

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**2047th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 29 September 1972,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	
Speech by Mr. Al-Khalifah (Bahrain) . . . . .	1
Speech by Mr. Conombo (Upper Volta) . . . . .	2
Speech by Mr. Agústsson (Iceland) . . . . .	6
Speech by Mr. Mladenov (Bulgaria) . . . . .	9
Speech by Mr. Long Boret (Khmer Republic) . . . . .	13
Reply by the representative of the United Kingdom . . .	16
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda ( <i>continued</i> )	
Second report of the General Committee . . . . .	17

*President:* Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**General debate (*continued*)**

1. Mr. AL-KHALIFAH (Bahrain): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to express to you, Sir, on behalf of the Government of Bahrain, heartfelt congratulations on your election to your high office. I feel confident that you will guide our proceedings in a manner that will enable us to solve the difficult problems that face us at this session.

2. May I extend my thanks, too, to our outgoing President for his patient and wise conduct of the work of the last session, without which our task today would have been more difficult.

3. I should also like to thank our Secretary-General for the zeal and vigilance he has shown in carrying out his duties during the short time that he has been in office, and for the valuable and informative report he has submitted to us on the work of the Organization [*A/8701 and Add.1*].

4. Since Bahrain's admission to the United Nations during the last session, my country has pursued with interest and satisfaction the many useful activities of the Organization and its various organs and bodies in the economic, social, cultural, humanitarian, health and other fields. The advances made by the Organization in harmonizing international co-operation in these various fields through the dispatch of missions, the opening of regional offices or the convening of conferences have facilitated the study of world problems and the communication of technical knowledge and assistance to those who need it most in the developing world. The assistance and succour given to refugees and victims of racial, colonial or military aggres-

sion have reflected the awakening conscience of peace-loving nations and their desire to stamp out from world society the evils of racism, opportunism and exploitation.

5. One of the outstanding achievements of the Organization this year was the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment which was held in Stockholm. My Government attaches great importance to the recommendations of that Conference<sup>1</sup> which, we hope, will gain wide support.

6. The outcome of the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [*UNCTAD*], held at Santiago in April and May 1972, gave rise to disillusionment and disappointment in the ranks of the developing countries, which had hoped that the developed countries would agree to the implementation of convergent measures that would bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. It is a sad fact of international life that millions continue to live below the minimum levels required for decent human existence. The problems of the least developed among the developing countries have become so urgent that they require immediate and effective remedies. Other, advanced, countries must co-operate to make the concept of international development a reality so that the United Nations may fulfil its promise of ensuring a better world for all peoples.

7. The General Assembly has included in its agenda an item on measures to prevent international terrorism, including a study of the underlying causes of acts of violence, which are rooted in misery, frustration, grievance and despair [*item 92*]. This is indeed an important item because, in a sense, it reflects the failure of the United Nations to implement its own resolutions and mete out justice for all. In the United Nations there is still a wide gap between words and deeds, between decisions and enforcement measures, between ideals and reality. It behoves the United Nations, while debating this item, to examine its own record and draw a moral from its own shortcomings. It is not my intention to condone terrorism or acts of violence, which are alien to our history, civilization and culture. But while studying the underlying causes, we should avoid applying double standards and we should not allow this item to be used as a means of undermining liberation movements, challenging basic human rights, or exonerating from blame those States which, by their disregard of political and human rights, have driven some people to despair.

8. Israel, for instance, expelled the people of Palestine from their homeland and seized all their land and wordly

<sup>1</sup> See *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.A.14), chap. II, sect. B.

belongings. It also occupies the territories of three Arab States and commits periodic attacks on Arab countries, during which atrocities are committed against civilian populations and innocent people. Who should be condemned: the perpetrator of those acts or the victim, who may sometimes react by imitating the methods that have been used against his own people.

9. Some may say that the United Nations lacks the physical power to take enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is common knowledge that the Charter envisaged the creation of a world force, and such force would have been established but for the disagreement among the great Powers. But if physical measures are wanting, do we lack other moral and material forces to implement our decisions and ward off any threat to international peace and security? We honestly believe that the United Nations can marshal enough moral and material force to coerce the aggressor and oppressor to return to reason and to abide by the common will of the international community. How can we say that we have done everything we can, when we see in the Middle East that one party—namely, Israel—has been excessively armed to wage short and aggressive wars against neighbouring countries which are Members of the United Nations. It has occupied parts of three Arab countries and replaced the lawful occupants by hastily drawn immigrants from abroad, contrary to the decisions of the United Nations and to the very letter of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. All appeals to the aggressor to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations calling upon it to vacate land illegally occupied and to restore the lawful rights of the dispossessed Arab people of Palestine and extend to them proper humanitarian treatment have been continuously ignored and rejected.

10. Would I be asking much if I requested us to call upon those Powers that unceasingly supply strategic and offensive weapons to the aggressive forces of Israel to help them fulfil their expansionist policies and kill innocent women and children, among their other victims, to reconsider their policy and desist, for the sake of peace and humanity? Or would it be much to request, further, that the United Nations use all available means, including sanctions, as provided for in the Charter to put pressure upon the aggressor to comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and all other resolutions of the United Nations pertaining to the restoration of the rights of the people of Palestine.

11. I think I should ask for your forbearance and indulgence if I happened to have dwelt a little too long on a problem which is of the utmost importance to my country. This does not mean that I am unconcerned with other problems and questions facing us and the world at large. We live on this small planet as one family of nations, and any act of injustice or oppression committed in any part of the world is of concern to us all and should call for our collective action to redress the wrong and suppress the oppressor.

12. Bahrain, therefore, condemns all policies of racism, discrimination and *apartheid* followed by the Government of South Africa and other sectarian and authoritarian régimes, and gives its whole-hearted support to all measures

taken to alleviate the sufferings of the victims of such policies and their eventual liberation from their oppression.

13. We also support all measures taken or to be taken to liberate people who still live under colonial régimes and to assist them to obtain their freedom and exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

14. In pursuit of its policy of peace and prosperity for all nations, the State of Bahrain proclaims its support for the disarmament of the Indian Ocean and the creation of a zone of peace in that area with the agreement of the States concerned. Such a step would tend to eliminate the dangers of war and strengthen world peace and security. We call for similar measures to be extended to all other seas and gulfs where littoral States and lands would be within the reach of destructive naval and aerial forces.

15. In the field of the human environment, my country, as I have already mentioned, participated in the Stockholm Conference, and looked forward to further measures to be taken to develop the study and protection of the human environment, particularly in the interests of smaller countries which lack the technical knowledge and expertise to protect their people and material resources from environmental pollution or contamination.

16. Those are the views of my delegation on some of the problems and questions placed on the agenda of this session. Our stand on other matters and questions before us will be revealed during the coming discussions and proceedings of this session.

17. Mr. CONOMBO (Upper Volta) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is a pleasant duty for me to congratulate you on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Upper Volta on your brilliant election as President of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. You are eminently qualified for the post. There is no doubt that, thanks to the wisdom and experience for which you are known, the work of the present session will be crowned with success. I would assure you that, in the accomplishment of the delicate task that has been entrusted to you, you may fully rely upon the collaboration of my delegation.

18. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Adam Malik, who as President of the twenty-sixth session gave us the benefit of his wisdom and rich experience.

19. I would also address the warmest congratulations of my Government to the new Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who has taken office in an unstable world in which violence and injustice and the disparity in development between States constitute the most urgent threats to the future of our civilization. The United Nations needs men who have faith in it, and Mr. Kurt Waldheim is such a man, as was his predecessor, U Thant, to whom I wish to pay a tribute for his great work as Secretary-General of this Organization for a whole decade.

20. May I likewise on behalf of my delegation pay a tribute to the memory of the late Paul-Henri Spaak, who

was President of the first session of the General Assembly. He was a great statesman who unceasingly proclaimed his faith in the United Nations.

21. In considering the agenda of the present session, what surprises and astonishes us most is the presence—indeed, I might say the permanent presence—of a large number of items that have already been examined by this Assembly at a number of previous sessions. This state of affairs rapidly leads us to pessimism and to doubt, because what can one truly feel if not a sense of failure in the face of the paucity of practical results obtained by the United Nations over the past few years in its fundamental task of maintaining international peace and security? The trouble-spots that subsist or break out, the injustices born of colonial domination or racial discrimination, the feeling of frustration of peoples who have the painful impression that they have been left out because of the wastage brought about by war, military domination and the arms race—these are the melancholy realities that lead us to pessimism.

22. Upper Volta and a large number of small and medium-sized countries are and always will be available to turn the United Nations into an institution in the service of peace, justice, progress and the freedom of peoples. The experience of the past few years has shown that it is these small countries which the great Powers often for uncharitable or dubious purposes like to designate by the term “irresponsible majority”. It is these small and medium-sized Powers that are the sap of the United Nations. In them can be found the faith and enthusiasm that presided over the birth of our Organization.

23. If today the United Nations has in various circumstances given the impression of an ineffective, even passive, organism, it is because after a quarter of a century of participation in the Organization that enthusiasm has worn off some of its Members, which may be understandable. But what the small Powers such as Upper Volta have difficulty in understanding and accepting is that great Powers are trying to divert the United Nations from its true vocation to the exclusive defence of their own interests.

24. This state of affairs does not, of course, lead us to question the importance or utility of the United Nations, because, apart from the forum it represents for the examination of the problems of our times, this Organization remains invested with a historic responsibility based upon the need to build a world where fruitful relations between human beings and Governments depend on peace, the recognition of fundamental human rights, the freedom of peoples still under colonial domination, and a constant quest for economic and social progress. Of course, the obstacles blocking the attainment of that noble purpose are numerous and sometimes unforeseeable. The composition of this Assembly, which reflects a complex world, is not the least of these.

25. At this session this Assembly will see the confrontation of ideologies and interests. Unanimity will be difficult to achieve on a large number of questions. Nevertheless let us have the courage to rise above ourselves. Let us see to it that the United Nations does not become a synonym for failure, as was the defunct League of Nations. The Charter is an appeal addressed to all the peoples of the

world, asking them to work together in order to build peace and international security.

26. We must acknowledge that at the beginning of this session an analysis of the facts does not allow us to show any optimism. Indeed, throughout the world tragedies are being played out, sowing suffering, mourning and ruin among innocent populations. By an irony of fate violence and injustice take place in the poorest continents.

27. What, then, can one say concerning the persistence of colonial situations in Africa? The General Assembly and the Security Council have had to consider colonialism in Africa for a number of years. Numerous resolutions, and in particular resolution 1514 (XV), on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, have been adopted without the proponents of colonialism yielding on any point. They have refused to abandon positions they have inherited from past systematic exploitation of the African continent. The international order the United Nations defends should not accept this situation. Everything should be set in motion by the world community to eradicate any domination in Africa and elsewhere.

28. In referring to colonialism, it is especially to Portugal that we turn once again. Portugal's will to maintain itself through repression in Angola and Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) makes no sense whatever today. It is erroneous and Utopian for Portugal to believe that it will withstand the struggle for national liberation on which the populations of these countries have embarked.

29. What we find most distressing is that members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] which on numerous occasions have proved their devotion to the sacred principle of the freedom of peoples provide considerable assistance to Portugal, thus making it possible for it to pursue its colonial war.

30. It seems to me that the time has come for Portugal to enter into a healthy discussion with those who have risen in order to recover their freedom and dignity, so as to find solutions to problems which weapons have thus far been unable to solve.

*Mr. Trepczyński (Poland) took the Chair.*

31. To the States which grant their support to Portugal, we say that they are wrong to do so, because this people is clinging to a lost cause: moribund colonialism. From the United Nations, over and above the resolutions, we now ask for concrete action in favour of the liberation movements in colonized Africa because these are proceeding from victory to victory and control vast expanses of their territory which had been under foreign domination.

32. For our part, we affirm once again that we shall not cease to work for the total liberation of the African continent from the colonial yoke, both in the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] and as well as in this Assembly.

33. Now, I come to southern Africa: colonialism and racism constitute a threat to international peace and security in that region.

34. In Rhodesia—we were going to say in Zimbabwe—it is almost seven years since Ian Smith and his band defied the international community and the United Kingdom by deliberately choosing illegality. In the face of the unfortunate ineffectiveness of the international action, still being undertaken by the United Kingdom, the white racists of Rhodesia are gradually giving hatred and racial separation the status of a system, aided in this by South Africa and Portugal. The black population of Rhodesia has clearly manifested its rejection of white domination by turning down the Anglo-Rhodesian “proposals for a settlement” of November 1971.<sup>2</sup> In view of the impasses, the honourable solution for the United Kingdom and for all concerned would consist in convening as soon as possible a national constitutional conference with the participation of the authentic political representatives of the Rhodesian people to resolve together the problems of Rhodesia. As for the international community, it can make a positive contribution to the restoration of legality and justice in Rhodesia by stringently applying the sanctions decided upon by the Security Council; we are aware that unfortunately this is not the case, inasmuch as results show that the sanctions decided on by the Council as far back as June 1968 in its resolution 253 (1968) have been a failure and have thus far been unable to bring down the Ian Smith régime. My country regrets that a super-Power—the United States of America—a permanent member of the Security Council, is setting a bad example by purchasing chrome from Rhodesia.

35. In the case of Namibia, a mission was entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council in its resolution 309 (1972) adopted at its meetings in Addis Ababa in February. That mission has now been extended. My country is not accustomed to passing *a priori* judgement upon the efforts of the Security Council concerning any given situation. Nevertheless, the known facts, in particular the conduct of the policy which is that of the “national homes”, cannot prevent us from having doubts concerning the real desire of South Africa to co-operate with the United Nations.

36. It goes without saying that, independently of the present mission of the Secretary-General—which is one attempt among so many others—the international community must continue and intensify its efforts to help, by appropriate means, the Namibian people to reach independence in unity and in territorial integrity.

37. In South Africa still, human rights continue to be flouted through a system that has been universally condemned, and I am referring to *apartheid*. That doctrine of white supremacy is absurd and we shall condemn it ceaselessly. It is unthinkable that in the midst of the twentieth century individuals should invoke racial supremacy in order to oppress others. Recent history has shown the grave dangers for the peace and the future of mankind inherent in such doctrines. International opinion has condemned *apartheid*. This Assembly has declared that that system is a crime against humanity. The racist authorities of Pretoria have embarked upon a vast campaign

of propaganda in order to rid themselves of their guilt in the face of this unanimous condemnation. The failure of that campaign proves that the policy of racial discrimination practised by South Africa is indefensible. The responsibilities vested in this Organization require of all its Members a responsible attitude towards the problem of *apartheid*; in other words, the acquiescence, nay, the complicity of certain great Powers members of the Security Council with respect to South Africa give the peoples of Africa grounds for concern.

38. Lately, however, there have been some encouraging events in the world. First of all, within this very Organization, the presence of the People's Republic of China is a major step towards the universality prescribed by the Charter. This event is demonstrably a prime mover in the international détente of which the visit of President Nixon to Peking is an example. In Asia we were pleased to note the historic decision taken by the two Koreas in order to bring about the peaceful and independent unification of that country divided, as it has been, for almost a quarter of a century.

39. Furthermore, in Europe the ratification of the treaties between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union and between the Federal Republic and Poland, the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin, pending the conference on European security, are also so many additional elements of international détente. But we cannot overlook the fact that the clash between the ideologies and the ambitions of States in that region led to two world wars, and we must say how encouraged we are by the new atmosphere of détente and co-operation which is emerging there.

40. If all peace-loving nations have seen a glimmer of hope in these events, there are still serious problems facing the international community.

41. In addition to incomplete decolonization, we now have centres of tension and crises, all of which represent particularly dangerous situations throughout the world. For five years the Middle East has attracted the attention of world public opinion. For five years we have heard mention of the peaceful solution; and yet, thus far, no solution for peace has been found. We must state again that it is not realistic to challenge the existence of a State, regardless of which it is, in that region; furthermore the acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible and must be condemned. However, the more time passes, the more difficult the problem becomes to solve; peace must be achieved as soon as possible. Thus, we have always been convinced that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is still a sound basis for the settlement of the conflict. We at the OAU have also tried to make our modest contribution to the implementation of that resolution. Unfortunately, the Committee of African Heads of State, the 10 wise men of Africa, encountered the same obstacles as the Jarring mission, namely, the refusal by one of the parties to accept the terms of resolution 242 (1967).

42. In South-East Asia, the same tragedy is being played out. The populations of Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos are at one and the same time the protagonists and the victims of a tragedy which is beyond their control.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405.



43. We are particularly conscious of Viet-Nam, where an entire generation has known nothing but war and all the miseries in its train. The road to peace is still long, but we must admit that any solution to Viet-Nam must rest on the choice by the people of Viet-Nam of the political system that they desire without foreign pressure or interference.

44. The Indian subcontinent was shaken a year ago by a fratricidal war; it is encouraging to see now that peace has been restored in that region. We pay a tribute to the wisdom of the parties to that conflict which allowed the Simla Agreement of 3 July to be concluded.

45. The building and strengthening of international peace and security are closely linked to the achievement of progress towards general and complete disarmament.

46. This Assembly last year took up eight points relating to disarmament, and that is a good indication of our concern over this problem. But we must admit that a certain discouragement and lassitude has taken over our minds in the light of the meagre practical results obtained in the conferences, documents and statements made. In the meantime, the two super-Powers— and I am thinking here of the United States and the Soviet Union—continued quantitatively and qualitatively to develop and improve formidable weapons, and the smaller countries are perfectly justified in wondering fearfully to what ends these weapons will be put. Hence we welcomed with relief the Agreement for a limitation of the strategic arms race, arrived at in Moscow in May 1972 between the two super-Powers.<sup>3</sup> We should like to believe that that Agreement is the first step in a de-escalation that will banish once and for all the prospects of a nuclear war. We would also hope that the two great Powers will not rest on their laurels but will continue to ponder the question of disarmament because—as we hardly need to remind you—the survival of our civilization is at stake.

47. The survival of our civilization is not only threatened by the arms race but also—and perhaps even more so—by disparities in economic development. In this field, the responsibility for the effort to be made lies first and foremost with the developing countries. Unfortunately, in many sectors this effort is checked by foreign forces which are entirely outside the control of the developing countries. The success of the International Development Strategy lies in the capacity of the poor nations to control these external forces, and the aim of international co-operation is to assist them to achieve that control. We appeal particularly to the wealthy countries, which represent 25 per cent of the world's population but which own 80 per cent of its wealth, to become aware of the role they have to play in the economic future of the developing countries. In this respect, the third session of UNCTAD, held at Santiago in April and May, is the best yardstick for measuring the evolution which has taken place since the second session at New Delhi in 1968. With some chagrin we are forced to recognize that the economic and trade system of the world is far from having undergone the qualitative changes

indispensable to the establishment of a new system which would be more equitable towards the third world, and is thus less likely to assist their efforts towards economic and social development. The third session at Santiago has indeed showed that in trade matters the intention was to reject out of hand the requests of the developing countries for a total liberation of exchanges in their favour, for a share in the market for commodities competing with those of the developed countries and for a price policy through international agreements.

48. The developed countries preferred to refer all these matters to the trade negotiations to be held in 1973 within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [*GATT*], whereas the experience of the Kennedy Round has clearly shown that at that level the main action consists of mutual concessions between the wealthy countries to the detriment of the interests of the third world.

49. Upper Volta remains convinced that as long as an appropriate solution is not found to these questions within UNCTAD, the international community, in particular the developing countries, has no chance of achieving the targets set in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*], because, in fact, the developed countries would continue to take back through trade more than they give through technical and financial assistance and the imbalance of the operation will remain in their favour.

50. To illustrate this bad faith, we only have to mention the lack of agreement on coffee, the uncertainties about a sugar agreement and so on. In this connexion Upper Volta, like its neighbouring countries, was disagreeably surprised one morning in August to note that we had been forced to purchase a kilo of sugar at 110 CFA francs as opposed to 80 CFA francs, which had been the price the day before. Our countries are therefore nothing but pawns in the hands of the financial magnates, and the indignant populations are powerless to stop this exploitation. Such plunder must cease, at all costs.

51. On the financial level, the participation of the third world in seeking solutions to the present monetary crisis seems to be an accepted principle; we are gratified at the recognition—albeit a tardy one—of the need to give the third world a voice in negotiations on a problem which affects it just as much, if not more, than it affects the wealthy countries.

52. With regard to the supply of public and private resources for development, the developing countries have expressed their disquiet at the net reduction of the total volume of capital flow and the failure to reach the target of 1 per cent set by the Strategy. There have been very few actions aimed at improving terms for the granting of aid and, in particular, for “*untying*” aid.

53. Furthermore, the cost of debt servicing has increased very rapidly, thereby decreasing the importing capacity of the developing countries. Upper Volta hopes that UNCTAD will set up an organization to investigate ways and means of lightening the debt load of the developing countries.

54. The connexion between special drawing rights and supplementary financing of development has yet to be

<sup>3</sup> Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Moscow on 26 May 1972.

determined, and the reason for this is the lack of goodwill of the wealthy countries.

55. Concerning the special measures to assist the least developed countries and the additional measures to assist land-locked countries, I think some gratification can be expressed on the results achieved. However, that is but a document that is worth only the value the signatories place on it. In other words, the measures envisaged to assist the less advanced countries have to be implemented for the international community to decide whether it can state objectively that this was one of the rare successes of the meetings at Santiago.

56. We do not need to reiterate our position on the different aspects of these special measures. We have already done so in many forums these past years. The international community in general, and the developed countries and the international institutions in particular have before them a document which is the result of mutual concessions and which is accepted by all. It is now a question of translating these declarations of intention and the acceptance of the resolution into specific and immediate actions.

57. Thus, if after more than 25 years, the United Nations can claim credit for a large number of achievements, this Organization still has serious shortcomings: the persistence of colonial régimes, the bastions of racial discrimination, the fact that many crises are kept out of the United Nations or solved outside it, inequality in economic and social development of peoples—all show that the United Nations have not always or not yet lived up to our hopes. In this connexion we do not believe it fair to blame the Charter and to connect the ineffectiveness of the United Nations with its review. No human undertaking is perfect, and the Charter cannot be an exception to this principle.

58. What stands in the way of our Organization acting in a dynamic and effective way is the lack of will on the part of certain Member States to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs.

59. Upper Volta believes in peace and in the need for international security and we should like to reiterate our confidence in the immense possibilities of this Organization through the concerted action of all its Members. It is true that today the general interest continues more often than not to be subordinated to selfish interests. But we have the duty to rise above all this and to be worthy of the mission which the peoples of the world have entrusted to us, namely, to work towards the achievement of an era of peace, justice and equality among men.

60. Mr. ÁGÚSTSSON (Iceland): Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues who have spoken before me in extending to you my delegation's warmest congratulations upon your election as President of this session of the Assembly.

61. The participation of my delegation in the present general debate will be limited to a discussion of the situation in the waters around Iceland. A dangerous situation exists now in that part of the world which I feel should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly. I shall discuss that situation first specifically and then

in the wider framework of the law of the sea in general, particularly in light of the preparations being made for the forthcoming Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The general implications of this specific case will then be readily realized.

62. Let me first describe the situation in the seas surrounding Iceland.

63. The plain fact is that on 1 September 1972, the fishery limits off Iceland were extended to 50 miles, as I had the honour to announce from this rostrum a year ago [1945th meeting]. For more than a year now efforts have been made to reach a practical solution of the problems with which the trawler industries of the nations most concerned have been faced in this connexion. On that basis an agreement was concluded on 7 September 1972 between Belgium and Iceland, whereby a specific number of Belgian trawlers have been licensed by Iceland to fish until 1 June 1974, during specified periods in certain areas inside the new limits. This is a practical arrangement which, under the circumstances, proved to constitute an acceptable solution of the problems involved. Similar arrangements have been made in the case of fishing vessels from the Faeroe islands.

64. Discussions with the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany are still in progress, but no solution has been found. Only one Member of the United Nations—the United Kingdom—has continued to send fishing vessels inside the limits in violation of Icelandic laws and regulations, and serious incidents have already occurred. These activities are connected with an indication of interim measures of protection, dated 17 August 1972, issued by the International Court of Justice,<sup>4</sup> which purports to authorize British trawlers to catch 170,000 tons of fish annually in the Icelandic area. The United Kingdom has in effect sought to institute proceedings before the Court on the basis of an Exchange of Notes of 1961.<sup>5</sup>

65. The Government of Iceland already, on 31 August 1971, informed the Government of the United Kingdom that it considered the acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction under the 1961 agreement to have achieved its objective and that the agreement was consequently terminated. This view was subsequently confirmed by a unanimous vote of the Parliament of Iceland, the Althing. In order to clarify the position I wish, with your permission, Mr. President, to read to the Assembly the text of the Icelandic aide-mémoire of 31 August 1971, which was transmitted to the Government of the United Kingdom. It reads as follows:

“On 11 March 1961 the Governments of Iceland and the United Kingdom exchanged Notes for the settlement of the fisheries dispute between the two countries, which had its origin in the extension of Iceland's fishery limits effected in 1958. In that Exchange of Notes it was stated:

<sup>4</sup> See *Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v. Iceland)*, *Interim Protection, Order of 17 August 1972*, *I.C.J. Reports 1972*, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> See International Court of Justice, *Application Instituting Proceedings filed in the Registry of the Court on 14 April 1972—Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v. Iceland)*, annex A.

“The Icelandic Government will continue to work for the implementation of the Althing Resolution of 5 May 1959 regarding the extension of fisheries jurisdiction around Iceland, but shall give to the United Kingdom Government six months’ notice of such extension and, in case of a dispute in relation to such extension, the matter shall, at the request of either party, be referred to the International Court of Justice.’

“In the opinion of the Icelandic Government, which is continuing to work for the implementation of the Althing Resolution in the light of increased knowledge and other developments that have occurred since that Exchange of Notes, the object and purpose of the provisions for recourse to judicial settlement of certain matters envisaged in the passage quoted above have been fully achieved. In the period of ten years which has elapsed, the United Kingdom Government enjoyed the benefit of the Icelandic Government’s policy to the effect that further extension of the limits of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction would be placed in abeyance for a reasonable and equitable period. Continuation of that policy by the Icelandic Government, in the light of intervening scientific and economic evolution (including the ever greater threat of increased diversion of highly developed fishing effort to the Icelandic area) has become excessively onerous and unacceptable, and is harmful to the maintenance of the resources of the sea on which the livelihood of the Icelandic people depends.

“In order to strengthen the measures of protection essential to safeguard the vital interests of the Icelandic people in the seas surrounding its coasts, the Government of Iceland now finds it essential to extend further the zone of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction around its coasts to include the areas of sea covering the continental shelf. It is contemplated that the new limits, the precise boundaries of which will be furnished at a later date, will enter into force not later than 1 September 1972.

“Having regard to the foregoing, the Government of Iceland is prepared, on the basis of the discussions which have already taken place in London, that representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Iceland should meet for the purpose of achieving a practical solution of the problems involved.”<sup>6</sup>

66. These arguments were reiterated in an aide-mémoire of 24 February 1972,<sup>7</sup> with which was enclosed a memorandum entitled “Fisheries Jurisdiction in Iceland”, where the considerations which led the Government of Iceland to issue the new regulations were set forth. That memorandum has been distributed to all States Members of the United Nations.

67. On 14 April 1972, the Registrar of the International Court of Justice informed me that an application had been filed by the United Kingdom Government in the Registry of the Court instituting proceedings against Iceland on the basis of the Exchange of Notes of 1961, to which I have already referred.

68. In reply, I requested that a number of documents dealing with the background and termination of the agreement referred to and with the changed circumstances resulting from the ever-increasing exploitation of the fishery resources in the seas surrounding Iceland be brought to the attention of the Court. I stated that the danger which this entails for the Icelandic people necessitates further control by the Government of Iceland, the only coastal State concerned.

69. In my letter to the Court I also stated the views of my Government with regard to the Exchange of Notes on the basis of which proceedings before the Court were sought to be instituted. These views are the following.

70. The 1961 Exchange of Notes took place under extremely difficult circumstances, when the British Royal Navy had been using force to oppose the 12-mile fishery limit established by the Icelandic Government in 1958. It constituted the settlement of that dispute, but the agreement it recorded was not of a permanent nature. The United Kingdom Government acknowledged the exceptional dependence of the Icelandic people upon coastal fisheries for their livelihood and economic development and recognized the 12-mile fishery zone, subject to an adjustment period of three years. Incidentally, the United Kingdom Government has since adopted a 12-mile fishery zone in British waters. The Icelandic Government, for its part, stated that it would continue to work for the implementation of the Althing resolution of 5 May 1959, regarding the extension of fisheries jurisdiction around Iceland, but would give to the United Kingdom Government six months’ notice of such extension, with a possibility of recourse to the International Court of Justice in the event of a dispute in relation to such extension. Thus, the United Kingdom Government was given the opportunity of recourse to the Court should the Icelandic Government without warning further extend the limits immediately or in the near future.

71. The agreement by which that dispute was settled, and consequently the possibility of such recourse to the Court—to which the Government of Iceland has been consistently opposed as far as concerns disputes over the extent of its exclusive fisheries jurisdiction, as indeed the United Kingdom recognizes—was not of a permanent nature. In particular, an undertaking for judicial settlement cannot be considered to be of a permanent nature. There is nothing in that situation, or in any general rule of contemporary international law, to justify any other view.

72. In its aide-mémoire of 31 August 1971, as I have already stated, the Government of Iceland, *inter alia*, gave to the United Kingdom Government 12 months’ notice of its intention to extend the zone of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction around its coasts to include the areas of sea covering the continental shelf, the precise boundaries of which would be furnished later. It also expressed its willingness to explore possibilities for finding a practical solution to the problems with which the British trawler industry found itself faced. It was specifically stated that the new limits would enter into force not later than 1 September 1972. At the same time it was intimated that the object and purpose of the 1961 agreement had been fully achieved. The position of the Icelandic Government

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, annex C.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, annex H.

was reiterated in its aide-mémoire of 24 February 1972, which again indicated that the 1961 Exchange of Notes was no longer applicable and was terminated. Copies of that aide-mémoire were transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice.

73. After the termination of the agreement recorded in the Exchange of Notes of 1961 there was on 14 April 1972, when proceedings were sought to be instituted, no basis under the Statute for the Court to exercise jurisdiction in the case to which the United Kingdom refers.

74. The Government of Iceland, considering that the vital interests of the people of Iceland were involved, respectfully informed the Court that it was not willing to confer jurisdiction on the Court in any case involving the extent of the fishery limits of Iceland, including specifically the case sought to be instituted by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 14 April 1972. Having regard to the foregoing, no agent was appointed to represent the Government of Iceland.

75. It will be seen from the documents to which I have referred that the Government of Iceland does not agree that the International Court of Justice has jurisdiction in the case that the United Kingdom has sought to institute. Nor does my Government consider that the International Court is competent to assess what size of catch might be taken from Icelandic waters by British trawlers without endangering fish stocks in an area over which the Government of Iceland has declared its sovereign rights for fishery purposes. That is a matter for negotiations between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of Iceland, and my Government is willing, as I have stated repeatedly, to continue efforts to bring such negotiations to a successful conclusion. Discussions between the representatives of the two Governments will continue next week.

76. I now want to refer to one argument which has been advanced in this matter, namely that the Government of Iceland should not have extended the fishery limits but should have waited for the holding of the forthcoming Conference on the Law of the Sea before doing so. In that connexion I want to emphasize that my Government has in effect been waiting for almost 25 years for such a solution. It was at this Assembly in 1949 that the delegation of Iceland successfully proposed that the entire body of law of the sea should be taken up for study by the International Law Commission.<sup>8</sup> That study led to the First and Second United Nations Conferences on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva in 1958 and 1960 respectively, and, although it was not possible there to reach a solution concerning the extent of coastal jurisdiction, it is now hoped that the forthcoming Conference on the Law of the Sea will achieve such results. We most certainly hope so. When we consider that the preparatory work for the Conference shows that an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations already accepts the basic principle that fishery limits should be based on relevant local considerations up to a reasonable extent from the coast, the end may very well be in sight. But it is not certain when that task

will be completed. It may still take several years before a convention is concluded, signed and ratified by a sufficient number of States to enter into effect.

77. In the meantime the Icelandic nation is faced with the fact that its only natural resources may be destroyed by foreign fishing. A working group established by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea has reached the conclusion that the cod fisheries in the North Atlantic should be reduced by 50 per cent. This is a question of life or death. Our conclusion was and is that we could not wait any longer. We could not just sit idly by and watch the collapse of our economy. No accusations of selfishness or of unilateral action can change that fact. Let us all in this Assembly be aware of the fact that rigid rules based on the protection of the interests of distant-water fishing nations in utilizing for themselves the coastal fishery resources of other countries are now no longer sacrosanct. On the contrary, they are obsolete.

78. As far as the International Court of Justice is concerned, I will say that its proper role in the United Nations system is extremely valuable. However, its jurisdiction is limited to cases where consent for jurisdiction has been given and exists. The consent of Iceland to the Court's jurisdiction with regard to fishery limits was given under extremely difficult circumstances. That consent has been terminated and no longer exists.

79. In its order concerning interim measures of protection, the Court states that, on a request for such measures, the Court need not, before indicating them, finally satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case, although it ought not to act under Article 41 of the Statute if the absence of jurisdiction on the merits is manifest.

80. My Government's view is that the absence of jurisdiction is manifest since its consent no longer existed when the proceedings were sought to be instituted.

81. One of the Judges of the International Court of Justice, Judge Padilla Nervo, reached the conclusion that the Court should not have indicated provisional measures since its jurisdiction had not been established. As to the merits, Judge Padilla Nervo said the following:

“The Government of Iceland in its information and documents sent to the Court, has given well-founded reasons and explanations of its sovereign right to extend its fisheries jurisdiction to the entire continental shelf area.

“The coastal fisheries in Iceland have always been the foundation of the country's economy.

“The coastal fisheries are the *conditio sine qua non* for the Icelandic economy; without them the country would not have been habitable.

“Iceland rests on a platform or continental shelf whose outlines follow those of the country itself. In these shallow underwater terraces, ideal conditions are found for spawning areas and nursery grounds upon whose preservation and utilization the livelihood of the nation

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 49, document A/1196, paras. 18 and 71.



depends. It is increasingly being recognized that coastal fisheries are based on the special conditions prevailing in the coastal areas which provide the necessary environment for the fishstocks. The environment is an integral part of the natural resources of the coastal State.

“The continental shelf is really the platform of the country and must be considered to be a part of the country itself.

“The vital interests of the Icelandic people are therefore at stake. They must be protected.

“The priority position of the coastal State has then always been recognized through the system of fishery limits. In the past these limits have to a great extent not been established with any regard to the interests of the coastal State. They owe their origin rather to the preponderant influence of distant-water fishery nations, who wished to fish as close as possible to the shores of other nations, frequently destroying one area and then proceeding to another.

“In a system of progressive development of international law the question of fishery limits has to be reconsidered in terms of the protection and utilization of coastal resources regardless of other considerations which apply to the extent of the territorial sea. The international community has increasingly recognized that the coastal fishery resources are to be considered as a part of the natural resources of the coastal State. The special situation of countries who are overwhelmingly dependent on coastal fisheries, was generally recognized at both Geneva Conferences in 1958 and 1960. Since then this view has found frequent expression both in the legislation of various countries and in important political statements. The course of events is decidedly progressing in this direction.”<sup>9</sup>

82. In conclusion I want to say, with all the conviction at my command, that our vital interests are at stake. We know that a great many nations represented here understand our views. Some of them have taken similar steps to safeguard their own coastal resources. Others have supported our action and are making their own preparations. I want to use this opportunity to thank them for their understanding of the necessity for the Icelandic nation to protect its very existence, its right to live, its right to cultivate its own garden.

83. Mr. MLADENOV (Bulgaria) (*translation from Russian*): Comrade President, in making my first speech from this rostrum, I should like first of all, on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and on my own behalf, to extend cordial congratulations to you on your election as President of the twenty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly. I wish you success in carrying out your noble task, and I am certain that under your guidance the present session of the General Assembly will take new, concrete steps towards the affirmation and practical attainment of peaceful, constructive relations

<sup>9</sup> See “Dissenting Opinion of Judge Padilla Nervo” in *Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v. Iceland), Interim Protection, Order of 17 August 1972, I.C.J. Reports 1972, p. 23.*

between peoples—a goal towards which Poland has made its contribution together with the other socialist countries.

84. I should also like to welcome the Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim, and to take this opportunity at the opening of the twenty-seventh session, the first session since his election to that high post, to wish him success in his demanding work.

85. At a time when the most authoritative representatives of States Members of the United Nations have an opportunity to speak from this rostrum and to set out the position of their Governments on the principal problems of the present day, we should like to state that we join a number of previous speakers in noting with satisfaction that the process of détente is one of the most significant and encouraging factors of the present moment in history. For that reason, we associate ourselves with all those who laid stress on the favourable trends in international life that have appeared since the end of the twenty-sixth session.

86. Indeed, we have witnessed events which only a year ago appeared far off and improbable. Exceptionally important agreements came into force within a brief period during the current year, summit meetings were held between the leaders of great Powers, and historic treaties were signed. Of course, these events cannot be regarded as accidental or coincidental. We are deeply convinced—and I should like to stress this—that what is involved is a natural development, the result of the growth of the forces of peace and their unyielding struggle for détente and the strengthening of peace and international security.

87. In noting the importance of the favourable developments which have occurred during the year, one cannot but stress their link with the consistent and active foreign policies of the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, which has for 50 years been pursuing an unwavering policy of peace, mutual understanding and co-operation. It was because of that policy that such useful steps were taken as the coming into force of the treaty of 12 August 1970 between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany and the Treaty of 7 December 1970 between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Quadripartite Agreement, of 3 September 1971, on West Berlin and the agreements concluded on 8 December 1971 by the German Democratic Republic with the Federal Republic of Germany and with the West Berlin Senate. This put an end to an extremely serious problem which had been troubling international relations in Europe for many years.

88. There can no doubt that the talks held in Moscow, the Basic Principles of Mutual Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States signed in the Soviet capital on 29 May 1972<sup>10</sup> and the concrete agreements reached in the field of strategic arms control<sup>11</sup> are also beneficial to the cause of strengthening peace.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972, document S/10674.*

<sup>11</sup> Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Moscow on 26 May 1972.

89. Another encouraging factor has been the contacts initiated in a key area of the Far East, where the possibility has arisen of achieving direct mutual understanding between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. An important agreement on bilateral relations has been reached between India and Pakistan, and this is a step forward towards the establishment of a lasting peace on the Hindustan peninsula.

90. All these events bear witness to an increasingly pronounced trend in international life towards the establishment of new relationships between States and an improved outlook for the peaceful settlement of long-standing disputes, without the use or the threat of force. There are thus encouraging prospects for new efforts to achieve a further détente, to prevent a revival of the cold war, to eliminate existing hotbeds of conflicts and to strengthen international security and peace throughout the world.

91. In this positive process, great importance naturally attaches to the question of convening a European conference on security and co-operation, which would be an extremely significant contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and international security. I believe that today no one can deny that the socialist countries' initiative evoked a wide and favourable public response not only in Europe but throughout the world. This initiative revitalized the political activities of European States, produced numerous contacts and useful exchanges of views between statesmen, and facilitated and accelerated the development of various types of closer co-operation in all spheres of public life.

92. There is no question that the achievements of this year have established the necessary objective preconditions for the convening of the conference, which is now an urgent matter facing the peoples of Europe. It is essential to take advantage of the favourable political climate prevailing on the ancient continent in order to hasten and strengthen this process of clearing the air.

93. In addition to the need to convene a European conference on security and co-operation, there are pressing issues like the normalization of relations between the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, including recognition that the Munich Agreement was invalid *ab initio*, and the admission of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. There is no question that the settlement of these issues would give new and powerful impetus to an even more rapid improvement of the political climate on the continent and throughout the world.

94. The admission of the two German States to the United Nations is undeniably one of the most urgent steps that could be taken to strengthen security in Europe, and it would be in the interests of all European States and the entire world community. This would be a significant contribution to the cause of strengthening the United Nations itself by reinforcing one of the basic principles of the Charter, the principle of universality.

95. The argument that a settlement of this question is dependent on the establishment of normal bilateral rela-

tions between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany does not stand up under examination. It runs counter to the logic of present developments in Europe. The immediate admission of the two German States to the United Nations would provide a decisive stimulus to the establishment of a climate of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourliness between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany and would contribute to a solution of the problems which are impeding the establishment of normal relations between them.

96. As a representative of a socialist country whose foreign policy has at all times been inspired by the principles of peaceful coexistence, I should like to deal specifically with the favourable development of the situation in the Balkans. For almost three decades, the Bulgarian Government has been making every effort to support, develop and strengthen friendly and good-neighbourly ties with the Balkan countries and to contribute to an improvement in the political climate in that area. I should like to express my satisfaction at the fact that our country's efforts are appreciated and welcomed by other Balkan States. The favourable signs and tendencies pointing towards mutual understanding and mutually beneficial co-operation between the States of the Balkan peninsula are becoming a permanent, encouraging trend which all Balkan peoples have an interest in furthering.

97. In its attitude towards the favourable results of the visits, meetings and contacts which have taken place between high-ranking representatives of the Balkan countries and which have provided opportunities for the discussion of problems of mutual interest—as the President of the State Council, Todor Zhivkov, has emphasized several times—the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to be inspired by the same unchangeable principles and will, as before, be ready at all times to follow this path, to contribute actively to a further affirmation and strengthening of the spirit of mutual understanding and trust in the Balkans.

98. However, I cannot but express here my concern at the attempts of certain circles in the West to provoke and promote tension in areas in close proximity to the Balkan peninsula. Their purpose is to disturb the tranquil atmosphere which the peoples of the Balkans are so anxious to maintain and improve.

99. The main problem and, if I may be permitted to say so, the object of universal concern in the thoughts and feelings of peoples is the question of strengthening international security and maintaining peace. There is no need to point out how real and justified are people's fears of a new international conflagration and its disastrous consequences. It is an elementary truth that only in conditions of lasting peace and security can the extremely complex problems facing mankind be solved.

100. That is why the international community gives priority to questions connected with the strengthening of peace and security. It is also the reason for its sensitivity to anything that directly or indirectly relates to security. Clear proof of this can be seen in decisions adopted at the last two sessions of the General Assembly—the Declaration on

the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] and the resolution concerning its implementation [*resolution 2880 (XXVI)*].

101. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is profoundly convinced that the problems of international security are of central importance in the work of the present session. The United Nations, which was created in order to watch tirelessly over world peace, does not and cannot have any greater task than that. The States Members of this Organization must and—given a spirit of goodwill—can breathe life into these extremely important documents.

102. The twenty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly is called upon to make a valuable contribution to the effort to strengthen international security and prevent military conflicts by making progress, in particular, towards solving the most important problem of all—that of the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The new Soviet proposal on the “non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons” [*A/L.676*] is therefore a timely and extremely important initiative. In calling upon all States to renounce the use of force by any means of warfare, the Soviet Government is affirming one of the most important and fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, renunciation of the use of force is inseparably bound up with the permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons, the most powerful means of mass destruction.

103. The draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation is a concrete and timely step towards the practical implementation of this proposal. The Bulgarian delegation firmly and whole-heartedly supports it and believes that its consideration and adoption by the General Assembly would open the way to giving its provisions binding force in accordance with Article 25 of the United Nations Charter and would promote the further strengthening of international security.

104. At the same time, this should not be construed as an infringement of the right of any nation to individual or collective self-defence or as a renunciation of the use of force against aggression in the struggle of oppressed peoples for national independence or self-determination. Moreover, a positive solution of this problem would give new impetus to the recent trend towards reducing international tension and limiting the arms race.

105. The logic of international developments creates a direct, indissoluble link between the problems of disarmament and the entire complex of problems relating to security.

106. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always supported and continues to support all useful initiatives in the field of disarmament. By taking part in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament meeting at Geneva, it is making its contribution to the adoption of a number of concrete decisions and draft treaties and conventions. From our own experience, we know well the difficulties and obstacles which stand in the way of such decisions. For that reason, we cannot agree with those who under-estimate the agreements that have

already been achieved. The Bulgarian delegation takes the view that new impetus should be given to the disarmament negotiations and that it is essential to take advantage of every opportunity to join efforts in promoting the widest possible international discussion of this crucial question.

107. The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the broad programme for disarmament negotiations proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union in April 1971 as well as the Soviet proposal at the twenty-sixth session for the convening of a World Disarmament Conference [*A/8491*] at which this question—so vitally important for mankind—would for the first time receive the most thorough consideration in all its aspects with a view to achieving the great ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament under strict international control. In its reply to the Secretary-General's letter on this [*see A/8817, annex*], the Bulgarian Government urges the immediate establishment of an appropriate preparatory organ for the World Disarmament Conference so that the Conference will be convened in the near future—in 1973, or at all events not later than 1974.

108. As we are all aware, events have occurred in recent months which bespeak a desire to improve the international situation in other parts of the world. I refer to new developments on the Korean peninsula, which are reflected in the joint communiqué issued by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea on 4 July 1972 [*A/8727, annex I*]. This positive development shows that the socialist countries are correct and justified in the urgent demand they have made in the United Nations General Assembly by the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the withdrawal of United States troops from the peninsula in order to enable the people of Korea to solve their problems themselves [*A/8752/Add.9*]. It also shows that the resolutions adopted in the past on the question of Korea do not reflect the desires of the people of Korea and are a major obstacle to the establishment of contacts between the two parts of the country. Today, the real issue is that of eliminating outside interference. The United Nations should assist the people of Korea in realizing its clearly expressed desire to decide its own fate. One can only deplore the fact that, through the efforts of those same forces which for many years have been obstructing the peaceful unification of Korea, consideration of the question of removing the principal obstacles to the reunification of the country has once again been deferred this year.

109. The agreement on bilateral relations signed by India and Pakistan is an important step towards establishing normal relations and laying the foundations for a lasting peace and good-neighbourliness on the Hindustan peninsula. This sound policy being pursued by two major Asian States is a significant contribution to the task of improving the political climate in southern Asia.

110. The admission of Bangladesh to membership in the United Nations would further help to promote the process of establishing a genuinely peaceful atmosphere in that part of the world and would also be an affirmation of the principle of United Nations universality. Like any sovereign State, Bangladesh meets all the requirements for mem-

bership in the world organization, and no one has any basis for disputing its right to become a Member. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is convinced that the United Nations General Assembly will take the only correct decision and support Bangladesh's request for admission to the United Nations [A/8754].

111. Being concerned about the maintenance of peace and bearing responsibility for it, States Members of the Organization cannot and do not have the right to remain silent about the most acute and most urgent crises and conflicts of our time.

112. The war in Viet-Nam is continuing, with use being made of everything that modern military technology has to offer. The annihilation of the peaceful, defenceless population is arousing righteous indignation and outrage throughout the world. The interventionists are attempting to do what is clearly impossible—to destroy the will and the unparalleled courage of the heroic people of Viet-Nam.

113. The Bulgarian people, who have always maintained solidarity with the just struggle of Viet-Nam and the other peoples of Indo-China, support the demand for the unconditional cessation of the bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the blockade of its ports, as well as the demand for the withdrawal of all United States armed forces from that area in order to permit the peoples of Indo-China to determine their own fate. After 10 years of military operations, it has become quite clear that the war will be ended not through escalation but only through negotiations on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

114. Another constant source of alarm and anxiety in the world is the situation in the Middle East. As events of the last few weeks have shown, a storm can blow up there at any time, producing a dangerous crisis with unforeseeable consequences. The United Nations has been involved in the search for a just and peaceful solution of the problem, and the anxiety with which the matter has been viewed here over a period of many years is justified. A huge majority of States Members of the United Nations are rightly insisting that Israel should accept full responsibility for the increasing tension which now exists. By their refusal to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and their entire policy of expansion, aggression and disregard for the rules of international law, the Israeli leaders are frustrating the efforts of this international organization, undermining its authority and sabotaging the mission of the Secretary-General's representative, Ambassador Jarring.

115. The People's Republic of Bulgaria has always insisted that Israel should desist from its dangerous policy of provocation in this highly tense area and that, in order to facilitate Ambassador Jarring's task, Israel should finally begin to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We believe that the present General Assembly session will once again demonstrate to Israel that it cannot expect to obtain, and will not obtain, foreign territory as a reward for committing aggression and flouting the Charter and the authority of the United Nations.

116. We unreservedly support the efforts of the Arab States to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression and the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for the restoration of their rights. At the same time, we repudiate the terrorist acts committed by certain elements in the resistance movement. Such desperate and reckless acts as the incident in Munich harm chiefly the cause of the Palestinian people and are used by Israel in the interests of its aggressive Zionist policies.

117. A number of important questions are on the agenda of the current session. My delegation regards all of them as very significant and will set forth its position in the appropriate Committees. However, I should like to state from this rostrum that we oppose today, as we have in the past, all attempts of any kind to revise the United Nations Charter. I wish to emphasize again that the reason for the shortcomings of this international Organization should be sought not in the Organization itself but in the policies of those countries which, now as in the past, are not observing the United Nations Charter and are violating its fundamental principles.

118. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches great importance to the question of preparing a convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting. This question has immediate relevance and deserves to be considered in a properly serious and careful manner.

119. The United Nations is also confronted with the task of resolving a number of important questions relating to economic co-operation, including the problem of accelerating the economic development of the recently liberated peoples.

120. We believe that in the struggle for a new and just international division of labour which will take account of the interests of all States and ensure favourable conditions for rapid economic development, the United Nations should play an important role and take a firm position on the side of the developing countries.

121. We are profoundly convinced that the United Nations is also called upon to play a historic role in carrying out the programme of action for the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], including, first and foremost, its application to the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique, Angola, Zimbabwe and Namibia in their struggle for the final elimination of the criminal policy of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination.

122. The position of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on all these questions has been set forth on more than one occasion in the appropriate organs of the United Nations and is well known.

123. In concluding my statement, I should like to express my delegation's conviction that the current session, in giving serious and thorough consideration to the items on the agenda, will take into account the important present stage in the development of international relations and will give new impetus to the trend towards acceleration of the process of *détente* and the strengthening of international



security. In doing so, the twenty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly will help to ensure that the positive factors in contemporary political life tip the scales of history and that mankind advances even closer to the realization of its great objective: the establishment of lasting peace and security throughout the world.

124. Mr. LONG BORET (Khmer Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I at the outset, on behalf of my delegation and personally, offer you our warmest congratulations on being elected to preside over the twenty-seventh regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Your unanimous choice as President is a tribute paid at one and the same time to the heroic Polish people and to you, whose prestige and competence are guarantees of the successful conduct of the work of the Assembly.

125. I should also like to pay a tribute to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and to inform him of how much my Government appreciates his constant and devoted efforts to achieve détente and international co-operation. In these delicate circumstances where, in a world ravaged by conflict, there is at last a slight glimmer of peace, we are happy to find in our Secretary-General all the necessary qualifications to assist us together to find the appropriate ways and means of keeping alive and even increasing that glimmer of peace for the greater welfare of mankind.

126. At the same time, I should like to endorse, with great gratitude, what has been said by eminent representatives who have preceded me, in paying tribute also to our outgoing President, Mr. Adam Malik, for his patient and unflagging efforts in the search of a just and lasting peace in the world, and particularly, in our region of South-East Asia.

127. While I am addressing you, the Khmer people, innocent victims of an unjustified and unjustifiable foreign aggression, is still suffering in its own flesh and blood. Its sufferings are such that neither the comfort nor the ultramodern installations of this glass palace, nor the distance that separates me from my country, can banish from my mind the image of the ghastly spectacle of the exactions committed by the invaders against our civilian population: women mourning their husbands; children, their mothers; monks, their monasteries that have been devastated; and the refugees, their lost homes.

128. In this abyss of suffering, where its North Viet-Nameese neighbours have plunged it without reason, the Khmer people is struggling with courage and determination for its destiny, its survival and its very existence as a nation. It is that very conviction that is our strength, a moral strength that no subversive campaign and no weapon can weaken. In this struggle to liberate our country from the claws of foreign invaders that are militarily better equipped and better trained, the Khmer people needs, if not assistance, at least understanding and encouragement from all the peoples who have committed themselves formally to honouring the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

129. More than at any other time in its existence, the Khmer people has realized how great is the danger for

mankind if the United Nations does not intervene to help to call an immediate halt to a systematic and foolhardy aggression on the part of North Viet-Nam against a peaceful people, whose only crime has been that of wishing to live in peace within its own frontiers and with good understanding with all nations, particularly, its neighbours, without any distinctions of ideology, race, religion or system of Government.

130. A State that recovered its independence and sovereignty in 1953 and a Member of the United Nations since 1955, Cambodia then and the Khmer Republic now has given proof of being an exemplary Member, one which, in all circumstances, in peace as in war, has always scrupulously complied with the principles of the Charter and the agreements and commitments it has assumed. Unfortunately, our conduct did not prevent open aggression, an attack inflicted with impunity by the troops of North Viet-Nam and the Viet-Cong. This can be no other than deliberate aggression, since the Khmer Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam have no common frontier, being separated one from the other by the Kingdom of Laos and the Republic of Viet-Nam.

131. This aggression is all the more unjustifiable since it is against a neutral and peaceful State, a demographically and militarily weaker country that has never threatened any other nation. Deeply imbued with the principles of Buddha, the Khmer people, with its 3,500 monasteries and its 70,000 monks in a population of 7 million inhabitants—that is, one monastery for each 2,000 inhabitants and one monk for each 100 persons—is reputed to be one of the most peaceful peoples of the world.

132. Furthermore, after the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements of 1954, my country has never joined any military pact and never authorized the installation of any foreign base of any sort on our territory until the last years of the 1960s when its ex-Head of State, Sihanouk, in a secret agreement, without the knowledge of the Khmer Government and Parliament, authorized the clandestine installation of sanctuaries for the North Viet-Minh and Viet-Cong. It was from those bases that the 60,000 North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong soldiers in March of 1970 launched their open attacks against the Khmer army that had only 32,000 men, despite people's demonstrations in the provinces, as well as in the capital, that requested their withdrawal from Khmer territory.

133. In the light of that situation, the Khmer people had no other choice but to organize itself for resistance, a national resistance that was and is a typical case of legitimate self-defence as provided for in the Geneva Agreements of 1954 as well as in the Charter of the United Nations.

134. Evidence mounts day by day, attesting to the increased atrocities committed not only against our defence forces, but, over and above all, against our civilian population, our children, our Buddhist monks, our doctors, without counting the manifold destruction caused to our economic, cultural and social infrastructure, or the acts of terrorism committed against peaceful inhabitants in their towns and villages. This aggression, which is an obvious fact, is amply proved by the many captured weapons and

documents as well as by the declarations of North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong prisoners held at present in Phnom Penh. A number of foreign observers that have free access to Khmer territory since April of 1970 no longer challenge the reality of this invasion despite the efforts of enemy propaganda to camouflage it by representing its four North Viet-Nameese divisions (the first, fifth, seventh and the ninth) and the C-40 Viet-Cong regiment as the so-called army of Sihanouk.

135. In fact, besides those 60,000 North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong invaders, there are barely 30,000 "red Khmers", of which 6,000 rallied to the legal Government as of last 30 August. Furthermore, the latter are made up of disparate elements, the overwhelming majority of which do not even make use of the name of Sihanouk in their own propaganda within the country, knowing that that name is rejected by the Khmer people. Moreover, they constitute neither an army nor a political force, since they are used only for propaganda and as arms carriers for the aggressors, or are forced to perform minor tasks of supply and logistics.

136. Obviously, the consequences of North Viet-Nameese aggression have been cruelly felt by the Khmer Republic and its people.

137. About one third of the 181,000 square kilometers of the territory is still under the occupation by the forces of the aggressors, who have endeavoured to sow terrorism and insecurity wherever they have been able to do so. Approximately one seventh of our population of 7 million are forced to live under the control of the enemy under a régime of terror imposed by the invaders.

138. It is out of fear of suffering enemy occupation that our peasants, usually deeply attached to their rice fields and their native soil, have not hesitated to flee their lands in order to seek refuge in the zones controlled by the Government. Thus far, approximately 700,000 refugees have fled to the capital and the main provincial towns. This immense exodus has caused an imbalance in the demographic structure of the country, with over-population in that part of the territory which remains free and under-population in that part occupied by the aggressors.

139. In August last, after having conducted massive bombing of the civilian population and used some hundred heavy ultramodern tanks against our defence forces, the North Viet-Nameese invasion forces used poisonous gas shells, which are weapons strictly prohibited by international conventions.

140. The occupiers are attacking our communications lines, our works of art, our public utilities—administrative buildings, hospitals, infirmaries, schools, plantations, plants, industrial enterprises, and so on.

141. Furthermore, these invaders did not even respect the works being carried out under the auspices of the United Nations to help the developing countries. The most shocking proof of this was the attack planned and carried out in 1971 against the construction sites of the Prek Thnot Dam, which is located in the Province of Kompong Speu and is intended to irrigate vast areas of land for the benefit of the people.

142. Therefore, our enemies do not even spare the undertakings of an economic and social nature of the United Nations itself.

143. Special mention must also be made of the depredation and occupation of our monuments at Angkor by the Viet-Cong troops, contrary to international law, particularly the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, done at The Hague on 14 May 1954. The danger is all the greater since the invaders, after the armed occupation of that zone, have turned it into a veritable logistics and military base by digging bunkers and building other defences without having shown the slightest regard for these vast monuments that are considered and admitted by all nations as being one of the richest cultural treasures of mankind.

144. Since 11 June 1971, the Government of the Khmer Republic, profoundly concerned by the fate of these occupied monuments, appealed to all Governments and all men of goodwill all over the world to help neutralize the Angkor zone and place it under international control.

145. In this connexion I should like to express, on behalf of my Government, our warmest thanks to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our Secretary-General, and to Mr. René Maheu, the Director-General of UNESCO, for the great efforts they made before they succeeded in having the Angkor monuments listed under the special protection of the above-mentioned Convention.

146. We are glad to mention that on 25 August last the period for objection to that listing expired. We therefore appeal to all the signatory States of this Convention, as well as to all the Governments of the world, actively to help from now on, by joint efforts within the framework of the Convention, to preserve these monuments from destruction and damage due to enemy occupation.

147. For its part, the Khmer Government has taken all the necessary precautions under The Hague Convention to avoid any damage to this heritage of mankind.

148. For all the reasons I have just mentioned, it appears to us urgent that the international community at last take effective action to put an end as soon as possible to North Viet-Nam and Viet-Cong aggression against the Khmer Republic. This foreign aggression, which is continuing even today with increased intensity, constitutes a grave threat not only to the existence of the Khmer people but also to that of all the neighbouring peoples, which are peaceful and do not have any expansionist designs.

149. In the Khmer Republic there is only one struggle: the national struggle of the Khmer people to free its country from these invaders. In the Khmer Republic today there is only one foreign aggression: the North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong aggression, because there are neither American troops nor American military bases on our soil. In contending that they are "liberating" us, the foreign invaders are in fact only seeking to liberate the Khmer country from the Khmers. Is that not a true definition of annexationism, of colonialism or of imperialism?

150. This aggression is in clear and open defiance of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and of the fundamental principles of our Organization, which advocate respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries, large and small, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, and non-aggression and peaceful coexistence among all political and social systems.

151. This barbarous aggression, of which the Khmer people is the victim, has only one positive aspect, that of having awakened and consolidated our national consciousness in the face of the threats of the enemy from outside.

152. That aggression, regardless of the atrocities committed, has still not sapped or weakened our firm determination to create a new society based upon the principles of democracy, that is, that all power comes from the people and that only the people is sovereign.

153. Responding thus to the aspirations of its people, the Government of the Khmer Republic has specifically laid down the groundwork for democracy by establishing republican institutions.

154. The Khmer people has definitively renounced a traditionally feudal monarchy and adopted a republican constitution on 30 April 1972, after a national referendum.

155. In the presidential elections of 4 June 1972, the Khmer people by universal and direct suffrage elected Marshal Lon Nol as the first President of the Republic. The first National Assembly and the first Senate of the Khmer Republic were respectively elected on 3 and 17 September last.

156. This change of political régime was due to the fact that the Khmer people no longer wished to tolerate the excesses of its monarchs who, during 2,000 years, kept the people in slavery. All the Khmers remember the dictatorial methods with which the former King of Cambodia Norodom Sihanouk, who later became Head of State, led our country. We still remember too well the hundreds of Khmer patriots who were summarily and savagely executed on his orders, accused solely of being Communists and so forth, whereas in reality they merely opposed his anachronistic régime.

157. I must restate that the removal of Sihanouk from power was not the result of a coup d'état, as some of his friends of the moment contend, but it was a legal deposition, carried out in accordance with the constitution then in force. Raised to the highest office of the country by the Khmer Parliament 12 years ago, Sihanouk was deposed by that same Parliament by the unanimous vote of its members on 18 March 1970.

158. All this shows how ridiculous and irrelevant were the words pronounced yesterday by the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo when he referred to my Government and our republican régime. That representative was hardly the one to refer to us as "a clique thrown out by the people" [2045th meeting, para. 238] and boast of the merits of a prince in exile when that representative himself represents a clique which, not long ago, eliminated a leader risen from the people, President Masmassa Debat—and as everyone knows—by hardly democratic means.

159. Does one call it "a clique thrown out by the people" when one speaks of a President of a Republic and a Parliament elected by universal and direct suffrage?

160. Does one call a "legal Head of State" of a country a Head of State who, having betrayed the higher interests of his people, was deposed by the unanimous vote of the two Houses of Parliament?

161. We deny that representative of the People's Republic of the Congo any right to interfere in the domestic affairs of our country or to claim to know them better than we do.

162. In brief, in his zeal to plead in favour of a Government-in-exile that represents no one but itself and that was so truly "thrown out by the people" that it is still permanently located on foreign soil, Mr. Henri Lopes is doing less than justice to the People's Republic of China when he compares the rights of the latter in the United Nations with those of the so-called Royal Government of Sihanouk.

163. Although deeply concerned over the bitter struggle to survive against an enemy which is particularly ferocious and which is determined to wipe it from the map of the world, my country has at no time overlooked or ignored its duties and its obligations as a Member of the United Nations. Thus my country continues and will continue unflinchingly to participate actively in the work of our Organization in the various fields of international co-operation.

164. We remain fundamentally opposed to racial discrimination in all its forms or manifestations and wherever it may appear. It is in fact inadmissible that human beings today can still be victims of discrimination of any sort because they belong to one race or another, one religion or another, one colour or another, or one ethnic group or another.

165. The Khmer people has always rejected any form of discrimination, because nothing would be more contrary to our Buddhist principles, which are primarily based upon tolerance, compassion and respect for all living beings.

166. Thus, too, our traditions of resistance and particularly our present-day struggle to repulse the foreign invasion can only strengthen day by day our constant and sincere determination to uphold the genuine movements of liberation of peoples from the colonial yoke. What we refuse to accept is that the sacred term "the liberation struggle" should be used to camouflage the realities of aggression. We therefore strongly oppose those pseudo-liberation movements which, under the pretext of freeing one country or another that has already gained its independence, interfere in the domestic affairs of that country and, in fact, practise expansionism and annexationism to the detriment of other countries.

167. With regard to the so-called "divided-country problem", the Khmer people welcome with satisfaction the latest developments towards détente and peaceful co-existence of those with different political and social systems. In accordance with our own aspirations for peace

and international co-operation, we trust that that trend towards reconciliation will be strengthened on the basis of reciprocity, mutual respect and the principles established to govern relations among States, pending a reunification that must be achieved according to the principles of self-determination, without foreign interference and, if necessary, with the assistance of international organizations.

168. As one of the peoples that has suffered from acts of terrorism on the part of our invaders, the Khmer people can only express its gratitude for any initiative taken to prevent such crimes against humanity. Our delegation hopes that without passion or prejudice, the United Nations, aware of what has occurred, will give urgent attention to this problem in order scientifically to devise appropriate and suitable concrete means to combat effectively this type of crime, condemned as it is by all civilized peoples.

169. While welcoming the recent developments leading to the reduction of tension in the world, and particularly in Asia, we must voice our hope for a successful conclusion of the talks on general and complete disarmament.

170. With regard to the conflict in Viet-Nam, we are relieved to note that a number of initiatives for peace have been undertaken, not only by the great Powers, including the United States of America and the Soviet Union, but also on the part of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines and Singapore.

171. The Government of the Khmer Republic feels that the Viet-Nameese conflict cannot be successfully and justly solved unless there is a global solution, namely, a general cease-fire in the whole Indo-Chinese peninsula, followed by the withdrawal of foreign troops from each of the three countries: the Kingdom of Laos, the Republic of Viet-Nam and the Khmer Republic.

172. We are always ready to contribute to a peaceful settlement in order to ensure the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Khmer territory on the basis of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and in accordance with the joint communiqué in May 1970 at the Djakarta Conference on Cambodia. The Khmer problems will be solved by the Khmers themselves, without any foreign interference.

173. The situation in the Khmer Republic is a typical case of foreign aggression, open and blatant, against a people that has not crossed its frontiers by one millimetre to threaten any other country or attack it.

174. Such a situation must be one that confronts the world with a moral issue.

175. A small country such as mine must wonder whether the innocence of a people and its scrupulous respect for the principles of the Charter and of international law could be considered to be sufficient guarantees of peace or whether the crime of aggression is to continue to go unpunished after 27 years of the existence of the United Nations.

176. As I said earlier, at this very moment while I am addressing you, my compatriots are still suffering in their struggle to defend a cause that could not be more just or legitimate. Your words, Mr. President, spoken on 19 Sep-

tember, echo particularly our own hearts when, speaking of Poland, you said:

“My country owes its existence, its freedom, its independence and its present dynamic development to great effort on the part of its people, but also to tremendous sacrifices. This unites us with the many peoples of the different continents for whom the struggle for freedom was a struggle for national existence.”  
[2032nd meeting, para. 55.]

177. The Khmer people is today doing nothing but fighting for its national existence; and it was in that spirit that Marshal Lon Nol, President of our Republic, when speaking to the Deputies on 14 September last on the occasion of the opening of the National Assembly, said:

“The North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong Communists that so savagely attacked our country have not only sown death and ruin but, over and above all, they have showed the criminal intention of killing our new Republic at its inception. They want to restore a reactionary régime that is obedient to them and that has worked to ensure their expansionist and imperialist aims. They have imposed on us a war without mercy. The Khmer people has, however, taken up the challenge. Young and old, civilians and soldiers, all have rallied to the defence of their country in danger. Their sacrifices have allowed our nation to reject the foreign yoke and to live freely and independently thus far.”

178. For these reasons, the Khmer people are fighting and will fight with determination and energy against the foreign invaders. Like all peoples throughout universal history, the Khmer people continues to have faith in the sacred principles which are the foundation of our Organization and of the dignity of man.

179. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

180. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): The statement of the Foreign Minister of Iceland included a number of arguments on certain issues outstanding between his country and mine—an unfortunate state of affairs between friends and allies. These issues are the subject of proceedings before the International Court of Justice. In this connexion I must mention the order of the Court for interim measures, which was made on 17 August 1972 by 14 votes to only 1 dissenting vote. The United Kingdom for its part is abiding by this order.

181. I do not want to say too much about this matter, because my Government attaches great importance to the fact that the Foreign Minister of Iceland and my own Foreign Secretary agreed during their meeting in New York on 27 September that the negotiations between us should be resumed next week. We wish to do everything possible to encourage an atmosphere favourable to a successful outcome of these negotiations. In any case it would not be appropriate for me to rehearse all the counter-arguments now, if only because the issues are before the International Court of Justice, and it is there that our full legal case will be deployed. However, I must put it on record that my Government does not accept as valid the legal arguments in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Iceland, either on questions of jurisdiction or on substance, and I must also



say that there are points in the Foreign Minister's factual presentation that we cannot accept.

### AGENDA ITEM 8

#### Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)\*

#### SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/8800/REV.1/ADD.1)

182. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the

\* Resumed from the 2037th meeting.

Assembly to the second report of the General Committee [A/8800/Rev.1/Add.1], which has been circulated. The General Committee has decided to defer its decision on whether it should recommend the inclusion in the agenda of the additional item proposed in document A/8794. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of that decision?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*