



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 3:	
Credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (<i>continued</i>):	
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee	
Second report of the Credentials Committee	1

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Martínez Ordóñez (Honduras), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (*continued*):*
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

**SECOND REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS
COMMITTEE (A/9179/ADD.1)**

1. The **PRESIDENT** (*interpretation from Spanish*): The report on this item appears in document A/9179/Add.1. In this connexion some amendments have been submitted; they are contained in documents A/L.719 and A/L.720. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to introduce them.

2. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): On behalf of the delegations of Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania I wish to introduce the amendment in document A/L.720. That amendment would insert the following paragraph as section I of the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 29 of the second report of the Credentials Committee:

“Approves the credentials of the representatives of Portugal, on the clear understanding that they represent Portugal as it exists within its frontiers in Europe, and rejects the credentials of those representatives who purport to represent, within the delegation of Portugal to the General Assembly at its present session, the Portuguese-dominated Territories of Angola and Mozambique and the independent State of Guinea-Bissau”.

3. As I have said, this particular text, which would become section I of the draft resolution proposed by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 29 of its report, is being circulated and should be in the hands of delegations shortly. In introducing this section on behalf of the delegation of Senegal and my own delegation and expressing the wishes and aspirations of the African delegations on this matter, I need not go into detail as regards the relevance of this amendment,

* Resumed from the 2141st meeting.

which we wish to be voted on separately and to be given priority.

4. I say that I do not have to go into the details of the matter because it seems to my delegation that the issue is very clear. This Assembly and its organs and the Security Council, as well as other international organizations, representing the overwhelming majority of mankind, have clearly expressed their position with respect to Portuguese colonialism in Africa. Year in year out the General Assembly has conclusively and convincingly rejected the myths and pretences consistently advanced by the Fascist authorities of Lisbon to the effect that by some miracle the territory of Portugal happens to extend to the continent of Africa. Our position has been vindicated year in year out by the General Assembly, and the Portuguese contention that the Territories of Angola and Mozambique are somehow part and parcel of metropolitan Portugal has been repeatedly and decisively rejected.

5. In proposing the amendment, we are convinced we shall have the overwhelming support of the membership of this Organization. We are convinced we shall have that support because we believe that Members of our Organization would wish to be consistent with the position that we have repeatedly taken in the United Nations General Assembly, in the Security Council and in other forums. We believe that, as the Assembly has rightly asserted, Portugal has no right to claim that it can represent the people of Angola, the people of Mozambique and the people of the independent State of Guinea-Bissau. Furthermore, we maintain that any acceptance by the United Nations General Assembly of a situation whereby, even by the slightest implication, the Portuguese would have some amount of credibility given to their claim would not only be doing a disservice to the struggle of the people who are shedding their blood for the purpose of their liberation but also be contrary to the decisions of our Assembly and indeed to the principles of our Organization. Therefore we wish to make our position clear: while we do not wish to pronounce ourselves on the merits or demerits, on the representativeness or non-representativeness of the Portuguese régime with respect to Portugal, since this is a matter which is clearly within the domestic jurisdiction of the people of Portugal, we refuse to allow ourselves to confirm a position which would also by the slightest implication seem to confirm the wild dreams of the Fascists in Lisbon.

6. It is for that reason that we want it to be clearly understood that the African delegations do not wish to challenge the credentials of Portugal, though I must say quite candidly, sincerely and honestly that, if a situation is forced upon us whereby the myths of the Portuguese claims are somehow confirmed or sustained by some Members of this Organization, then we should be forced into a situation

where we might have to question the very credentials of the representative of Portugal. I am saying this because we should not be put in a position of allowing the Portuguese representatives the opportunity to get away with misrepresentation of facts, to get away with violations of the decisions of the General Assembly.

7. I say that I do not want to go into the details because the history of Portuguese colonialism and the position of the United Nations on this matter are clear; but, for the benefits of those of our colleagues who are still in doubt about the correctness of the African position on this question, who are still in doubt about the constitutionality, the legality and the morality of the African position on this matter, I should like humbly to refer them to the different positions and the different decisions continuously and consistently taken by our Organization, whether in the General Assembly or in the Security Council.

8. In resolution 1542 (XV) the General Assembly, in its wisdom, made it very clear that it did not accept the claims of Portugal that the so-called overseas provinces were an integral part of Portugal and made it very clear that these were colonial Territories and that the Portuguese Government was responsible to ensure that the people of the Territories enjoyed the right to self-determination and independence. If there was any doubt about the position adopted by the General Assembly, this position was further vindicated by Security Council resolution 183 (1963) adopted on 11 December 1963. I believe that all our colleagues will recall all these resolutions and therefore I do not want to take up the time of the Assembly by reiterating some of their provisions. However, if it is necessary, as it appears sometimes is the case, I will beg the indulgence of the Assembly to reiterate the decision taken by the Security Council in its resolution 180 (1963) adopted on 31 July 1963. Paragraph 2 of that resolution reads as follows:

"Affirms that the policies of Portugal in claiming the Territories under its administration as 'overseas territories' and as integral parts of metropolitan Portugal are contrary to the principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council".

9. Furthermore, in its resolution 312 (1972), one of the most recent resolutions of the Security Council, adopted at its meetings in Addis Ababa, the Council reaffirms:

"... the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence, as recognized by the General Assembly in its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, and recognizes the legitimacy of their struggle to achieve that right".

In paragraph 2 of that resolution, the Security Council condemned

"... the persistent refusal of the Government of Portugal to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and all other relevant resolutions of the Security Council".

10. It may be wondered why the sponsors of the section we have introduced find it necessary to go into the details of these resolutions, some of which were adopted as far back as

10 years ago and some of which were adopted only last year, when members of this Assembly in their wisdom know perfectly well that year in year out the Assembly has been adopting resolutions with resounding majorities condemning the perpetuation of Portuguese colonialism in Africa and demanding that Portugal terminate its wars of aggression and occupation in the African continent. If I have found it necessary to recite these resolutions it is only because I think perhaps sometimes we need to refresh our memories on the decisions we have taken, on the resolutions we have adopted with overwhelming majorities, so as to ensure that the positions we take subsequently correspond with the positions we have adopted on previous occasions. That is particularly so when we are faced not only with a situation where the decisions of the Assembly are consistently and defiantly being challenged but also with a situation where the recalcitrant Power now finds it convenient even to mock the General Assembly's reasoning.

11. In saying so, I wish to state quite categorically that our opposition to the credentials of those gentlemen who come from Angola and Mozambique in no way stems from the fact that they are perhaps not nationals of Portugal. As far as the sponsors are concerned, those gentlemen might as well have come from outer space. They could have come from outer space and the delegation of Portugal would have been most welcome to incorporate them as members of the reinforced Portuguese delegation. But our position here stems from the fact that, given the particularization in the credentials of the Portuguese representatives and taking into consideration the Portuguese contention that Angola and Mozambique are part and parcel of Portugal, concurrence by this Assembly in the credentials of these gentlemen would have only one effect—that is, somehow, indirectly or implicitly, to recognize or to acquiesce to the Portuguese contention that Mozambique and Angola belong to Portugal.

12. When we were discussing this matter in the Credentials Committee, our good friend the representative of the United States, who unfortunately, and to our delegation most regrettably, finds it particularly rewarding these days to be the most staunch supporter and champion of Portuguese colonialism, questioned the position adopted by the delegations of Senegal and Tanzania on the ground that there were many examples of persons belonging to a delegation without being nationals of the country concerned. I should like to agree with him entirely. We know of those examples. But that is beside the point. We do not challenge the credentials of those gentlemen simply because they are not nationals of Portugal. In fact, in this particular case, the Portuguese claim they are nationals. Our challenge is based on the explanation I have given—that is, on our desire to ensure that we do not, either directly or indirectly, give any semblance of legitimacy or recognition to Portuguese myths, Portuguese pretenses and Portuguese claims.

13. On this point, perhaps I may add one more thing. In this Assembly we are, of course, aware that a number of representatives represent delegations without necessarily being citizens of the countries concerned. We have absolutely no reason to question their position or their representativeness. After all, the determination of who shall serve on its delegation is a sovereign decision of a sovereign country. But in this particular case we question the so-called sovereignty of Portugal when it comes to incorporating Angola or

Mozambique or the citizens of those countries as part and parcel of metropolitan Portugal.

14. I may say, further, that the Portuguese have a fantastic capacity for day-dreaming, and when Mozambique is free, and when Angola is free, there may still be some Mozambicans and Angolans who may prefer to stay in Portugal, just as there are, perhaps, one or two Goans who, after the liberation of Goa, opted to stay in Portugal. At that particular moment, I can assure this Assembly, my delegation will raise no objection whatsoever to a Mozambican or an Angolan who happens to be a member of the Portuguese delegation, because the situation and the circumstances would be completely different.

15. Mention has also been made—and I say this in order to anticipate an argument and to allay any apprehension—of our being opposed to representatives coming from Mozambique and Angola, while at the same time only a week or so ago we had representatives from Papua New Guinea, Niue and other Territories. I think the answer is so clear that it does not really need or merit any clarification. But for the purpose of clarifying the problem, may I say that those representatives who have come from Papua New Guinea or Niue have come here as part and parcel of the delegation of administering Powers—administering Powers that are fulfilling the responsibilities entrusted to them by the international community and promoting policies in accordance with the demands and expectations of the United Nations. In other words, when those representatives come here they come as part and parcel of the metropolitan delegation, but we all know those representatives are subsequently going to assume their responsibilities as representatives of sovereign States.

16. I said earlier that the issue is clear, so clear that it does not really need undue elaboration. If I have taken the time of the Assembly, however, to elucidate some of these points, it is because I feel that this is a question about which all our colleagues must be made very much aware, and that they must clearly understand its implications so that when they proceed to vote on it they will know exactly what they are voting on.

17. Finally, I should like to launch an appeal. I should like to launch an appeal on behalf of my colleague and brother the Ambassador of Senegal, who is also a sponsor of this amendment, and also, I will say, on behalf of the conscience of Africa; I should like to launch an appeal to all the friends of Africa and to all who oppose Portuguese colonialism to vote on our proposal so that we put an end categorically and decisively to any pretences or Portuguese myths. And I would like to launch a particular appeal to our friends and brothers from Latin America, whom we hold in the highest affection and to whom we are bound by traditional ties of amity and solidarity and with whom we share a common destiny. To them we say that we expect them to do no less than to uphold justice. We expect them to live up to the solidarity of the Africans and Latin Americans, and to live up to the spirit of solidarity of Panama, which we all witnessed.

18. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): After the masterly statement just made before this Assembly by my friend and colleague Mr. Salim on the draft amend-

ment regarding the credentials of Portugal, which we submitted as representatives of Africa in the Credentials Committee, it seems to me that there is very little to add. However, I should particularly like to explain to the Assembly why we saw fit to insist on this amendment and to ask the Secretariat at the same time to annex to the report of the Credentials Committee the credentials of the Portuguese Government. We are aware that this is not the usual practice, but we are particularly anxious that the representatives seated in this Assembly should know that we took this decision because there were certain things in the document concerning the credentials of Portugal that we felt were at variance with the provisions of our Charter and with resolutions adopted both by the Assembly and by the Security Council.

19. Mr. Salim has given all the references that were needed to justify our action. He has appealed to our friends from the Latin American continent. It is particularly in connexion with that appeal that I would venture to expand somewhat on his remarks. During the discussions that took place in the Credentials Committee, the various delegations that supported Portugal—reluctantly, it must be recognized—gave us to understand that their position was dictated by strictly juridical considerations. It was to enable them, should it be necessary, to overcome their quite legitimate scruples, that my friend Mr. Salim, in turn, drew their attention to the points that form the legal basis for our contention.

20. I would like, however, to add something to that. We are all Members of the United Nations, and, as such, we have all committed ourselves to respecting the Charter. Among those resolutions that were mentioned by my friend Mr. Salim there are three which emanate from the Security Council, three resolutions of the Security Council which at the time were not vetoed and which, consequently, are subject to implementation. In this connexion, I should like to remind our friends who may still entertain some feelings of diffidence because of legal considerations that Article 25 of the Charter states that:

“The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.”

21. Thus, the decisions adopted by the Security Council concerning the problem we are now discussing concern the authority which Portugal can exercise over what it calls its overseas territories. Now in all those resolutions it is clearly spelled out that Portugal in fact has no authority over those Territories; and resolution 1542 (XV), which was referred to by my colleague Mr. Salim, even gave a list of those Territories, which are:

- “(a) The Cape Verde Archipelago;
- “(b) Guinea, called Portuguese Guinea;
- “(c) Sao Tomé and Príncipe, and their dependencies;
- “(d) Sao Joao Batista de Ajudá;
- “(e) Angola, including the enclave of Cabinda;
- “(f) Mozambique;
- “(g) Goa and dependencies, called the State of India;
- “(h) Macau and dependencies;
- “(i) Timor and dependencies”.

22. These were the Territories on which our Assembly has decided that Portugal should exercise no authority, and yet

Portugal has listed as members of its delegation nationals of some of those Territories, including African Territories and in particular Mozambique and Angola and the independent Territory of Guinea-Bissau, taking care to indicate their origin. This would suggest that Portugal wishes in this way to have our Assembly endorse the authority which it claims to exercise over what it calls its "overseas provinces".

23. It is for those reasons, therefore, that the African representatives in the Credentials Committee felt it was their duty to raise the question of Portugal's credentials.

24. But there was another problem which we feel we should raise. This is completely different from the Portuguese problem, both in form and in substance; and I have been instructed by the 103 sponsors of the amendment on this matter to explain to the Assembly what it is.

25. That is why, Mr. President, I should like to ask what your ruling is on our discussion of this problem. Are you going to bring up for discussion first the question of the amendment on Portugal and then proceed to the second question which we intend to raise? As you may have suspected, it is the question of the credentials of the Khmer Republic. If your decision, Sir, is to take up both those matters together, I am prepared to go on to the second matter. But, if, on the other hand, you feel that it would be more appropriate to discuss the first point before we go on to the second, then I will bow to your decision and wait until you bring up the question of the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic before I myself take up this point. I await your ruling, Sir.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly is discussing the report of the Credentials Committee. As I understand it, two amendments have been submitted to it. The amendments can be discussed by speakers as they see fit to deal with them. There is a list of speakers and I shall call on them in the order in which they are listed. The delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania asked for priority for one of those amendments and the Assembly will decide if that priority should be given. As for the vote, the amendments will naturally have to be voted on before the report. I would ask the representative of Senegal to continue.

27. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): The careful composition of the Credentials Committee frequently makes it impossible for that body to take decisions which reflect the actual trends which emerge in the course of the discussions of this Assembly. Thus three times the Committee has approved the credentials of representatives of the racist régime of Pretoria, despite successive mass votes cast by the General Assembly, rejecting the credentials of those representatives over the last three years. Once again this time the Committee has disregarded certain decisions taken by the General Assembly, particularly on the questions of Cambodia and Portugal. Some consider that the Credentials Committee is a purely mechanical instrument which does not have to take account of the views expressed by delegations in the General Assembly, and that its duty is to take up the documents which are referred to it without considering any political or other factors. Hence, we wonder why that Committee was set up in the first place because, if that is its role, it could just as well, if not better, be performed

by the Secretariat of the United Nations which is in a better position to discharge those purely administrative functions. Fortunately, however, our Assembly still has the prerogative of endorsing the conclusions of the Committee which, if necessary, makes it possible for this very unfortunate interpretation to be corrected. On 11 December during the 2nd meeting of the Committee appointed during this twenty-eighth session, we had to take up two contentious cases: first, that of the so-called Khmer Republic, and then the question of Portugal, to which I have just referred.

28. Therefore, I shall now confine myself to the question of the Khmer Republic. We should have liked to have two separate discussions on these two problems because they involve two completely different cases, both from the point of view of form and of substance. The proposals we made in each case give quite a clear idea of why this is so. But, Mr. President, since you have decided to hold these two discussions concurrently, we will comply with that ruling.

29. On 17 October of this year, [2155th meeting], our Assembly decided to include in its agenda a new item entitled, "Restoration of the Lawful Rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations" [item 106]. The discussion on that item started on 4 December [2188th meeting] and it was then suspended just after the fourth meeting [2191st meeting] at the proposal of the representative of one member State; 27 speakers, however, had already spoken on that item and 17 others had already put their names down and were waiting for their turn to speak. In taking that decision to defer the item, the Assembly was also aware that it had an opportunity to take a decision on the matter in the immediate future. It therefore recognized that there was indisputably a problem in connexion with the representation of Cambodia in the United Nations, and that the solution to that problem had to be studied in more depth before any substantive decision could be taken. Hence, we believe that the presence in the United Nations of the representatives of the party which is in fact the most challenged party, was inappropriate pending a final decision on this matter by the General Assembly. We further believe that that interpretation is in fact the same interpretation as that of the authorities of the Government of Phnom Penh, because the day after our decision in the Assembly, Ngoc Thanh, the Head of the Phnom Penh Government, handed in his resignation to Marshal Lon Nol. At present, the representatives of the Khmer Republic do not represent any Government here. There is no longer any Government in Phnom Penh.

30. During the discussions which were held on 4 and 5 December last [2188th-2191st meetings], several speakers drew the attention of the Assembly to the abnormal, scandalous and explosive situation which at present prevails in Cambodia. Since its accession to international sovereignty in 1953, the Kingdom of Cambodia kept for 17 years out of a war which has been ravaging the Indo-Chinese peninsula for more than 20 years. It goes without saying that the Powers which are responsible and which initiated the tormented atmosphere of the strife-torn Indo-Chinese peninsula, could hardly tolerate that oasis of peace and prosperity which remained a challenge and an annoying witness of their blind and selfish cruelty.

31. The people of Cambodia is a peace-loving people. But it is also a proud people, passionately jealous of its independence and national sovereignty. Thus, the plot which was hatched on 17 March 1970 against Prince Norodom Sihanouk, who was never forgiven for his stubborn policy of neutrality and of national independence, provoked the indignation of the Khmer people, who immediately joined him, in a firm resolve to defend its fatherland and its legitimate and sacred rights. Furthermore, we should emphasize that in its national liberation struggle the people of Cambodia enjoys the support and solidarity of all peoples and all Governments that care for peace and justice. Thus during the general discussion, which marked the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, a large number of speakers vigorously condemned the intervention of the American armies in Cambodia; that intervention, the scope and intensity of which attained scarcely imaginable proportions, nevertheless was approved and encouraged by those whose representatives claim to hold a seat here on behalf of the martyred people of Cambodia.

32. Since the Paris agreements of January 1973, the United States has spent \$423 million in order to drop 240,000 tons of bombs on Cambodia. This tonnage is 50 per cent greater than the 160,000 tons of bombs dropped on Japan during the entire Second World War. Furthermore, we have learnt from recent indiscretions that the American aggression against Cambodia did not start with the coup d'état of 18 March 1970. And the American authorities themselves now confess that they secretly made 3,630 raids on Cambodia during the 14 months which preceded the American/South Viet-Nameese offensive of May 1970.

33. Last weekend, on 8 and 9 December, a conference to support the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia was held in Paris, in the presence of 200 delegations representing more than 50 countries and some 15 international organizations. The proceedings of the conference began with the reading of a message in which Prince Sihanouk affirmed particularly that American aviation was continuing to operate in Cambodian skies to support the Government of its protégés in Phnom Penh. He went on to affirm categorically that no Viet-Nameese units are involved in the operations of the Cambodian liberation forces. Various public figures of world renown spoke at the conference. Thus, Professor Pfeiffer of the University of Montana, in the United States, bore witness to the effects of the defoliants used by the American army in Cambodia, particularly as regards the destruction of rice fields. Furthermore, a Japanese professor, Saburo Kugai, presented a report on the economic assistance which his Government was giving to the puppets of Phnom Penh under the orders of the United States.

34. Finally, after various other statements of the same nature, the conference issued a communiqué from which the following passages may be quoted:

"The conference holds the United States responsible for the continuation of the war in Cambodia. It demands the immediate, total and unconditional cessation of the intervention of the United States and its lackeys in Saigon and Bangkok. It also calls for the immediate cessation of all assistance and support to the puppet régime of Phnom Penh; the *de jure* recognition of the Royal Government of

National Union of Cambodia as the only legitimate and legal Government of the country; respect for the fundamental national rights of the Cambodian people so that they may freely order their own domestic affairs without any foreign interference."

And the conference

"... recommends that an international week of solidarity should be held from 17 to 24 March 1974, and would encourage all organizations represented to organize action committees in their various countries active support and to increase financial and material assistance to the Royal Government of National Union".

35. During the discussions held on 4 and 5 December in the Assembly, the representative of the so-called Khmer Republic stated that the Cambodian liberation forces only control four of the 29 provinces of the country. A recent declaration, made on 8 December by Prince Sihanouk, gives the lie categorically to these assertions. Thus, the legitimate Head of the State of Cambodia tells us that the country has 17 provinces only and that the new provinces created by the Lon Nol Government are tiny territories which, in 1970, were not even considered as districts or communes by the legal Government of the country. Hence, of these 17 provinces, the liberation forces control five of them entirely, and this in any case is not denied by the representatives of Phnom Penh. And all the other provinces are also controlled by the liberation forces, except for some towns in which the armed forces of Phnom Penh are under siege.

36. Everyone knows that the town of Takéo, which is one of the largest towns in Cambodia, has been surrounded for two years now, and for two years it has only been able to be supplied by parachute drops, naturally with the assistance of the American army.

37. The representative of Phnom Penh emphasized, during the meeting on 4 December, various remarks which the French newspaper *Le Monde* attributed to Prince Sihanouk. But, he forgot on that occasion to quote the statements made by his own Head of State, Marshal Lon Nol, who said, in an interview which was given on 29 November to the correspondent of *France-Inter* at Phnom Basset:

"I am prepared to meet Prince Sihanouk and to sit down at a conference table with him in order to reach a settlement for Cambodia. I wish for peace, peace at any price, and there is only one prerequisite, one condition which I would lay down, the withdrawal of the North Viet-Nameese from Cambodia".

38. The representative of Phnom Penh, who likes to quote from *Le Monde*, should also read this same paper of 23 April 1973 which, on the front page, has an article with the headline "According to the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh, the presence of Viet-Nameese Communists among the combatants in Cambodia has not been definitely established". This is a quotation, I repeat, from *Le Monde*, and the article contained in this newspaper, quoting American diplomats stationed in Phnom Penh itself, confirms the statements made by Prince Sihanouk to the effect "that no North Viet-Nameese units or any belonging to the National Liberation Front have operated militarily in Cambodia since June 1972".

39. On the eve of the discussions which took place on 4 and 5 December, several of Cambodia's neighbours published, in document A/9254 of 24 October 1973, a letter addressed to the Secretary-General, in which they expressed the view that the Cambodian problem should not be dealt with without the views of the countries in the immediate neighbourhood of the Khmer Republic being taken duly into consideration.

40. In a message addressed on 27 October 1973 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Prince Sihanouk also recognized that those countries were undoubtedly the ones most affected by the Cambodian tragedy. But he was also surprised that their intervention should be addressed only to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to delegations at the United Nations, and not to the United States, which bears the brunt of the responsibility for the tragic events which we all deplore.

41. My delegation, for its part, considers that if certain neighbouring countries are still qualified to offer their mediation in the Cambodian conflict, there are others which, in this matter, have adopted an attitude which gives cause for legitimate suspicions about the impartiality and the objectivity of their judgement.

42. In the three and a half years in which the bombers of the United States Air Force mercilessly ravaged the towns and villages of Cambodia, did those neighbouring countries make any protest or take any action to denounce that deplorable wholesale slaughter? By no means. Everyone knows that the bombs used in those circumstances came from arsenals situated in countries bordering on Cambodia, just as the bombers which delivered them came from air fields in those countries.

43. We would also point out that the liberation struggle which is at present being waged by the Cambodian people is by no means an isolated instance, although the adversary still remains the same. It is the same opponent which we have already met in Viet-Nam, where for more than 10 years it has sown death and destruction throughout the country.

44. We have also made its acquaintance in the Security Council, when it first exercised its right of veto in order to protect the racist régime of the Salisbury rebels.

45. Last July, that super-Power used the same right of veto to thwart the almost unanimous wishes of the Security Council in its quest for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is also the same Power which has been arming and encouraging the Portuguese colonialists in their foolhardy and bloody adventure in Africa. All these actions are undoubtedly harmful and regrettable in themselves, but they only serve to put off the day of reckoning. In fact, in the history of mankind there has never been an instance where the determination and self-sacrifice of a people struggling for their liberty did not succeed in liberating them from their oppressors, however powerful and cruelly stubborn those who oppressed them may have been.

46. The 33 Member States which submitted the draft resolution in document A/L.714 calling upon the General Assembly to restore the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations

are undertaking this action on the grounds that Government and its head, Prince Sihanouk, are the only authentic representatives of the Cambodian people. Prince Sihanouk, who never accepted any foreign interference in the domestic affairs of his country, has also never ceased to be the embodiment of the legitimacy and continuity of the Cambodian State. His Government is firmly established throughout the country and in fact now controls the major part of it, both as regards area and population. It enjoys the broad support of a great many Governments situated on every continent and representing the most varied political systems.

47. In the initial stages of its organization certain members of that Government for reasons of expediency and convenience installed themselves outside Cambodian territory. However, at the present time, when the popular armed forces are approaching the final stage of their struggle for liberation, all the members of the Royal Government are carrying on their activities within the territory of Cambodia itself. We know that certain delegations blame that Government for not having been set up in Phnom Penh, but what is less easy to understand is that most of those who raise this objection had for more than 20 years opposed admission to the United Nations of the Government of the People's Republic of China, which was not only installed in Peking but was also in control of practically all of Chinese territory.

48. Quite recently, some African delegations approached various Western European countries asking them to support their request for recognition of the Government of the New Republic of Guinea-Bissau. The replies which they received from practically all of them were that the criteria upon which a decision would be based were as follows: first, that there should be reasonable prospects for the Government lasting; secondly, that effective authority was in fact exercised over most of the territory by the Government; and thirdly, that it should be supported by the majority of the population.

49. There cannot be a shadow of a doubt, when we consider the position of the two Governments which at present claim to be the government of Cambodia in the light of those criteria, that our Assembly could have taken a decision upon the conclusion of the debate which started on 4 December last. We all know in effect that the future prospects of Cambodia can hardly be considered to be embodied in the government which is at present under siege at Phnom Penh, entirely cut off from the rest of the country and supplied by an air lift from units that are based in certain neighbouring countries. That Government, which has been spurned by the population, can scarcely even command the support of the mercenaries which make up its own army. The soldiers who on 14 October plundered the market of Pochentong belonged to the First Khmer Infantry Division and are, therefore, members of regular units of the Cambodian army.

50. A second point is that the fighter-bomber which, on 19 November last, dropped four bombs on the residence of Marshall Lon Nol also belonged to a regular squadron of the Phnom Penh air force, and the pilot of that aeroplane was also an officer belonging to the air force of the Khmer Republic.

51. In the economic and financial area the Government of Phnom Penh has hardly been more successful than it has in military matters, despite the considerable American assistance it receives. The riel—the unit of Cambodian currency, which was one of the most stable until the end of 1969, has been subjected to a devaluation of more than 300 per cent during the last three years. Rice, which is a prime commodity and is the staple for the population, is becoming increasingly scarce, and almost impossible to find in Phnom Penh, whereas before the invasion by American troops Cambodia was one of the rice exporting countries of South-East Asia.

52. Furthermore, we should note that the Government of Phnom Penh is unpopular not only because of the illegal way in which it came to power, but particularly because it has proved incapable of solving the problems facing it, owing to its incompetence and the corruption that has affected the most senior authorities. This state of affairs is now recognized and denounced by elements which can hardly be accused of being in favour of the régime of Prince Sihanouk. Thus, in a statement that was made on 28 July 1973, Son Ngoc Thanh, the former head of the Phnom Penh Government—in other words the Government of Marshal Lon Nol—accused the latter “of living surrounded by gamblers, alcoholics and schemers, instead of purging the country of the corrupt officials and generals he protected”. And this same gentleman ended his statement by revealing that the coup d’état of 1970 was encouraged by the American Secret Service, but expressing regret that the United States had put Marshal Lon Nol at the head of Cambodia and that it had continued to support him despite his failure to unify the country against the communists.

53. The person who said all that obviously knows what he is talking about because, as I have already said, not only was he called upon by Marshal Lon Nol in March 1972 to head the Government in Phnom Penh but he had also been Prime Minister of Cambodia during the Japanese occupation and is now reputed to be one of the favourites of the American/South Viet-Nameese authorities. This denunciation of American interference is even more convincing since, on the eve of the coup d’état of 18 March, the American command brought to the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville a cargo-ship—the Columbia Eagle—filled with arms and munitions, which were immediately made available to the Government of Marshal Lon Nol. I hardly need remind members of what I have already said about the clandestine bombings which were carried out in 1969 and 1970 to show that there has in fact been foreign interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia but that this interference consisted of overt aggression by the armed forces of the United States against an independent, peaceful and neutral Cambodia, a Member of the United Nations. This is all the more serious since the Power involved is one of the founding Members of our Organization and enjoys the formidable right of veto in the Security Council.

54. On this question of Cambodia, my delegation, like all the other delegations which support our point of view, is speaking within a strictly objective framework. From a purely subjective point of view, we have far more reason to oppose the presence of the representatives of Lisbon than that of the representatives of Phnom Penh; however, whatever resentment we may feel towards Portuguese colonialism, the delegation of Portugal, as the representatives of that

country as it exists within its European frontiers, does in fact have the credentials which the rules of procedure of our Assembly oblige us—albeit reluctantly—to accept. Now, in the case of the Khmer delegation, the Assembly itself recognizes that there is a problem regarding its representative nature and has decided to defer consideration of this question until the next session.

55. As I said just now, the Head of the Government of Phnom Penh has himself drawn the same conclusions as we have from the Assembly’s vote. It is therefore in consideration of all these points that we consider that the credentials submitted by the present Khmer delegation should not be accepted until a final decision has been taken on this matter.

56. We are aware of what the American authorities now feel about the existence of the United Nations, whose role they would seek to reduce to a strict minimum. So, what do they care about the representative nature of the delegations present in the General Assembly, particularly if they are delegations which have been placed under their protective umbrella? But we who still have faith in the United Nations, we who still believe in the message of the United Nations cannot subscribe to such a view of matters, and it is for that reason that we are requesting the Assembly to adopt the amendment submitted by 33 delegations in document A/L.719, which rejects the credentials of the delegation of the so-called Khmer Republic. In asking the Assembly to take such a decision, the 33 sponsors of the amendment feel that they are taking a step which reflects our great concern for the prestige and effectiveness of our Organization and for respect for the fundamental principles of our Organization.

57. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados): The Assembly is now seized of the report of the Credentials Committee in document A/9179/Add.1 and the draft resolution contained therein. The Assembly also has before it an amendment to that report submitted by a number of African and Asian States [A/L.719], inviting us to accept the report of the Credentials Committee except as it applies to the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic.

58. This is a procedural question. As such, therefore, we must look at the mandate of the Credentials Committee and its procedures as laid down in the rules of procedure of this Assembly to see if the Committee was faithful to its mandate and discharged its responsibilities in the manner prescribed. That being so, I wonder, with respect, if our colleague the Ambassador of Senegal has not overstated his case. For we are not dealing now with any question of substance touching and concerning the Khmer Republic.

59. Rule 27 of the rules of procedure reads as follows:

“The credentials of representatives and the names of members of a delegation shall be submitted to the Secretary-General if possible not less than one week before the opening of the session. The credentials shall be issued either by the Head of the State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.”

60. This rule deals with the manner in which credentials ought to be submitted and the authorized and recognized persons in the sending countries who can legitimately sign and submit credentials to the Secretary-General. Under this

rule only three kinds of persons can submit such credentials to the Secretary-General: first, a Head of State; secondly, a Head of Government—a Prime Minister, for instance; or thirdly, a Foreign Minister. Authenticated signatures of any of these three, attached to a document of credentials from the sending State, is sufficient, in the view of my delegation, to constitute satisfaction of the legal requirements for submission to the Secretary-General as demanded by rule 27 of our rules of procedure.

61. Rule 28 is stated as follows:

“A Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the beginning of each session. It shall consist of nine members, who shall be appointed by the General Assembly on the proposal of the President. The Committee shall elect its own officers. It shall examine the credentials of representatives and report without delay.”

I repeat: “It shall examine the credentials of representatives and report without delay”. This rule says how the Committee shall be appointed and sets out its mandate. That mandate is simply to examine the credentials of representatives and to report to the plenary Assembly as soon as possible.

62. Arguments on interpretation of this mandate tend to surround one word, the word “examine”. The preponderating view is that the Committee is required quite simply to examine the signatures of the documents of credentials and ascertain that they are authentic signatures of the officials in each State who are authorized under rule 27 to submit credentials and names to the Secretary-General, that is to say, that the signature on the document of transmittal is that of the Foreign Minister or the Head of State or Government of the sending State, a Member of this Assembly. No more is required of the Credentials Committee except to report to the Assembly without delay and to elect its own officers.

63. The minority view on the interpretation of the mandate of our Credentials Committee is that in examining the credentials the Committee is empowered to look at the personality and composition of a Government and decide whether that Government is a legitimate Government or not. That is the minority view. But this is a dangerous view and the procedure advocated would be an even more dangerous procedure. Would the Assembly give those sweeping powers of recognition and review to nine members chosen at random by the President of the General Assembly, even if confirmed by the Assembly? No single State has the right or power to sit in judgement upon the legitimacy of the Government and officials of another State while performing the routine, *pro forma* duties of a member of the Credentials Committee. It is not the duty of the Credentials Committee to say that it does not like nor does it recognize the Government of, for example, Barbados, or the United Kingdom, or Guinea, or China, or Ecuador, or any Government of any other Member State in this Assembly. That is none of the business of the Credentials Committee. And the Committee is not required to ventilate its likes and dislikes relating to the sending Governments of this Assembly. The only function the Credentials Committee has is to confirm that the signatures on the documents of credentials are the authenticated signatures of the Head of State or Government or the Foreign Minister of each State of this Assembly. Once the Committee has reported that the signatures on the documents of Credentials of delegations are in order, we in the

Assembly should accept those credentials and confirm the report of the Credentials Committee in a positive manner.

64. We are estopped, in the submission of the Barbados delegation, from going beyond the verification of the signatures on the documents of transmittal. We are not entitled to question the legitimacy of any Head of State or Government or Foreign Minister who may have signed the document of credentials. This principle is valid for all States, including the Khmer Republic. That Government has a right to send a delegation and we in this Assembly must confirm that right by accepting the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic.

65. The Credentials Committee was faithful to its mandate in the view of my delegation and acted wisely when it rejected, by a vote of 5 in favour to 3 against, a proposal by the delegation of Senegal to reject the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic. That decision of the Committee, as reflected in paragraph 12 of its report, was consistent with the long traditions of this Assembly. We must equally reject that same amendment now resubmitted by Senegal and a number of other States, inviting us not to accept the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic.

66. The Barbados delegation will vote for the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee and the draft resolution contained therein, and we will oppose the Senegalese amendment. We respectfully exhort members of this Assembly to do likewise.

67. Finally, we have always been at a loss to determine the practical effect of a challenge of the credentials of a State at the end of an Assembly session. If it were the practice of the Credentials Committee to report comprehensively and finally at the beginning of the session, we might perhaps understand the utility of a successful challenge. In any case, the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic are in order. They are valid. We should accept them as purporting to represent only the sovereign State of the Khmer Republic and no other region or dominion beyond this well-defined geographical circumscription.

68. Having made that assertion, the Barbados delegation fraternally and in friendship invites the Powers sponsoring this amendment to withdraw it and rely upon the more solid and persuasive foundation of the other proposal on the report of the Credentials Committee.

69. Mr. ESONO MICA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At this time when the General Assembly is about to approve the second report of the Credentials Committee [A/9179/Add.1], my delegation feels it cannot go along with the recommendation of the Committee, which calls for acceptance of the credentials of the Lon Nol clique.

70. The Assembly for three years has been confronted with false representatives of the Khmer Government, sent here against the will and in violation of the sovereign rights of the Cambodian people. My delegation can state that if we were to admit this clique it would be an anomaly and a flagrant violation of the principles and provisions of the Charter.

71. The valiant people of Cambodia has gone through a gradual process of evolution, the events of which clearly show who are the true sons of the Cambodian people and who are its traitors. We all know that before the coup d'état of 18 March 1970 Cambodia was a free and sovereign State which pursued a policy of peace, friendship and neutrality in defence of its national interests and its true independent development.

72. This policy is respected not only by my Government but also by many other Governments represented here, especially the friends of Cambodia. But the imperialists were not pleased with this policy and sought obstacles to thwart the Cambodian people in its progress in order to carry out their aggressive plans in the Indo-China peninsula and in almost all of South-East Asia.

73. The imperialists used a policy of repression and black-mail and organized plots and provocations until finally they instigated a coup d'état to install their lackeys in Phnom Penh. This inhuman aggression was indignantly condemned by all progressive mankind and by all peace-loving States.

74. Allow me to repeat the words of the President for Life and Chairman of the Central Committee of the Single National Party of Workers of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, His Excellency Don Francisco Macías Nguema Biyogo, who in his speech on 12 October 1968 in Bata, the capital of the province of Río Muni, said:

"Peace is our third emblem. We were born peacefully to independence, and this peace, both domestic and international, is the sign under which our nation was born. We must maintain it at all costs. We are entering the international community with the firm determination to make our contribution to the cause of peace."

75. This is the best testimony I can present to show that the United Nations should redouble its efforts to establish peace in Indo-China. There can be no peace if truth is trampled on. What is truth in this case? The answer is that there is only one Cambodian people, only one people in Cambodia—that people which is led by the United National Front and the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia.

76. It was a great victory for the Cambodian people in their struggle for liberation when at the beginning of May 1970 the National Congress was convened, which led to the formation of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. The formation of this Government, emerging from the United National Front, which unites the broad masses of the Cambodian people, reflects the will and aspirations of the Cambodian people to see the State of Cambodia take its rightful place on the international scene.

77. The United Nations must realize that for the clique of Lon Nol to remain among the legitimate representatives of peoples is an insult to the Organization and seriously affects the prestige and authority of the Organization. We must not lose sight of the fact that the imperialists are doing all they can to prolong this intolerable situation as far as possible.

78. Those are the reasons why we cannot accept the recommendation that the Credentials Committee submits for our consideration. Furthermore, we feel that the prob-

lem of Cambodia is not only a problem for the Cambodian people and is not merely an Asian problem, as certain States have insinuated in document A/9254 of 24 October last.

79. My delegation respects the principle of neighbourhood. We are not opposed to it, because we believe that it is an indelible geographical link, but we do object to the false idea put forward in an attempt to confuse our Assembly, based on the proximity of peoples. It is well known that the worst enemy of man is man, and in fact the worst enemies of Cambodia are its neighbours. That is why we believe that the problem of Cambodia is a problem for all peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples, all peoples which aspire to peace based on true justice and not on violence or contiguity. Our world is now too interdependent to consider that problems like this can remain isolated or concern only those who say they are neighbours or are directly involved in those problems.

80. The support of the Cambodian people for Prince Sihanouk and their commitment to the struggle for the liberation of their country show that the correct and logical answer is that the Cambodian people alone has the right to choose its true responsibilities and decide upon its own destiny.

81. In conclusion, my delegation believes that the Assembly should express the will of the majority of the people of Cambodia by refusing to recognize the credentials of the representatives of a clique that does not represent the true people. If we make amends, even partially, for this injustice we will win for our Organization the prestige it deserves. If we try to evade the issue we shall implicate the United Nations in a denial of justice to that people.

82. On the other hand, my delegation believes it is an anomaly to accept the credentials of the Portuguese delegation as presented. Recently, the Assembly recognized the illegality of the occupation by Portuguese forces of the sovereign and independent territory of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. Now that its independence has been recognized it is somewhat absurd that the Lisbon Government should issue credentials to a national of that country on the pretext that that territory is a so-called overseas province. This Assembly and the Security Council have adopted a number of resolutions condemning the continued presence of Portugal in Africa and recognizing the right of those Territories to self-determination.

83. For those reasons my delegation is opposed to the recommendation of the Credentials Committee that we should accept the credentials of Portugal, as reflected in the annex to the report that the Committee has submitted to the Assembly.

84. We firmly support the amendment in document A/L.720.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked for the floor in order to introduce a subamendment to the amendment in document A/L.719. If there are no objections, I shall now give him the floor.

86. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): It is high time that we put an end to a fruitless protracted debate.

87. I have been thinking seriously for the last two or three days, since hearing that some of our colleagues were going to submit an amendment not dissimilar to the one they submitted at the twenty-fifth session when our illustrious friend Mr. Edvard Hambro was President of the Assembly.

88. I fully sympathized with the sponsors of that amendment regarding South Africa¹. I have never held a brief for South Africa. My interventions in this very Assembly and in the Security Council attest to what I say. But it fell to me during the twenty-fifth session, at about this time of the year, to warn our colleagues that the Credentials Committee had no juridical power to do anything but verify the signatures on documents. In fact, it is an honourific committee; the work of verification is carried out by members of the Secretariat of the Office of Legal Affairs who are familiar with the signatures on credentials documents.

89. After a long and protracted debate we finally had to find a solution so that the emotions that were running high—and rightly so—should be allayed. We worked behind that wall on a formula that satisfied the sponsors of that amendment to the report of the Credentials Committee. Since then, we have dubbed it “the Hambro solution”. I must say that Mr. Stavropoulos, the Legal Counsel, also lent his hand, and everybody was satisfied.

90. I think we are now repeating that debate. The only difference is that the *dramatis personae* are not the same. One day they are South African; one day they are Portuguese; today they are from the Khmer Republic, or Cambodia, as I have known it for many years.

91. In fairness to you all, I can no longer be objective and dispassionate and just listen to an abortive debate.

92. What, I must ask, is the object of this amendment [A/L.719]? To unseat the representatives of the Khmer Republic? I believe this question has been postponed—by a narrow margin, it is true—until the next session, without an opportunity having been given to any of us who thought, perhaps, of a compromise, to take the floor. I think it was a hasty decision. We only delayed the pain till next year and are subjecting the Cambodian people to more suffering and sorrow by the postponement.

93. Now, what is the gist of this amendment? It will not unseat the representatives of the Khmer Republic. But suppose this amendment is carried: it means that all the voting, from the beginning of this session to this very day, should be revised, because by virtue of this amendment the representatives of the Khmer Republic had no right to participate in the vote. Have you weighed the possibility that there were votes that differed, between the affirmative and the negative, by one vote? What will you do about them? Just be practical. Are you willing to give the Secretariat the task of revising all the votes that were cast by the Khmer Republic, should it be decided that it had no right to participate in the voting because its credentials were false, to put it mildly?

94. I have told you time and again that this is a juridical question. Since 1970, I have been telling you that this is a

juridical question that should be referred to the Sixth Committee for a legal opinion, and that then, if the Sixth Committee were divided and gave two opposing opinions, the International Court of Justice could also be asked for an opinion, but only if the two parties accepted—and most likely they would not accept.

95. Therefore, frustrated as some Members find themselves, what do they do? They engage in a political debate, not in a juridical decision.

96. Let us be frank and not vote, as I said, automatically by solidarity, because this United Nations will totter and fall if we follow that system of voting by solidarity. While we bicker over such matters, the Cambodian people suffers. And let me tell you, one thing that concerns me, and that should concern every one of us, is the Cambodian people and the affirmation, first and foremost, that sovereignty resides in the people. I want to save our face in this debate by saying that there not only are two colours, black and white, but a whole gamut of colours. And this is where compromise can be worked out, perhaps to find a fair solution to our predicament. This situation prompted me a few minutes ago to work out a subamendment to the amendment submitted by my good friends—and their number is legion. I did not consult with either party as to what I was going to do lest I be influenced, even subjectively, as to what my duty called upon me to do as one who had spent so many years in the United Nations. The implications of a vote are serious in the sense that it will be ludicrous to any jurist who takes the time to scrutinize it—and this is a juridical matter.

97. Therefore, Mr. President, with your permission, I will read the subamendment to the amendment. First let me read what is to be amended. This document before me, document A/9179/Add.1, reads, in paragraph 29: “Credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly”, and then:

“The General Assembly

“Approves the second report of the Credentials Committee.”

Now, the amendment in document A/L.719 reads: “except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic”.

98. I shall now read to you my subamendment² and explain it forthwith. After “except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic”, kindly insert a comma, followed by: “which should be reconsidered when the General Assembly determines which constituted Government inside Cambodia wields authority over the majority of the Cambodian people”.

99. A group of States tells us that Prince Sihanouk controls 70 or 80 per cent of the territory and I do not know what percentage—60, 70, 80 per cent—of the people. On the other hand, others tell us that the so-called Khmer Rouge are not loyal to Prince Sihanouk. Then a third group tells us that Mr. Lon Nol is still well entrenched in the capital and the loyalty of the Cambodian people is to him.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 3, document A/L.608/Rev.1 and Add.1.

² Subsequently circulated as document A/L.722.

100. Now, how can we decide? Whom are people like me and, I believe, many of you to believe? If we believe one, it means we are saying that the others are misrepresenting the facts—and we have no right to say that. This does not mean we should content ourselves with the *status quo*, because in fact there is a civil war in Cambodia.

101. As an adjunct to the subamendment, I should like to read from this podium a draft resolution which I will not submit for the vote but which I hope will be one of the documents that will be considered by those who will be seized directly of this question, because I believe it would have been a fair compromise. It will be better to read it than to ad lib on all kinds of situations that may arise, were we to be hasty and vote for an amendment which could really involve us in trouble.

102. I have been approached by good friends who are in the Government of Prince Sihanouk. One gentleman wrote to me whom I had known as a colleague for many years. Of course, some of you might say "He is a politician and is giving you Prince Sihanouk's side of the whole question". On the other hand, I have also had the pleasure of working with some of our Cambodian colleagues who are now with the Lon Nol Government. They also approached me and I had an hour's or an hour and a half's talk with them. In fairness to both parties, my conscience will not allow me to take the side of either. Why? Because the picture is very confused. I think the situation could be clarified. I had intended to submit this draft resolution, if Ambassador Barnes of Liberia had not axed the question of the representation of Cambodia by the procedural *démarche* he took, a few days ago [2191st meeting], and which succeeded by 53 votes to 50. The following text, I think, reflects the situation—and I do hope that it will be taken into account by both Governments, that of Prince Sihanouk on the one hand and that of the Khmer Republic on the other:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that the civil strife in Cambodia has divided the people of that country into conflicting groups with different political persuasions,

"Taking into account that the protracted conflict in Cambodia has assumed the dimensions of civil war and has caused a lot of suffering to the Cambodian people,

"Noting that Cambodia has become the arena in which the interplay of clashing foreign political interests has become clearly evident,

"Mindful of the fact that certain major Powers are still pursuing policies predicated on establishing, maintaining or consolidating spheres of influence to the detriment of the Cambodian people,"

Who can challenge that paragraph? It applies also to what happened in Korea. I shall read it again:

"Mindful of the fact that certain major Powers are still pursuing policies predicated on establishing, maintaining or consolidating spheres of influence to the detriment of the Cambodian people,"

"Affirming that first and foremost sovereignty resides in the people,

"Appeals to Mr. Lon Nol and to Prince Sihanouk to negotiate the formation of a provisional national government with a view ultimately to ascertaining the wishes of the Cambodian people."

103. With such a text, we are being impartial. We, especially the representatives of the small Powers, are perhaps saving the face of Mr. Lon Nol and Prince Sihanouk, because the powerful sometimes need to save face—everywhere, not only in Cambodia. This way neither of them would say "I am the ultimate authority" in that unhappy land. But if they have the welfare of the Cambodian people at heart, they will appoint deputies and in turn the deputies will negotiate, to constitute a temporary government which will ascertain the will of the Cambodian people.

104. But what have you done here? You have postponed the whole question until next year, not thinking for a moment that the price that the Cambodian people will pay will be very high in blood and treasure.

105. That is why, Sir, I ask you to ascertain whether the text I have read out would still be valid as a draft resolution—taking into account, not technicalities, but the welfare of the Cambodian people. But if there are technical difficulties, at least I would have a clear conscience and that text of the draft resolution may, perchance, give both sides a respite to think coolly and to come to some understanding along the lines I suggested, lest we be guilty of contributing inadvertently to the protraction of that struggle which will cost the Cambodian people more suffering.

106. That is why, Sir, I ask you, and I beg my colleagues, forgiveness if I have spoken at such length because it is high time that we should take a decision on my subamendment which has priority in the voting.

107. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): Having studied the second report of the Credentials Committee in document A/9179/Add.1, my delegation must record its strong opposition with regard to the acceptance of the credentials of the so-called Khmer Republic and the Fascist Government of Portugal.

108. My delegation's opposition in the case of those who claim to represent Cambodia stems from the fact that the presence in the United Nations of the representatives of the Lon Nol régime has already been challenged in the General Assembly early this month. It has been sufficiently demonstrated during the debate in the General Assembly on 4 and 5 December [2188-2191st meetings] that the Lon Nol régime does not represent the legitimate Government of the people of Cambodia since it was installed as a puppet Government by the United States of America to serve imperialist designs. My delegation wishes to reiterate its firm conviction that the Royal Government of National Union, led by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, is the only legitimate Government in that country.

109. In these circumstances, my delegation must register its profound regret that the Credentials Committee has accepted the credentials of a puppet régime as the legitimate representative of the people of Cambodia, particularly at a time when the General Assembly, taking into account the

strong opposition to the recognition of the Lon Nol régime, has decided to postpone till next year the debate on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia.

110. For this reason my delegation has lent its sponsorship to the amendment [A/L.719] to the draft resolution in the second report of the Credentials Committee in document A/9179/Add.1.

111. With regard to the credentials of Portugal, my delegation fully endorses the views expressed by the representative of Senegal in paragraph 14 of the report. The credentials of the Portuguese delegation to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly [A/9179/Add.1, annex] is a document which holds the absolute record for absurdity. It lists, among others, four persons designated as advisers to the delegation, two as being members of the Legislative Assembly of the "Portuguese State of Mozambique"; the third, as being the Chief of the Office of Provincial Credit and Securities Inspection of the "Portuguese State of Angola"; and the fourth, as being a Director in the "Province of Guinea".

112. Thus, we go back to the mythical nature of the Portuguese Government's claim that the African Territories under its fascist domination are an extension of Portugal in Africa, a claim which we have often denounced as absurd and illegitimate, and which is based solely on falsehood and decadent colonial theory.

113. In this connexion, I must, on behalf of my delegation also take issue with the contents of paragraph 21 of the report wherein the Legal Counsel of the United Nations is reported as saying, among other things, that:

"... delegations to the General Assembly had, in the past, often included members of a nationality other than that of the State in question and that that practice had never been challenged by the General Assembly." [A/9179/Add.1, para. 21.]

But that is not the question in dispute here. The credentials of the Portuguese delegation speak of persons from the Portuguese State of Mozambique and Angola, and the implication is quite clear. The persons in question do not belong, according to the Portuguese, to the category of members which the Legal Counsel spoke about in paragraph 21.

114. In approving the second report of the Credentials Committee and its recommendations as presented, the General Assembly would endorse the Portuguese claim that Mozambique and Angola, and even the independent State of Guinea-Bissau, are integral parts of Portugal. It will, I am sure, be recalled that speaking before the plenary meeting during the general debate of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on 2 October 1972, the Foreign Minister of Portugal claimed that the United Nations had already recognized the precept of Portuguese overseas provinces. More precisely, he said:

"Having admitted Portugal to membership, the United Nations recognized the territorial composition of the Portuguese State, as well as the constitutional statute of all its integral parts."³

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh session, Plenary Meetings*, 2048th meeting, para. 38.

115. The whole tragedy lies here, it is borne out of this ridiculous, absurd and untenable claim. In refuting the Portuguese Foreign Minister's ridiculous and absurd claim, my delegation stated before the General Assembly on 19 October 1972 that:

"We maintain that this claim is based upon the so-called right of conquest of the past centuries and was established by force. But force does not and cannot—and never will—create right. Consequently, it is absurd and inconceivable to pretend that African Territories and peoples are integral parts of a European country... because no laws of usurpation, constitutional amendments or organic laws passed in Portugal can make immense African regions part of continental Europe. Is there anyone in this Assembly who has seen land marked as belonging to Africa on the map of Europe?"⁴

116. In conclusion, it is the view of my delegation that the General Assembly must reject the credentials of the Portuguese delegation in its entirety, in so far as they contain the names of persons purporting to represent Portuguese States in Africa. Because this tricky approach runs counter to the principles of the Charter and to the development of those principles laid down in resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. For this reason, my delegation fully supports the amendment proposed by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Senegal and others [A/L.720] a while ago.

117. As far as the other amendments are concerned, I think that I am rather confused. I did not fully understand what the representative of Saudi Arabia was talking about a while ago when he read out a draft resolution which, in my mind, I felt was perhaps for future consideration and had nothing to do with the debate at hand.

118. Therefore, at this stage, I would refrain from making any comments of endorsement or otherwise with regard to those amendments.

Mr. Boaten (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

119. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): In having to consider the report of the Credentials Committee, the Assembly once again is faced with the problem of Cambodia since the establishment of the validity of the credentials, that is, the representative character of the Khmer delegation, was the central issue of a debate which could not be completed.

120. When we spoke on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations, we argued that the authority of Prince Sihanouk was legitimate under the Constitution and showed that this legitimacy had never been discontinued. The coup d'état of March 1970, which illegally overthrew the Sihanouk régime, was not a manifestation of the will of the people of Cambodia, which had never ceased to show its devotion to Prince Sihanouk and continued to do so even after Prince Sihanouk was removed from power. This coup d'état was instigated and organized

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2067th meeting, para. 29.

by the United States of America, with a view to putting an end to Cambodia's neutrality and bringing that country over to its side in the Viet-Nam war. Prince Sihanouk's crime was to cling to that neutrality despite pressures, threats and attacks directed against Cambodia. By placing its hirelings in positions of authority, the United States involved that country in its war, making Cambodia's territory a new base for aggression against North Viet-Nam and against the patriots in the South. It has been affirmed here that the group which took power at the instigation of the United States was made up of political leaders who were already part of the Sihanouk Government. This by no means implies that constitutional legality is still represented by them, or that given the approval of the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk by a parliament subject to American threats and pressure, what happened in Cambodia was nothing more than a normal operation of internal politics in keeping with the legal provisions of the country's Constitution. No, what happened in Cambodia was something far more serious than that. And the result was that a peaceful, neutral, non-aligned country, as Cambodia was, suddenly became a territory under American domination and participating directly in the American war effort in Viet-Nam.

121. If Lon Nol's men already had political responsibilities before the coup d'état, overnight they repudiated the policy which they were responsible for applying and led their country into the most tragic adventure of its history. If they served Cambodia before the overthrow, all of a sudden they began to serve the United States, and their act is nothing but a betrayal of their country, their people and their leader, Prince Sihanouk. The Cambodian people could not approve such actions whereby their freedom was ended and their dignity was placed in jeopardy. The people of Cambodia have proved this by remaining faithful to Prince Sihanouk and by giving him their complete support in the struggle he undertook to liberate the country and to restore therein the constitutional legality which he alone lawfully represents.

122. The victories scored by the Cambodian people under the leadership of the Royal Government of National Union have already made it possible to liberate most of the territory and to weaken day by day the position of the Lon Nol group which now has no authority anywhere outside the city of Phnom Penh.

123. The people of Cambodia were all the more justified in strengthening their attitude in favour of Prince Sihanouk in that the new masters of Phnom Penh proved incapable of governing, because of the prevailing corruption, nepotism and mediocrity that characterized their administration. The economic and social situation of the country is catastrophic. The political situation continues to deteriorate and there has just been a sixth crisis in the space of three years. The so-called Government of Lon Nol has just resigned, thus making even more obvious the instability of the situation created after the coup d'état of March 1970 and revealing the scant faith that can validly be placed in an isolated group torn between the rival ambitions of its members, powerless to exercise an authority owing its survival solely to United States support.

124. What, then, does the delegation which occupies the seat of Cambodia here represent? On whose behalf can it

speak? It has no authority to represent a people which manifestly rejects the Phnom Penh régime and which has confidence only in the Royal Government of National Union. The mandate it holds comes from an isolated group which is disintegrating and writhing in the death throes of a crisis that reveals its original weaknesses.

125. The General Assembly could have given a clear-cut answer to the questions we put to it had it not been for manoeuvres which have regrettably become habitual for certain delegations and which led to the interruption of the debate that was intended to deal with that question.

126. Some chose to shrink from the truth, from the facts which they know as well as we do, perhaps better than we do, but which pose a threat to their interests and lay bare their designs.

127. But today the General Assembly must take a stand. We challenge the credentials of the Khmer delegation and we call upon the General Assembly to consider them null and void. This reply must be given to the Cambodian people, whose struggle and sacrifice call for this decision on our part. This is the reply we must also give to international public opinion, which can only show respect for our Organization in so far as this Organization respects itself by refusing to lend itself to a fiction that discredits it and destroys the confidence that may still be placed in it.

128. The representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroodi, for whom I personally have the greatest respect, a few moments ago submitted a subamendment to our amendment. We are always responsive to any efforts made by Mr. Baroodi to try to maintain harmony among us and to avoid having the General Assembly become a battleground for irreconcilable positions. We listened most carefully to what he said but we believe that a situation cannot be saved by surrounding it by ambiguities or by introducing elements of confusion which, while they may enable us to overcome an immediate difficulty, ultimately complicate the problem, thus rendering its future solution even more delicate.

129. I rather fear that this may be the effect of the subamendment introduced by Mr. Baroodi unless it is clarified somewhat. Thus, when he asks that the decision on the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic be deferred until the General Assembly determines which Government really represents legal authority in Cambodia, we would have to ascertain what is to be the legal status of the credentials, and of the delegation holding them, pending this decision. Will their credentials be considered valid during this interval, or will the General Assembly consider that they are suspended, so that the Cambodian seat would be vacant until such time as the General Assembly decided which was the legitimate Government of Cambodia?

130. Clearly we could not accept the proposal of Mr. Baroodi if it would simply destroy our amendment.

131. On the other hand, and in a spirit of conciliation, we could go along with the proposed subamendment if it were understood that we would thereby suspend the credentials presented by the Khmer delegation and the seat of Cambodia would become vacant and be filled when we determined

the question as to which of the two Governments—the Royal Government of National Union or the Lon Nol Government—genuinely represents legality in Cambodia.

132. If we were to support this alternative view provided it is confirmed by the sponsor and made clear in the text, I think that we would be taking a conciliatory attitude and helping the Assembly not to take cold-blooded action on a burning issue and to postpone any decision without prejudging the issue, until it has had a substantive discussion on the problem.

133. Our attitude will therefore be governed both by the explanations to be given by the sponsor of the sub-amendment and by any amendments to the text itself which may be introduced to make the meaning clear.

Mr. Martínez Ordóñez (Honduras), Vice-President, resumed the Chair.

134. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): During the discussions in the Credentials Committee the Chinese representative pointed out that it is entirely illegal for the Lon Nol clique to usurp the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations. The credentials of the representatives of the Lon Nol clique are completely null and void.

135. The sole genuine and lawful representative of Cambodia is the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of Head of State Prince Norodom Sihanouk. In its speech during the debate at the plenary meeting on 4 December 1973 [2188th meeting], the Chinese delegation already stated its position on the Cambodian question in an all-round way, and I will not repeat it here. However, when the debate at the plenary meeting was under way with many more speakers on the list, some people, resorting to machination and a sneak attack, forced the Assembly to vote hastily on a "point of order", thus postponing the discussions of the item "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations" to the next session by a narrow margin of 52 to 50. This is utterly unreasonable and only shows that they have a guilty conscience, fearing an open and fair debate at the plenary meeting and a vote on the 33-nation draft resolution. If truth were on their side, why should they be afraid of the debate? Why should they suddenly move for a postponement in wilful distortion of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and force the Assembly to vote on it hastily when the sponsors of the item were not all present? It is no doubt a pipe-dream to imagine that by such most dishonourable means the Lon Nol clique can be saved from its doomed defeat and enabled to usurp for ever the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations.

136. Turning the truth upside down and confusing right and wrong, the United States representative, in his speech of 5 December [2190th meeting], even described the question of restoring the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations as one "to support great-Power hegemony in Asia", "interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States", and so on and so forth. This is fantastic indeed. Are not these labels more fitting for United States imperialism? It is known to all what the United States had done in Cambodia. Who is it that

subverted the legal Government of Cambodia by taking advantage of Prince Sihanouk's absence from the country? Who is it that carried out flagrant armed invasion and wanton bombing of Cambodia? Who is it that up till now is sparing no expense to prop up the tottering traitorous Lon Nol clique? If you really had no intention of seeking hegemony in Asia, you should not have obstructed the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations and would not have clung fast to the Lon Nol clique, a political corpse.

137. Some have also asserted that the views of some of the neighbours of Cambodia and the principle of self-determination by the Cambodian people should be respected. It is utterly illogical to speak of the neighbours of Cambodia. Why should the problem of one country hinge on the attitude of its few neighbours? Now this is the United Nations and not a kind of regional treaty group, not to mention the fact that everyone knows what kind of role some of Cambodia's neighbours have played in the United States aggression against Indo-China, including Cambodia. As far as the Cambodian people are concerned, they have long made the choice. They firmly support the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. They have won increasingly great victories in their just punitive actions against the Lon Nol clique. They are supported not only by the people of its surrounding countries but also by the people of the rest of the world, including the American people. It is an irresistible general trend which no force on earth can stop that the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations will be restored and the Lon Nol clique will be expelled from the United Nations and all its related bodies.

138. The Chinese delegation reaffirms that the traitorous Lon Nol clique is not qualified at all to represent Cambodia and that the credentials of the representatives of the Lon Nol clique are completely illegal and null and void. The Chinese delegation recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the amendment to the report of the Credentials Committee put forward by the representative of Senegal on behalf of the 33 sponsors [A/L.719].

139. Here we must also point out that in the credentials of the Portuguese representatives Angola and Mozambique appear in the list of names as two states of Portugal and the Republic of Guinea-Bissau that has attained independence is even listed as a province of Portugal. This is most absurd and intolerable.

140. As everyone knows, Angola has always belonged to the people of Angola, Mozambique to the people of Mozambique, and Portugal is simply an aggressor from Europe. It must unconditionally withdraw from these regions. We would also like to remind you all that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States in 1960 [resolution 1514 (XV)] once again reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola and Mozambique to national independence and self-determination. This fully proves the report of the Credentials Committee to be in total contravention of the related resolution of the United Nations General Assembly.

141. Through many years of arduous fight, the heroic people of Guinea-Bissau have proclaimed their independence and founded the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. Up till now it has been recognized by more than 70 countries. Not long ago the General Assembly adopted a resolution confirming the Republic of Guinea-Bissau as an independent State [*resolution 3061 (XXVIII)*] and denouncing the continued occupation of certain sectors of the territory of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau by Portuguese colonialism as naked aggression against that State. Approval of the report of the Credentials Committee on this question would be tantamount to utilizing the United Nations itself to nullify the resolution adopted not long ago by the General Assembly. One may ask, In what position will the United Nations find itself? And what will be left of the General Assembly resolution?

142. The Chinese delegation solemnly states that we are firmly against the report of the Credentials Committee and holds that the amendment put forward by the representatives of Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania in this connexion is not only very reasonable but also reflects the strong desire of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations. We firmly support the amendment.

143. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Haiti to speak on a point of order.

144. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation moves that the Assembly adjourn the meeting because of the late hour and the number and complexity of the amendments and subamendments which were only circulated a few minutes ago.

145. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before putting to the Assembly the representative of Haiti's motion for the adjournment of this meeting, I must clarify two points: first, there are still 10 speakers on the list and a few others who wish to explain their vote before the voting. It is now 6.45 p.m; secondly, if we adjourn this meeting it will be necessary to have a General Assembly plenary meeting on Saturday or on Monday evening in order to complete our work. The representative of Haiti has formally moved the adjournment of the meeting. That has to be put to the vote immediately.

The motion was adopted by 50 votes to 46, with 22 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.