. How is it expressed? In the commemorative medallions and stamps. If the stamps and medallions are not in accord with the theme, this means in practice that the Assembly’s decision is not being implemented or, in other words, that it is being modified. Rule 83 of the General Assembly’s rules of procedure is, however, categorical on the question of amending an Assembly decision. I do not believe that the President is empowered to ask for a vote, as he has done, on whether or not the resolution should be implemented or whether we should authorize something which is tantamount to its non-implementation.

65. If a Member State submits a proposal under rule 83 calling for reconsideration, then, in accordance with the provisions of that rule, the Assembly should vote on the motion. If it is approved by a two-thirds majority, consideration of the item can be reopened. As no motion has been made along those lines, there is nothing to vote on and the decision in force should be fully implemented. That is all I wished to say.

66. Mrs. HAUSER (United States of America): My delegation has listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of Brazil, Chile and Venezuela, and we fully appreciate the serious considerations they have advanced in support of their position. Nevertheless, we support your thesis, Mr. President, that the action proposed by the Secretary-General is required not only for the practical reasons which he has outlined but is also compatible with the resolution adopted by this Assembly [*resolution 2499 A (XXIV)*]. In paragraph 14 of that resolution the Assembly

“Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary facilities for implementing the recommendations contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee”.

Included in the recommendations are those contained in paragraphs 30 and 31 concerning commemorative stamps or medallions, which stipulated that the words “peace and progress” should appear thereon.

67. Those paragraphs were not altered by the adoption of the amended paragraph 2 of resolution 2499 A (XXIV). Paragraph 2 changed the recommendation in paragraph 29 of the report of the Preparatory Committee. In other words, the theme has now become “peace, justice and progress”. We support that theme but we do not believe it necessarily affects consideration of the stamps and medallions and practical considerations require that we move forward on the lines proposed by the Secretary-General. Those who support practicability are not thereby opposed to the theme of justice.

68. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I need hardly emphasize what my colleagues from Brazil and Chile have just told us, but I endorse their reasoning on this question. Mrs. Rita Hauser, the representative of the host country, has endorsed the principle of the three words, but has said that on practical grounds we should use only the two words “peace and progress”. I find myself constrained to take exception to what was said by this charming and intelligent lady, who may perhaps sway some votes because of her charm and intelligence and because she is the representative of the host country. I would beg her to bear with me while I show that practicability is not the only thing we seek in life, outside or inside the United Nations. “Practicability” in this context reminds me of “expediency”—things are done for purposes of expediency. Expediency is a policy that has brought injustice to many countries, not to speak of individuals. Practicability here is synonymous with expediency and we do not want to deal with expediency in this Assembly.

69. I do not want to be misunderstood as being critical of the Preparatory Committee, for after all it has done good work. But, for the benefit of my colleague from the United States, I am going to use American slang: in one word, the Committee “goofed”. We are not going to accept practicability or expediency just because the Preparatory Committee “goofed” on this particular matter. But I must praise it for the patient and consummate efforts it made on the whole question.

70. We are concerned now in particular with the symbolism—or “symbology”, because it is more than symbolism—

of the medallion and the stamp. I cannot be sold the idea that we have not time and that time is of the essence. We have at least six months. There is a human element here. It could be that if the word "justice" were introduced—as I mentioned, it would entail a certain redesigning—the gentleman or the lady or the group of artists who designed the medallion and/or the stamp would be left out. I would suggest that they should not be left out but should be given credit. If they are not available, we should communicate with them and tell them of our ideas. If they cannot participate in the redesigning, we should tender them our thanks for the good work they have done with two words.

71. Towards the end of his statement the President said: "They are already in the hands of the engravers"—meaning the medallion and the stamp. "If changes now have to be made in the design of the commemorative stamps or medallions, they could not be produced in time for the anniversary" [see para. 26 above].

72. I have connexions with private medallion concerns. I think our good friend, Mrs. Rita Hauser, could mobilize the mint of the United States. With her influence in her country she should expedite things and not accept expediency. I for one will donate my services as a servant of this Organization to spend some time early next month in lining up mints. The Franklin Mint sends me a silver coin every year. There are other mints. We will tell them to expedite their work and to see that the medallions and the stamps are ready in time. I know several designers, one of whom works in the United Nations. I can plead with him to work with the original designers—if he is not already a member of the group—in order to expedite and co-ordinate the redesigning. I cannot accept the statement that the redesigning will take six months. We are situated in a country that is very efficient, technologically speaking. Is it possible that those who can go the moon twice within a year cannot redesign within a few days or a few weeks? What is this excuse? It is invalid.

73. The Preparatory Committee received its mandate from the General Assembly, and the final decision resides in us. We—and not a subsidiary Committee—are the masters of our own house. With all due respect to the Preparatory Committee for everything that it has done in other fields on this question of the anniversary, I think it has made the mistake of acting somewhat arbitrarily.

74. We do not know who it was in the Preparatory Committee that made the decision. I should like to question the Committee about that, if this Assembly does not adopt a decision to have the stamp and the medallion redesigned—something which I believe most of us would like to see done. Giving a mandate to a subsidiary body of the General Assembly does not make the decision of that body sacrosanct. Even the General Committee, which deals with our agenda, is subject to the decisions of the General Assembly.

75. It is for practical purposes that the General Assembly delegates powers to the General Committee or any other subsidiary body and gives it certain mandates; but those mandates are not final, and we stand on our authority as the final judges in our collectivity, by way of vote. I do not want to hear anything about a two thirds majority; this is

not a question of peace and war; this is not a resolution that has to do with essentials of peace or progress. It is a question of style; it is a question of inserting the fulcrum of the scales: justice.

76. Perhaps I have not yet convinced my good friend Mrs. Hauser, the representative of the United States, who very skilfully did not refer to what I said but referred to her Latin American friends. I should not like to cross swords with her, but to play another game of argument: either she convinces me or I convince her. And I say to the representatives here: this is not a question of regionalism; it is a question of seeing that we uphold the decision of the General Assembly and are not cowed by any preparatory committee—with all due respect to its members.

77. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Members of the Assembly have listened with great attention to the various arguments put forward and to the statements made. I think the time has come to ask the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs whether he has any additional explanations to give us. I give him the floor.

78. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): I should like to take this occasion to reply to some of the points made this morning. I do not believe that any question of reconsideration of a decision of the General Assembly is involved here. There was no proposal in your statement this morning, Mr. President, that the word "justice" should be deleted from paragraph 2 of resolution 2499 A (XXIV). On the contrary, you stressed that the general theme of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations would be "peace, justice and progress", exactly as had been decided in the resolution. Your statement merely informed the Assembly that for practical reasons—and there are indeed practical reasons—the stamps and medallions would bear the words "peace and progress".

79. I would stress that this is not a whim of the Secretariat. The preparation of stamps and medallions was undertaken on the instructions of the Preparatory Committee, acting unanimously. No Member State objected when that Committee asked each State to issue stamps bearing the words "peace and progress"; no Member State made any other suggestion. If the stamps and medallions are now to be changed, the practical result, in all probability, will be that there will be no stamps and medallions. Certainly, far fewer States will be able to issue stamps if they now have to redesign them.

80. I want to refer to one other difficulty. Representatives have said "it is a question of just one word", but in five languages one word makes five words on the stamp. Now it is proposed that the whole stamp be changed, that there should be a new inscription. Thus the expenditure already incurred by the United Nations and Member States will have been in vain if these changes are made and added expense will be incurred.

81. To recapitulate, representatives have not been asked to reconsider any decision but only to take into account the fact that for practical reasons there will be only partial implementation of the resolution. It is not a matter of

changing the principle. It is simply that for practical reasons Members will have to decide either not to have the stamps or to have them with the two words and not the three words. Members may be sure that the Secretariat will do its best to implement the resolution in its present wording, but it may not be possible to do so in view of the present situation. That is the technical advice we have received.

82. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I think that this clarifies the question and that it is unnecessary for us to dwell upon it further. I assume that the Assembly will agree, therefore, to pass on to the next item on our agenda.

83. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Point of order.

84. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Point of order.

85. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the Brazilian representative on a point of order.

86. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President:—

87. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): I should be very glad to yield to the representative of Saudi Arabia, who, I believe, asked to speak on a point of order before I did.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have called upon the representative of Brazil and on no one else in the hall.

89. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Before we proceed to another item, I should like to request a clarification from you, Mr. President. I should like to know what decision has been made and what the present situation is. In other words, if we proceed to another item without taking any decision for reconsideration, it is my understanding—and the only understanding I can have—that the General Assembly resolution will be respected and that the word “justice” will be included in all medallions and all stamps commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary. My opinion was not changed at all by the statement—I think it was a statement rather than a clarification—made by the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Stavropoulos.

90. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

91. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): First of all, if I spoke from the floor without having been recognized by the President, it was because my request to speak on a point of order had not been granted, and I wanted to yield my turn to my brother and colleague from Brazil.

92. I am sitting in the middle of this hall today. At the nineteenth session, none other than my friend and colleague Ambassador Budo, who was sitting in the fourth row, stood up and asked to speak on a point of order, and was not recognized by the President of the General Assembly. That was irregular. I do not say that you acted in an irregular way, Mr. President, nor do I want to criticize my good friend the Under-Secretary-General; but if I am not recognized—and the representative of Brazil has admitted that my request to speak on a point of order preceded his—I have the right to stand up and protest.

93. Excuse me, Mr. President. There is no personal ill-feeling towards either you or the Under-Secretary-General, but I stand on my rights, not because I represent a small State but because I have a right like any other representative here, and if I do not make such remarks somebody may violate our rights not only as representatives of States but as individuals.

94. I listened very carefully to the statement of the Under-Secretary-General. It confronts us with a *fait accompli*. The Secretary-General has the honour to be our servant, as we have the honour to be the servants of our respective Governments. The Secretary-General, who has so many duties that he cannot keep tab on every one of them, sometimes has no choice but to delegate certain powers to his colleagues or Under-Secretaries-General. We are not impressed by the argument we have heard to the effect that the Preparatory Committee unanimously recommended that we use only the words “peace and progress”. In this Assembly we will not consent to being confronted with *faits accomplis*. Let there be no medal and no stamp if the Secretariat or the Preparatory Committee want to bungle the project. We will not accept the words “peace and progress” without the word “justice”. I may recommend to Governments to forgo their designs if they do not have the word “justice” to temper “peace” and “progress”. But it is not as serious as that. I still think we have plenty of time.

95. I will not accept the argument that the principle of justice would be implicit in the medal. By what stretch of the imagination can we accept such an implication? There are other principles and lofty objectives in the Charter. Why should it be the word “justice” that is implied and not another word or another principle? We are dealing here with symbolism, and in the coming decade we are bringing out three ideas about what we all aspire to, namely, peace and progress and justice. If I have not made my point clear with regard to the dryness and the lifelessness of the words “peace and progress” without “justice”, then I have failed in my use of the English language. It is too late for me now to speak in Arabic. I think I have driven my point home that peace and progress without justice are invalid in so far as our aspirations in the coming decade are concerned.

96. Therefore I say with all due respect, Sir, that you cannot tell us that we should take note of this document and move to another item. We have not taken a decision. Are we here a rubber stamp to take note of something with which we do not agree because there was allegedly unanimity—and I have no doubt that there was unanimity—in the Preparatory Committee? The Preparatory Committee is not sacrosanct and its decisions are not final. We would rather fail as an Organization if we are considered to be mere rubber stamps, here just to please certain Member States that like it that way. There are many *faits accomplis* nowadays in the world which are unjust. We have heard the term “*fait accompli*” in many situations in the world, though I am not going to mention where lest we digress into another subject. I appeal to my colleagues to reject the idea of accepting a *fait accompli* by taking note of this document. However, I have a suggestion which may be practicable: that, pending any final decision on this question—and we should take a decision—a committee of three be appointed to see how we can expedite the designing of the medallion and the stamp. This is a

suggestion, not a proposal, but I may make it a proposal, because I am not going to leave this rostrum until the United Nations in its entirety rejects the idea of being considered a rubber stamp.

97. As for the cost, we are always told about the cost. When our good friend, Mr. Stavropoulos, the Under-Secretary-General, told us of the cost, I was thinking that it was as if he were talking in terms of expanding the whole United Nations. Yesterday we saw the beautiful expansion plans—but we will talk about that in the Fifth Committee. Are we building a house here? Anyway the cost could be passed on to those who purchase the stamps and/or the medallions. Therefore, Sir, I request you not to take final note of this document. It would be ill-advised to take note of this document without taking a decision ourselves. I would invite some of my colleagues to submit suggestions to ensure that the proper thing will be done.

98. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have listened carefully to the statements made by the representatives of Brazil and Saudi Arabia. In the light of those statements, I should like to amend the suggestion I made just now and to propose that the General Assembly should take a few days for reflection. We have heard many arguments this morning on one side and on the other. I think we need time to digest them and that it would be wise for us to take the question again at a later meeting before the closure of the session, in other words, towards the middle of December.

99. If I hear no objection to this proposal, I shall assume that it is acceptable to the General Assembly and we shall pass on to the next item of the agenda.

100. I give the floor to the representative of Ecuador on a point of order.

101. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): I thought I heard you say, Mr. President, that we would pass on to the next item on the agenda, namely, item 24. It was also my understanding that it had been decided to postpone the item that was being considered a moment ago and which had given rise to a debate, but not the draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries [A/L.570/Rev.1].

102. In this connexion, and this is the purpose of the point of order I am raising, I should like to refer to rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the second sentence of which states:

“No resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General shall be voted by the General Assembly until the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations.”

103. All that we have so far received from the Fifth Committee is a report referring to the fact that, in the opinion of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary-General had not had time to study the question thoroughly enough to determine whether the objectives of the resolution might

not be attained in a more economical manner. It ends by stating, in its sixth paragraph:

“The Fifth Committee decided to advise the General Assembly that, should the Assembly adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/L.570/Rev.1, the financial implications could be of the order of \$625,000 to \$675,000. At the same time, the Fifth Committee concurred in the observations of the Advisory Committee and agreed that the Secretary-General should be given additional time to consider the question in greater detail.” [A/7739.]

104. Since, under rule 154 of the rules of procedure, it is necessary for the Fifth Committee to submit to the Assembly an estimate of the effect of the expenditure on the budget and since the Fifth Committee has not done so, I do not understand how a vote on this matter can have been proposed.

105. This is one of the many points relating to the original Latin American draft resolution on which an attempt has been made to create confusion. The first time I came to this rostrum [1796th meeting] was to point out that, when the draft resolution was submitted an incorrect cost estimate was put forward, an estimate that, apart from being incorrect, was at variance with the facts, since the costs were estimated at \$1.3 million, as if they had to be covered by this year's budget, although the project was to be carried out over a number of years. After that situation had been put right, another incorrect and unfair estimate was submitted, because the Secretary-General has still not reached any conclusion on the matter.

106. I should like to ask that a serious and respectful approach should be adopted to the Latin American group of countries which has submitted this draft resolution and which, so far, has not received a precise and accurate reply. For the moment, in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, I request that the vote should be postponed until the appropriate report arrives from the Fifth Committee.

107. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Ecuador for his statement and endorse the conclusion which he has just formulated.

108. I think that the Assembly has no objection to this course and we can thus pass on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 24

Special programme of activities in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Tenth Anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*)*

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): At the 1797th plenary meeting on 31 October 1969, the Rapporteur of the Preparatory Committee introduced that

* Resumed from the 1797th meeting.

Committee's report [A/7684]. In this connexion, the Assembly has before it a revised draft resolution [A/L.572/Rev.1] and a report of the Fifth Committee [A/7801] concerning the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution.

110. Mr. RIOS (Panama) (*translated from Spanish*): First of all, my delegation wishes to place on record its gratitude to the Committee for the excellent report contained in document A/7684 concerning the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is for this same reason that we warmly support draft resolution A/L.572/Rev.1.

111. I should now like to make a few brief comments on the item we are discussing. The United Nations has begun the most determined process of decolonization in this century. The legal foundations of this process are to be found in Chapters XI, XII and XIII of the Charter. The records of this world Organization reflect from the very outset concern and action to bring about the independence of territories under foreign domination.

112. Between 1946 and 1960, 34 countries with 775 million inhabitants obtained their independence. Nevertheless, at the present day, colonialism is still a scourge and a disease afflicting many peoples. What is more, the cold war that developed in the United Nations was, to a large extent, centred upon colonialism, though this was due to political reasons rather than to humanitarian considerations or to concern for human rights.

113. On this occasion, it is useful to recall a number of facts, facts involving certain notorious contradictions which should be emphasized. It was the President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Nikita S. Khrushchev, who, in addressing the General Assembly on 23 September 1960 [869th meeting], outlined the key points of resolution 1514 (XV). The memorandum circulated by his delegation² stated that it was necessary to achieve "the complete and final liberation of peoples languishing in colonial bondage" and added that the United Nations should, out of respect for the principles of its own Charter, declare itself "in favour of the immediate and complete elimination of the colonial system in all its forms and manifestations".

114. The Soviet proposal states three sound fundamental principles: first, all peoples subject to any form of colonial bondage should be free to determine their own destinies. The colonial system and the administration of territories in all its forms must be terminated immediately. Secondly, all military bases on foreign soil must be eliminated. I personally think that this would certainly also apply to the armies of occupation which, since the end of the Second World War, have continued to violate the sovereignty of even friendly countries in Europe. Thirdly, all Member States without exception are called upon strictly to observe the principles concerning respect for the territorial integrity of other peoples. It is immoral for a powerful State to make use of its strength to the detriment of weak and defenceless peoples.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4502.*

115. These are the three fundamental principles contained in the Soviet proposal. All of them are principles of justice; they are the basic postulates for a happy world and this would indeed be a happy world were it not for the great Powers, with the proponents of those principles at their head, which have made a bloody mockery of them all.

116. On 28 September 1960, the General Committee of the Assembly recommended that the Soviet proposal should be included in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. The proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions. It gave rise to a draft resolution³ submitted by 43 delegations. Seventy delegations participated in the debate and the final text was adopted on 14 December 1960 by 89 votes to none, with 9 abstentions. It is hardly necessary to state that the Panamanian delegation spoke in favour of the text. The debate began on 28 November and ended with the adoption of the Declaration on 14 December 1960, as I have just said.

117. After this brief historical summary, I now wish to say that my delegation finds it very stimulating to take part in what will undoubtedly be the approval of a programme to extol the merits of, and place renewed emphasis on, a resolution such as General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which is a corner-stone of the work of the United Nations. If we consider the text of this Declaration, we come to the conclusion that it embodies the basic principles for a peaceful, happy world devoted to the search for progress in its most varied forms. We shall examine and comment on some of these principles which are contained in the preamble to the resolution:

"The General Assembly,

" . . .

"Conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples, and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

"Recognizing the passionate yearning for freedom in all dependent peoples and the decisive role of such peoples in the attainment of their independence,

"Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting from the denial of or impediments in the way of the freedom of such peoples, which constitute a serious threat to world peace,

" . . .

"Convinced that all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory,

"Solemnly proclaim the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms

³ *Ibid.*, document A/L.323 and Add.1-6.

and manifestations;"

and the Declaration ends by stating in paragraph 7 that:

"All States shall observe faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all States, and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity."

118. I have cited basic principles from the resolution. They are certainly very fine principles. If put into practice, they would bring about a permanent and lasting peace based on justice and on the respect which men and peoples owe to each other. In our opinion, it is essential that, when the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations is being celebrated, we should exalt and disseminate these basic principles of the Declaration we are considering with deep conviction. We also believe that really effective results would be achieved if the United Nations was sufficiently strong and aggressive to impose the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV), to compel the elimination of *apartheid*, to ensure the granting of independence to Namibia, and to bring about the restoration of the legitimate rights of independence and self-determination to the nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, to these countries whose sovereignty was brutally usurped by the insatiable greed of social imperialism. Let these Baltic peoples be given back their freedom, these peoples whom the British Ambassador, Mr. Ormsby Gore, speaking in the debate on resolution 1514 (XV), described as "exceedingly new colonies" on account of the imperialist conquest to which they had been subjected.

119. Let us apply fully and without restriction the basic principles of resolution 1514 (XV), so that the economic imperialism which drains the wealth of countries lacking the means to exploit their own natural resources is eliminated.

120. Let resolution 1514 (XV) come into full effect so that, once and for all, we can put a brake on headstrong imperialism, which today, under the subterfuge of "limited sovereignty", confronts us with an even more cruel and humiliating form of colonialism. It is no longer traditional colonialism, under which the colonialist admitted he was a colonialist, fulfilled the responsibilities and enjoyed the pleasures of being a colonialist. There was even a king who said that the sun never set on his empire.

121. We are now confronted with a criminal colonialism which rends its garments in a dramatic repudiation of the colonialism of others, while continuing to tighten the chains around the peoples which have had the misfortune of falling into the circle of its friends.

122. Let resolution 1514 (XV) be applied and let all the peoples of Africa, Asia, and America be liberated as is their right, together with those in Europe so that in that continent all States, both of East and West, may enjoy total and complete self-determination; so that the youth of Czechoslovakia will not have to repeat the sublime and supreme sacrifice of Jan Palach.

123. Let us ensure that the people of South Viet-Nam decide for themselves what their own destiny is to be, without the presence of troops from the United States or from North Viet-Nam, and without fear of genocide effected by trained terrorists encouraged from outside. Let it cease to be said, all too rightly, that the well-being and future of the small countries depends on the decisions of the supreme Powers. Now, in the latter half of the twentieth century, they claim to divide the world just as, *mutatis mutandis*, Pope Alexander VI divided the world at the end of the fifteenth century.

124. The foreign interference which prevented pacification in the Middle East, which created the Berlin Wall, the illegal racist régime in Rhodesia, the problems of Belize and of the Islas Malvinas are all forms of colonialism or covert manifestations of colonialism, all equally detestable and, under the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, all to be utterly rejected.

125. Let resolution 1514 (XV) be fulfilled, so that more resources may become available to fight hunger, disease and poverty. Today, the imperialists spend astronomical sums on armaments, some to keep their colonies in subjugation and terror and others to keep their allies and friends in the same condition. If these thousands of millions which are spent today on perpetuating the most varied forms of colonial policies were used to combat poverty and underdevelopment, the world would be a happier place and peace would be more stable. There would be no need for so much talk and so much propaganda about the virtues of a peace which serves only to disguise the most aggressive intentions.

126. My delegation approves the report of the Preparatory Committee [A/7684], and offers its enthusiastic cooperation in the programme of activities which it outlines in order to draw attention to what General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has meant and could mean for the world. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, no task will be of greater importance than the evaluation of what has been achieved with respect to decolonization in 10 years and what still remains to be done.

127. Among the points in the programme which, in our view, should be emphasized, are the following:

(1) Item 5 (Documentation on decolonization). The collection and subsequent study of all this material would make it possible, as the report itself states, to carry out "an analysis of the various aspects and manifestations of colonialism...". Excellent! There would be more arguments ready to hand to combat traditional and defiant colonialism in Angola, Mozambique and Namibia and the disguised colonialism which, in an endeavour to give full protection to its friends, invades them with an impressive warlike array, as has occurred in Santo Domingo and Czechoslovakia, with the difference that, in the second case, the love felt is so great that, in the name of that love, the invading forces have decided to remain, thus outraging a foreign country. The proverb that some loves can kill seems apposite here.

(2) On item 6, we can only say how timely it appears to us. To give widespread publicity to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization is an idea which inspires us and fills us with optimism. I am, of course, thinking of an unvarnished and unadulterated dissemination of information reaching the most remote corners of Member States, so that the naked truth about colonialism, and I mean in all its forms and manifestations, may be known. If, on the other hand, this dissemination is carried out dishonestly in order to subserve the policies of the imperialists, it will be a pitiful waste of time.

128. To conclude, I wish to pay a most sincere tribute to the young States which were created by the work of the United Nations and which so urgently and rightly demand the speediest possible application of the principles of international morality and law contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

129. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Czechoslovakia who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

130. Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): The representative of Panama in the statement he has just made mentioned Czechoslovakia; therefore I consider it necessary, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, to exercise our right of reply.

131. First of all, I should like to emphasize that we consider the Panamanian representative's remarks about Czechoslovakia to be regrettable. The General Assembly knows very well that, in the statement he made during the general debate [*1771st meeting*], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic informed this Assembly that the Czechoslovak Government was categorically opposed to the attempts to internationalize our domestic problems. On that occasion it was pointed out that we were aware that some countries, because of the complex character of our domestic development and because of incorrect information at their disposal, might have taken action against Czechoslovakia which we cannot consider otherwise than as unfriendly.

132. In that statement we likewise expressed our hope that the position of the Czechoslovak Government would be respected. We are gratified to note that it was respected by a great majority of delegations assembled in this hall. Unfortunately, the delegation of Panama is not among them, as we witnessed a short while ago. Its statement cannot contribute to the normal working atmosphere of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, which is confronted by so many serious tasks. Let us hope that that is not the intention of the delegation of Panama.

133. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland): There are few indeed, at least in this hall, who would dare question the historical importance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session in 1960 [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. The overwhelming majority of United Nations Members and the whole of progressive mankind have accepted that Declaration as one of the most important documents elaborated by our Organization. It

reflected the great victorious struggle of the colonial peoples for their national liberation, a struggle which, next to the emergence and consolidation of socialism on our globe, has been a vital component of mankind's march towards progress and social justice in the twentieth century. It was only just for the United Nations to acclaim that historical process and to try to help bring it to its conclusion.

134. My country is proud to be among those who, both in this hall and elsewhere, have been doing their best to contribute to the final liquidation of colonial oppression and to help the peoples fighting against that oppression for freedom and independence.

135. With those goals in mind we also participated in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Tenth Anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. For not only do we consider the Declaration to be a landmark in United Nations history which has to be duly honoured at its tenth anniversary, but we also deem it necessary that that celebration should be marked by new and stronger action by our Organization, for, despite the progress achieved, the tasks we set ourselves in 1960 still remain unfulfilled.

136. Therefore the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee contained in paragraph 2 of its report [*A/7684*] rightly stress the need to elaborate a programme of action, aimed at dealing effectively with the remaining colonial problems, which should be taken by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session. This document also indicates the two main directions in which the United Nations action should proceed: one being assistance to national liberation movements and the other the world-wide mobilization of public opinion and of the international community towards the full implementation of the Declaration. As the Polish delegation sees it, there is wide scope for action by our Organization in either of those directions.

137. We find it very proper, too, that the Preparatory Committee should recommend that the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be the organ entrusted with the preparation of the aforementioned programme of action as well as with the analytical study on the subject of decolonization. We can hardly think of any other United Nations body that would have an equally complete knowledge of the problems of colonialism and an equally direct and continuous contact with those problems. Of course, the suggested co-operation of the Secretary-General in the elaboration of those documents is, in our opinion, essential.

138. Having taken part in the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee, the Polish delegation fully shares the opinions and supports the recommendations contained in the programme of activities in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In our opinion, that programme provides in general a good directive to be followed in further preparatory work on the anniversary during the year that separates us from that date.

139. Poland will spare no effort to participate actively in the preparatory work and to contribute at both the national and international level to the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the historic Declaration on the

Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.