



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 46 and 108: Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (<i>concluded</i>) Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed countries and the developing countries (<i>concluded</i>) Report of the Second Committee	1
Agenda item 105: Convocation of a world food conference under the auspices of the United Nations (<i>concluded</i>) Report of the Second Committee	2
Agenda item 3: Credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (<i>concluded</i>): (b) Report of the Credentials Committee	4
Agenda item 10: Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization	18
Agenda item 14: Report of the International Court of Justice	18
Agenda item 28: Appointment of the members of the Peace Observation Commission	19

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Ibingira (Uganda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 AND 108

Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (*concluded*)
Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed countries and the developing countries (*concluded*)

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/9401)

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Second Committee.

1. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 20 of its report [A/9401]. Those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting will be allowed to do so after the votes on all the draft resolutions have been taken.

2. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland): I should like to make a brief explanation of vote in relation to draft resolution I in the report of the Second Committee.

3. I take great pleasure in confirming to the Assembly that the Government of Finland has withdrawn its reservation with respect to the proposed establishment of a link between new allocations of special drawing rights and additional development financing. In so doing my Government would nevertheless stress that as the special drawing rights are to become the principal reserve asset their use for development purposes should be in conformity with their basic monetary function. The withdrawal of the reservation of my Government should be interpreted as an indication of a genuine desire on its part to contribute towards achieving the goals and objectives laid down in the International Development Strategy.

4. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 20 of its report [A/9401].

5. Draft resolution I, entitled "First biennial over-all review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade", was adopted in the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 3176 (XXVIII)).

6. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Economic co-operation among developing countries". In the Committee that draft resolution too was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution II?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 3177 (XXVIII)).

7. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Preparations for the mid-term review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade". The Second Committee adopted this draft resolution also without a vote. May I take it that draft resolution III is adopted by the General Assembly?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 3178 (XXVIII)).

8. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution IV, entitled "Quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development". In the Committee the draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution IV?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 3179 (XXVIII)).

9. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the Second Committee in paragraph 21 of its report. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the recommendation to defer consideration of agenda item 108 until the twenty-ninth session?

The recommendation was adopted.

10. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

11. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria) (*translation from Russian*): I have already had an opportunity in the Second Committee, speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Bulgaria, to make some comments on the draft resolution on the quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development. That draft, which appears as draft resolution IV in document A/9401, has now become a resolution. [*Resolution 3179 (XXVIII)*.]

12. On this occasion I should like briefly to repeat those comments. We have certain reservations on this resolution, since it does not make a clear distinction between the capitalist and the socialist countries regarding responsibility for the scientific and technological backwardness of the developing countries. The delegations of the socialist countries consider that this is an unjustified approach and cannot agree with it, since it is well known that the socialist countries historically bear no responsibility for the scientific and technological backwardness of the developing countries.

13. In this connexion, I should also like to recall the position of the socialist countries on the question of quantitative targets. In document A/9389, it is stated, *inter alia*, that:

“The socialist countries believe that such an approach in respect of them is objectively equivalent to consigning to oblivion the entire centuries’ long historical stage of colonial rule and exploitation, the responsibility of the colonial Powers for the present difficult position of the developing countries and the current policy of neo-colonialism being pursued against the developing countries as a form of economic oppression. The developing countries have the incontestable right to receive compensation for material damage from the colonial Powers and also from capitalist States which have exploited and continue to exploit the human and natural resources of the developing countries.” [*See A/9389, annex.*]

From the viewpoint of the socialist countries, the priority given to the formulation of quantitative targets at the second session of the Committee on Science and Technology will once again distract the Committee from its main tasks and will also cause unnecessary duplication of the work of the Committee on Review and Appraisal of the Second Development Decade.

14. For the foregoing reasons, the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR

and the USSR, as well as Bulgaria, would have abstained if draft resolution IV in document A/9401 had been put to a vote.

15. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom): For the sake of the completeness of the records of the Assembly, may I say, on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation and all other delegations concerned, that various statements of interpretation and reservation regarding draft resolution I are to be found in the summary records of the Second Committee.¹ These statements—at least in the case of my own delegation, but also, I am sure, in the case of others—remain valid.

AGENDA ITEM 105

Convocation of a world food conference under the auspices of the United Nations (*concluded*)

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/9403)

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Second Committee.

16. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 5 of its report [A/9403]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9459. Since the draft resolution was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote, may I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to adopt it?

The Draft resolution was adopted (resolution 3180 (XXVIII)).

17. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

18. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): I wish to express the appreciation of my Government for the co-operation of all members who have contributed their time and their ideas to the consideration of plans for the World Food Conference. It is a credit to the United Nations system that in the short time since this matter was proposed to the General Assembly in late September it has been reviewed and approved at the seventeenth General Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, by the Economic and Social Council, by the Second Committee and now by the General Assembly.

19. My Government takes satisfaction in the events leading to the adoption by the General Assembly of the draft resolution calling for the convening of a World Food Conference. The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Kissinger, called attention to the pressing nature of the problem in his statement to the General Assembly on 24 September when he said:

“The growing threat to the world’s food supply deserves the urgent attention of this Assembly. Since 1969, global consumption of cereals has risen more rapidly than production; stocks are at the lowest levels in years. We now face the prospect that, even with bumper crops, the world may not rebuild its seriously depleted reserves in this decade”. [*2124th meeting, para. 70.*]

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Second Committee, 1580th to 1583rd meetings.*

20. My Government believes that a World Food Conference can significantly assist the world community in meeting this challenge, which is one of global proportions. The purpose of the Conference, as we and many other representatives here have noted, would be to explore the means to maintain adequate food supplies in the face of rising world demand and to prevent hunger and malnutrition resulting from national disasters. The Conference will offer an opportunity to agree on principles which would be applicable to all Governments in this effort.

21. The United States proposal for a World Food Conference is fully consistent with the multilateral trade negotiations just now beginning. We believe that they are complementary. Questions of trade and of the supply and demand for food are highly interrelated. On the one hand, we hope to see the multilateral trade negotiations reaching agreement on specific commitments by countries to deal with all the factors that underlie trade distortions and trade in agricultural products specifically.

22. My Government sees the World Food Conference, on the other hand, not as a negotiating forum for agricultural trade issues but as an opportunity for arriving at generally accepted principles and objectives in the agricultural field which can facilitate negotiations at other international meetings.

23. Turning to the preparations for the Conference, we are pleased to note that there is general agreement that the Conference should be preceded by a careful analysis of factors directly relevant to the food situation. In our view, this review should include assessment of the demand and supply outlook, the projected pace of technological change and the prospects of the developing countries for improving their food production both for their own domestic consumption and for export. We believe that this type of information will provide an essential basis for effective planning by the international community.

24. It is generally recognized that increasing food production in developing countries is a fundamental requirement if we are to ensure long-term world food security. Increasing food production, as many representatives have pointed out, involves a vast range of agricultural, trade and developmental issues—issues that often transcend the strictly agricultural fields. A single conference could not possibly reach useful decisions on all these questions. Accordingly we believe the World Food Conference must concentrate on a few key issues where improved international co-operation can reasonably be expected to produce substantial results quickly.

25. For example, one means of increasing food availabilities within a relatively short time in the developing countries lies in devising more effective measures to prevent the large crop losses which regularly occur as a result of pests, plant diseases and inadequate storage facilities.

26. Another measure on which work is already being done is the maintenance of adequate stocks of food to enable the world to cope effectively with shortfalls in production as well as with surges in demand. The World Food Conference may wish to build on the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO] in

this field by developing a set of principles that would define the responsibilities of all countries for the maintenance of adequate food stocks. In this connexion, attention should also be paid to the role of independently held commercial stocks as an important part of world food reserves.

27. In addition to food reserves, the United States believes that food aid and disaster relief are areas that would benefit from improved international co-operation and co-ordination. Guidelines for both donor and recipient nations should be worked out that will ensure that food aid is used as effectively as possible both to meet disaster relief needs and to encourage agricultural productivity.

28. The United States believes that the nations of the world have in the World Food Conference a unique opportunity to rededicate themselves to the goal of providing sufficient food for all the world's people, a goal which, as Mr. Kissinger said on 24 September [2124th meeting], is an essential element and indeed a prerequisite for the kind of world community we are all seeking.

29. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy): My delegation gladly joined in the consensus on the draft resolution just approved. I have asked for permission to come to the rostrum also to reiterate to the General Assembly the expression of my Government's deep interest in all questions concerning the world food situation, as we share the concern of all countries, in particular of the developing countries, for the present state of this crucial problem.

30. I should like also to confirm the welcome extended by the Government of Italy to all the States and international organizations that will meet in Rome in 1974 to attend the World Food Conference. Italy will gladly act as host to and participate in the work of this Conference.

31. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The arduous consultations which made it possible for the Second Committee to come up with an excellent resolution reflecting the recommendations of the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers from 5 to 9 September 1973, on a conference to deal with food problems to be sponsored jointly by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, proved, if there were need to do so, the desire of the international community to reach final solutions which will save us from any threats of food shortages and famine.

32. We hope that the spirit of co-operation which marked those consultations will continue to prevail in the preparations for that Conference, which is to take up food problems in the broader context of development, and this has been confirmed by most of the developing countries themselves. We consider that the participation of all the organizations in the United Nations family should be ensured, particularly that of FAO and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which are to play cardinal roles in preparing for the Conference. The success of the Conference is firstly rooted in the political will of the developed countries to take the necessary steps and identify the ways and means which will respond to the vital needs of the countries of the third world, which are the most vulnerable in this connexion.

ion. This, of course, does not preclude essential efforts also being made by the developing countries themselves.

33. In connexion with participation in the Conference, we should like to reaffirm what we said in the Second Committee, that is, that the Conference should be open to all States members of the international community through the authentic representatives of their peoples.

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

AGENDA ITEM 3

Credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (concluded):*

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In connexion with part II of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/9179/Add.1], two amendments [A/L.719 and A/L.720] and a subamendment [A/L.722] have been submitted.

35. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): When I addressed the Assembly on 13 December [2200th meeting] introducing the amendment in document A/L.720, I stated that the sponsors of our amendment were hopeful and confident that it would receive the overwhelming support of the membership of the Assembly. Our confidence and hope were and are still based on the justice of the cause which most of us in this Organization espouse, the cause of freedom and human dignity of the people of Angola and Mozambique.

36. Since introducing our amendment we have had consultations with numerous delegations, particularly those which, while sympathizing and identifying with our cause, had some reservations or difficulties with respect to certain wording in our draft. Our Caribbean friends, whose commitment and dedication to the cause of decolonization is known to us all and respected and admired especially by the sponsors of our amendment, have been particularly actively involved in these consultations. Indeed, it is in response to their initiative, based on the consultations with several of our friends from Latin America, that the delegations of the Congo, Guinea, Madagascar, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania—the sponsors of the amendment in document A/L.720—now wish to introduce a revised draft amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

“Insert the following paragraph as section I of the draft resolution:

“ ‘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 that they do not represent the Portuguese dominated Territories of Angola and Mozambique nor could they represent Guinea-Bissau, which is an independent State.’ ”

* Resumed from the 2200th meeting.

37. In presenting this revised amendment it is our sincere hope that those who support the right of the African peoples of Angola and Mozambique to self-determination and independence, and who rightly refused to allow themselves to be parties to the indulgence in day-dreaming of the Fascist authorities of Lisbon, will support this amendment. We particularly hope for the unequivocal support of our friends from Latin America.

38. Finally, on behalf of the sponsors, which include my own delegation, I wish to express our thanks and appreciation to our friends and brothers of the Caribbean who have been active in attempts to find a formula which will command the widest possible support in this Assembly. Naturally, I sincerely trust that their efforts, as well as our own, in this context will not have been in vain.

39. Mr. KANTÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): We note from the second part of the report on the validity of the credentials of delegations to the twenty-eighth session, which is before us today for consideration, that the portion regarding the alleged mandate of the representatives of the puppets of Phnom Penh was adopted in the Committee by only five votes to four.

40. This is in itself a significant fact which cannot be overlooked by our Assembly, whose task it is at the end of the debate to take a decision on this document. In point of fact, the meagre majority by which the proposal of the United States of America was carried in the Committee indicates that the representative nature of the treacherous clique of Lon Nol, Sirik Matak, Cheng Heng and In Tam is strongly contested.

41. Furthermore, the very fact that it was by a very insignificant majority also that, on 5 December last, our Assembly, as a result of the manoeuvres and pressures exercised by certain Powers, referred the discussion of agenda item 106 on the same subject to the twenty-ninth session. And although the promoters and inspirers of the point of order designed to distract us were at pains to take the General Assembly unaware, the draft was adopted by only 52 votes to 50.

42. My delegation still wonders whether this blatant manoeuvre, which was inspired by the fear of seeing exposed the whole truth about the grim war imposed on the Khmer people, would not further ruin the moral authority of our Organization.

43. How can we honestly speak of the frustration of the United Nations in the case of the recent developments in the settlement of the Middle East crisis at a time when the international Organization itself is shirking its responsibilities on the Cambodian question? How can we really blame the super Powers for wishing to place the world under their domination when the Organization is invariably and insidiously urged to disqualify itself in international affairs? Is it not said that nature itself abhors a vacuum? How can we claim any role at all on the world scene for our Organization, such as is described in the Charter, when it is being encouraged to resign and abdicate? How can we sincerely speak of strengthening the role of the United Nations when efforts are being made to strip it of its prerogatives? And, finally, how can we require Member States to turn to the

United Nations for settlement of their disputes when they contrive to denature it completely and to reduce it to impotence in its primary mission, namely, the safeguarding and maintenance of peace.

44. These are contradictions which are irreconcilable with the lofty mission of our Organization. We have to determine whether or not we wish to be the arbiters of humanity in the sense of the Charter and also in the interests of our peoples. We must show that we are sufficiently committed to and possessed of the political will to carry out the peaceful mission of our Organization. We should not wait until our own interests are affected or until our own national pride is jeopardized to rise up in rebellion against unjust situations which we ourselves have helped to create.

45. The deferment of the Cambodian question until the next session has at least revealed that our actions are flagrantly out of step with our affirmations and proclamations of adherence to the Charter. It constitutes a reward to the imperialist aggressors and a grave injustice to the Khmer people. We bear towards humanity, which has given us our mandate, the responsibility for prolonging the agony of that people.

46. In fact, discussion of the Cambodian question, whatever its outcome, would have had the advantage of breaking the guilty silence of our Organization on one of the most serious threats to international peace and security of our time. Deprived of the passive stance of our Organization, which constitutes the trump card of their diabolical strategy, the aggressors against the Khmer people, and their puppets, would undoubtedly have sought to put an end to their criminal adventure.

47. However, it is not too late for us to redeem ourselves. Our consideration of the second report of the Credentials Committee on the credentials of representatives to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly gives us an opportunity to do this.

48. The fact that we have with us representatives of the Phnom Penh usurpers implicates our Organization in the Cambodian crisis. It confers a semblance of legality on their envoys. This tacit support which we continue to give to such an illegal régime is on the way to becoming guilty complicity to the extent that we are not unaware of the fact that the Lon Nol clique is repudiated by the Cambodian people itself. The liberation by the Khmer resistance, directed by its historic leader, His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, of 90 per cent of Cambodian territory, in which 80 per cent of the population live, gives a resounding rebuttal to all the noisy propaganda which has been organized by the henchmen of the Phnom Penh puppets.

49. In rejecting in this way the self-styled credentials of the representatives of the so-called Khmer Republic, we will absolve our Organization and will in this way hasten the solution of the distressing Cambodian crisis. In fact, beaten on the battlefield and deprived of legitimate recognition by our Organization, all that would be left for the Phnom Penh usurpers to do would be to renounce their criminal undertaking and resolve to join their crony General Lon Nol, in the luxurious exile which their imperialist masters will no doubt prepare for them. A most serious crisis, whose

developments daily threaten international security, will thus end and this will be the greatest service which we can render to the cause of peace and to the Khmer people. Rid of their aggressors and of their Trojan horses, the Khmer people will be able freely to take charge of their destiny.

50. We have thus the choice between, on the one hand, a people whose only aspiration is to peace, and, on the other, aggressive and predatory imperialism. We cannot of course invoke the Charter and its lofty ideals and continue to identify ourselves with the imperialist and colonialist forces and their lackeys. The Khmer people made its choice, immediately after the anti-national coup d'état of 18 March 1970, by rallying round its historic leader in the United National Front of Kampuchea to punish the traitors to the fatherland.

51. Today, the alleged Phnom Penh régime is in complete disarray. In Tam, the pseudo-Prime Minister, who undoubtedly still has his lucid moments, has just resigned from the Government and the so-called High Council, thus ushering in the sixth crisis within the usurping clique. Does not Lon Nol himself, a superstitious person, accuse his own anti-constitutional administration, which scarcely controls Phnom Penh and its environs, of immobility and corruption? In this connexion, let us recall the sensational seizure made at the Paris airport last month by customs officers from his sister-in-law, who was setting out into exile—that is, the wife of his corrupt brother, General Lon Nol, of evil memory.

52. What remains of the famous High Council, or in other words the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak-Cheng Heng triumvirate—is now at bay. Cornered in Phnom Penh, which is no more than a rat hole as far as they are concerned, the traitors anxiously await the end of their criminal adventure and their punishment. The tremendous material and financial means which their imperialist masters daily lavish on them cannot save them because the victory of the Khmer people, which is struggling for its national salvation, is inexorable. On 19 November last, the bombing of the residence of Lon Nol at Phnom Penh, which was the second attack perpetrated against him within the space of eight months by officers of his air force, drew this reaction from the pro-Government Saigon paper, *But Thep*:

“The United States should remember that, if it wishes to help Cambodia to become stable but continues to support a leader who has already twice been the target of bombings, the situation in that country will always remain troubled. Incapable of directing a country at war, Lon Nol is thinking only of maintaining his personal position. Whatever may be the reason for this attack, Lon Nol has revealed himself to be unworthy”.

That statement, which sounds like a verdict, cannot be questioned because it comes from one of the privileged allies of the Phnom Penh puppets. Did not Lon Nol himself say on 22 November last, in an interview which he granted to the correspondent of *France Inter* in Phnom Basset: “I am prepared to meet His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk in order to reach a settlement of the Cambodian question”?

53. Does he not thus recognize the unquestionable moral and political authority of the man to whom representation

in Cambodia has more than once been denied by him and his masters? The downfall of the treacherous clique of Lon Nol marks the bankruptcy not only of the criminal and anti-national enterprises of Phnom Penh, but also the breakdown of the infamous formula of replacement, that is, the formula of a triumvirate government which their masters simply drew out of their pouch.

54. The survival of the puppet régime of Phnom Penh depends much more on our vote this afternoon than on the immense material and financial support which it receives from its masters—in other words, on the choice that we are now going to make will depend whether hostilities in Cambodia continue or cease. Our Assembly cannot become responsible for uselessly protracting the list of the victims of the crisis of the Indo-Chinese peninsula. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that this region occupies a privileged strategic position for the control of the China Sea, and that its potentialities are tremendous and are the subject of insatiable greed.

55. It may further be feared that the energy crisis throughout the world and the overheating of the international atmosphere, the excessive excitement which has been created in certain imperialist circles, may well lead us to a new explosion in the Indo-Chinese peninsula redolent of the adventure of the Gulf of Tonkin, which was the beginning, in February 1965, of the last escalation of the Viet-Nameese war, the most lethal and devastating of all. The aggression which is continuing in Cambodia and in Viet-Nam against the peoples of those countries might well provide an opportunity for this. At any rate, they are a sufficient charge to ignite all of South-East Asia. As far as the detonator is concerned, the pretext, it would be very easy to find one, as you must be aware.

56. It is for that reason that we continue to believe that the Cambodian crisis is not merely a domestic affair but a problem which, because of its dimension and its repercussions and developments, must be of concern to the entire community of nations. It is much more the subject of Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter than of Article 2, paragraph 7, which is so frequently invoked in order to undermine our Organization, because it is a question of war and peace in Cambodia. Furthermore, according to the Charter, disputes are considered as being matters which belong to the exclusive jurisdiction of States when they cannot bring about disagreement among nations or when their persistence does not involve threats to the maintenance of international peace and security.

57. Is the Cambodian crisis this kind of dispute? Undoubtedly not, because it is the result of imperialist foreign aggression against the Cambodian people, with the purpose of imposing upon it a policy which runs contrary to its ethos and to its profound aspirations. Consequently, it becomes an international affair, the settlement of which cannot be left simply to the countries in the South-East Asian region, some of which undoubtedly are disqualified to begin with because of their participation in the aggression through the South-East Asia Treaty Organization or because of their passivity in connexion with the crisis which afflicts this part of the world for more than a quarter of a century.

58. The United Nations is authorized to deal with this matter and it derives this right from Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter. It is not, therefore, a question of our Assembly today simply verifying the validity of the mandates or credentials given to delegations in accordance with rule 27 of our rules of procedure, but, rather, of safeguarding peace by barring the road to warmongers and by restoring the authority and the prerogatives of our Organization in settling the vital problems of our society by preventing it from sliding towards its final failure—in other words, to forearm ourselves against the *Diktat* of those Powers that are imbued with the idea of hegemony which can be seen on the horizon.

59. The support of the cause of Cambodian resistance is in accordance with history and the mandate which we derive from the Charter. No juridical argument could justify any support for the opposite position. The stakes are high and I am sure that our Assembly will be fully aware of that.

60. The second point my delegation would like to make will be to explain its position regarding the alleged credentials of the representatives of the fascist Government of Lisbon. We note with some indignation the presence in the Portuguese delegation of nationals from the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the Territories under colonial domination—Mozambique and Angola. As we can see, not content with continually rendering ineffective the decisions of our Organization in Non-Self-Governing Territories placed under its administration, Caetano's Government flouts us and holds our august Assembly up to derision. Furthermore, the incorporation in the national delegation of Portugal of foreign nationals or, rather, turncoats, constitutes in itself a counterfeiting and a use of counterfeits, reprehensible in any case and particularly in the case of Portugal. We have here abundant proof that the Government of Lisbon is not fulfilling the criterion of honour required of a Member State of our Organization.

61. Therefore, this opportunity should be seized, not only to reject the credentials of the representatives of Portugal in all those parts which refer to the pseudo-representatives from the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the colonies of Angola and Mozambique, but also firmly to condemn the felonious act which the Government of that country has committed.

62. Mr. NAÇO (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania supports the amendment in document A/L.719 which was introduced here by the representative of Senegal on behalf of 33 sponsors, one of which is my own country. The intention of the amendment is to correct the decision of the Credentials Committee which this year again, at this session of the General Assembly of our Organization, has submitted a report in which it recognizes as valid the so-called credentials of the representatives of the Lon Nol clique who represent nothing and who illegally claim to represent Cambodia at the United Nations.

63. The delegation of Albania has forcefully and repeatedly emphasized that only the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, which is the result of the united national front, is entitled and able to represent Cam-

bodia at the United Nations and to carry out the tasks entrusted to this Organization under the Charter on behalf of that Member State.

64. No one can challenge this very clear reality. At present, 90 per cent of the territory, comprising 80 per cent of the population, is under the administration of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia which is installed and is active within the country, where it organizes and directs the life of the country over almost all of the Cambodian territory, devoting itself completely to the attainment of the noble aspirations of the people of Cambodia to be free and independent.

65. The four-year occupation of the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations by the representatives of the Lon Nol clique, that group of traitors to the Cambodian people, is the direct consequence of the imperialist policy of the United States of America, which fomented the coup d'état and illegally installed the Lon Nol clique in Phnom Penh and now maintains it, granting it all necessary political, military and economic aid, even here at the United Nations, in addition to doing everything in its power to prolong this abnormal situation prevailing at the United Nations. Thus in the course of the debate begun at this session of the General Assembly on the item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations", in order to have its representatives recognized as the only legitimate representatives of Cambodia, the United States and its followers, going against the will of the Cambodian people, organized behind-the-scenes manoeuvres designed to defer debate on this question and perpetuate the usurpation of the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations by the bankrupt Lon Nol clique.

66. On this occasion we cannot fail to underline the attitude of the Soviet Union in this regard. From the very outset, it opposed the national liberation struggle of the Cambodian people and maintained normal relations with the Lon Nol clique until it became clear that it was facing its inevitable end.

67. The Albanian delegation considers it necessary to emphasize that even the unjust decision of the Credentials Committee submitted to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, recognizing the credentials of agents of the Lon Nol clique, can be considered only as a new attempt of the United States and its followers to prolong the usurpation of the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations by the bankrupt Lon Nol clique. This is in flagrant contradiction to the sovereign rights of the Cambodian people and seriously harms the prestige of our Organization.

68. It is not difficult to prove the absurdity of the United States claim that the Cambodian people should be represented here by a clique of traitors who are detested by and isolated from the Cambodian people, which indignantly condemned the March 1970 coup d'état and have never accepted the power of the reactionary Phnom Penh group. For four years the Cambodian people have been waging an heroic struggle for national liberation, making enormous sacrifices and facing suffering and serious deprivation. The Cambodian people are fully resolved to liberate their homeland, to do away with the Lon Nol clique and to restore

independence, peace and neutrality. The just struggle of the Cambodian people for national liberation and their invincible will to defend their sovereign rights to the end and to have their legitimate representatives in this Organization have won the sympathy and support of all progressive peoples.

69. In the course of the debates during this General Assembly session, a large number of delegations, in condemning the continued United States armed aggression and brutal intervention in the internal affairs of Cambodia, have firmly and rightly expressed themselves in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union headed by the legitimate Chief of State of Cambodia, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and in favour also of the expulsion of the Lon Nol representatives from the United Nations and all related bodies. That solidarity and support is a source of inspiration to the Cambodian people, and a source of confidence in its final victory. We are convinced that the people of Cambodia and their armed forces of national liberation, under the leadership of the United National Front, will finally do away with the treacherous Lon Nol clique which, hated by and isolated from the people, is beset with serious military, political and economic difficulties.

70. We have often said, and repeat again, that the four-year occupation of the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations by the representatives of the Lon Nol clique is in open contradiction to the will and sovereign rights of the Cambodian people. It is an anomaly and a flagrant violation of the principles and fundamental provisions of the Charter, and compromises the name of the United Nations, as well as its very mission in accordance with the Charter.

71. Our delegation would strongly emphasize once again at this session that we must put an end to this unjust and absurd situation; that we must exclude from the United Nations these puppets in the hands of the United States and in the service of its policy of aggression and war in South-East Asia; and that we should invite here the true representatives of the Cambodian people to occupy their lawful seat, namely, the representatives of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

72. We are convinced that those Member States which hold dear the principles of the Charter will not allow the perpetuation of this situation, but will, on the contrary, fight even more forcefully to put an end to the great injustice being inflicted on the Cambodian people and to remedy the abnormal situation created in the United Nations concerning the representation of Cambodia, and that they will unreservedly support the amendment proposed in document A/L.719.

73. On this occasion, the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania wishes to make known that it fully supports the point of view of the delegations of the African continent regarding the credentials of the representatives of Portugal, and will support the amendment submitted here by the African countries in document A/L.720.

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

75. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Under rule 77 of the rules of procedure, and with my apologies to all the representatives whose names are inscribed on the list, I move the closure of the debate on the item we are discussing. We consider that little time remains to decide the pending problems. We believe that the present matter has been debated at length, that every delegation has its instructions, and that this is an eminently political problem which cannot be decided by any means except by vote. That is why I ask you, Mr. President, to apply rule 77 of the rules of procedure.

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Portugal on a point of order.

77. Mr. PATRÍCIO (Portugal): I should like to object to the proposal of the representative of Tunisia that we should close the debate on this point. My delegation has been attacked during the discussion of this item in the statements of several representatives, who have spoken at length about the credentials of my delegation. I think it would be completely fair to give an opportunity to representatives who have inscribed their names to speak on this item to do so. Otherwise, if a precedent like this is accepted by this Assembly, anything can happen. My delegation objects to this procedure and asks you, Mr. President, for a ruling on the legality of the motion.

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I explain to the General Assembly, in connexion with the proposal by the representative of Tunisia for closure of the debate on the item under discussion, that rule 77 provides that:

“A representative may at any time move the closure of the debate on the item under discussion, whether or not any other representative has signified his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the closure of the debate shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. . .”.

We have already heard the representative of Portugal, who opposes the closure of the debate. Under rule 77, we shall now hear another speaker in opposition before this motion is put to the vote. I call on the representative of India, who wishes to speak against the motion for closure of the debate.

79. Mr. SEN (India): I think what the representative of Tunisia has said is absolutely correct. We have had a long debate; I think the time has come to vote, and everyone knows how he is going to vote. At the same time, I do not like the idea that anyone who wishes to speak on a matter of extreme importance to him or to his country should be prevented from speaking. Therefore, I would suggest a slight amendment to the Tunisian motion saying that all those who have inscribed their names to speak should be limited to two minutes and no more. If they cannot express their views in two minutes, those views are not worth listening to. We know the views of all those who have spoken, and we do not want to deny others the courtesy of saying what they have to say, but they must say it in not more than two minutes and not go over again all that has been said before. Therefore, I would suggest that we accept the motion of the representative of Tunisia with that one little qualification.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Rule 77 of the rules of procedure compels me to follow the procedure that I have already outlined. Anyone who wishes to state his views on the matter under discussion may do so in an explanation of his vote before or after the vote, should the Assembly decide to close the debate. We have heard two speakers opposing the motion to close the debate, and I shall now put that motion to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 88 votes to 6, with 32 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The debate is accordingly closed.

82. The representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to introduce an amendment to his subamendment, and I now call on him.

83. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to speak in order to revise my subamendment in document A/L.722 before it is put to the vote. Some 20 or so representatives have contacted me since my subamendment was submitted last week. They had certain misgivings about the word “determines” in my subamendment—whether the General Assembly would have to go out and determine something. I toyed with using the word “ascertains”, but that is not as strong as “determines”. However, some doubt remained in the minds of certain colleagues whether the word “determines” or “ascertains” might perhaps give the impression that the General Assembly has a duty to find out, by sending a mission or by other means, which constituted government wields authority over the majority of the Cambodian people.

84. After long deliberations with my colleagues, I arrived at a precision to which I think no one would have objected. Members will note that the amendment in document A/L.719 proposes that the following should be added at the end of the draft resolution: “except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic”.

85. Since the debate has been closed, I shall not violate the rules and engage in any explanation. However, you must trust me, Mr. President, when I say that I did my best to amend this subamendment in a way that would be fair and that would reflect exactly what could be done in such difficult circumstances after the whole question had been referred to the next session. Kindly note that according to the subamendment, following the last words of the amendment [A/L.719]—that is, “the Khmer Republic”—the following text would be inserted:

“which”—meaning the credentials—“should be only provisionally accepted until the General Assembly becomes fully aware of which constituted government inside Cambodia wields authority over the majority of the Cambodian people” [A/L.722/Rev.1].

I think that is a fair formula to take us out of the predicament, lest we engage in such tactics as will present us in future with insurmountable difficulties and may set precedents that we may later regret.

86. This is not the general debate; this is in explanation of my subamendment. I warn the Assembly that if it does not

use this formula I shall wash my hands of the United Nations, because it may become quite possible for any one representative or group of representatives to play havoc with the constitutionality of the Organization. Therefore, my colleagues, I want to assure you that the delegation of Saudi Arabia in my person has no axe to grind but is trying to save the face of all of us by this subamendment, the more so because—rightly or wrongly, I do not know—the item concerning which is the constituted Government of Cambodia has been remitted to next year's session, and we have no right to prejudge the question until we are fully aware of which constituted Government inside Cambodia wields authority over the majority of the Cambodian people. And no one can with certainty say it is this or that Government. As the General Assembly, we should become aware of which is the Government—perhaps the *de facto* Government—of all Cambodia or part of it.

87. But sovereignty lies with the people, and, unless we know which constituted Government wields authority over the majority of the people, no one of us here has the right to prejudge the question. It is for the Cambodians themselves to decide their own destiny. It should not be decided by majorities or minorities or by whatever doubtful techniques may be open to us to say that this constituted Government or that constituted Government represents the Cambodian people.

88. Sovereignty lies in the people. Governments are ephemeral. Today they are here, tomorrow they are gone. We representatives of Governments will be in the ditch 20, 30 or 40 years hence, depending on our ages. And we have no right to decide which constituted Government represents Cambodia until we become fully aware—*de facto* more than *de jure*, but, better still, *de facto* and *de jure*—of who constitutes the Government that wields authority over the majority of the Cambodian people.

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before we proceed to the vote, I should like to inform the Assembly of the procedure I intend to follow. I shall first put to the General Assembly for its decision the request for priority in the voting made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania at the 2200th plenary meeting, on 13 December. Depending on the result of the decision the Assembly takes on the question of priority, I shall call upon representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the amendment to which priority has been given, and then we shall vote on that amendment. I shall then call on representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting on that amendment. After the votes and explanations of vote on the amendments and the subamendment, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, amended or not. If there are no objections, that is how we shall proceed.

It was so decided.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the General Assembly for its decision the request that the amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1 be given priority in the voting. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides to vote first on the amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1.

It was so decided.

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1.

92. Mr. ZULETA-TORRES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia will abstain in the vote on the amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1, because we consider that a purely formal study of the credentials of representatives of States Members accredited to the United Nations cannot serve as a pretext for the debate of subjects which, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, should be considered in other forums of the United Nations.

93. Mr. PATRÍCIO (Portugal): My delegation would like to call the attention of the Assembly, in the first place, to the fact that the representative of Tunisia asked for the closure of the debate at the exact moment when my delegation was going to speak. That was an attempt to prevent my delegation from expressing its views, which shows that certain delegations are not at all sure about the reasons on which the amendment regarding the credentials of the Portuguese delegation is based. The amendment proposed by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Senegal and others in document A/L.720, which has now been altered in document A/L.720/Rev.1, to the effect that the General Assembly should accept as valid the credentials of the Portuguese delegation on the understanding that it represents only the territory known by the designation of Portugal within its frontiers on the European continent, while rejecting the credentials of those members of the Portuguese delegation who come from overseas parts of the Portuguese nation in Africa, is so paradoxical and absurd that ordinarily it would have been difficult for us even to believe that a proposition of that sort could have been formulated. But by now we have grown so accustomed to such absurdities in this Organization that there is hardly any room left for surprise.

94. First, what, in reality, is the objective behind the move by which one country arrogates to itself the right to pick out from among the members of a delegation appointed by another country to represent it those who should be considered as legitimately accredited and those who should be rejected as not being so? Secondly, upon which provisions of the Charter, or even of the rules of procedure, is such a move based? Thirdly, let there be no doubt that it is aimed at striking at the basic and sovereign right of every State to determine which individuals shall be its nationals and upon whom it shall, in the full exercise of its sovereignty, confer the rights and privileges of citizenship. In no circumstances could such a prospect be accepted as valid, for, if it were, no country could be immune from a challenge to the nationality of its citizens. Thus, to give an example, Norway could dispute the nationality of Ugandans, Nepal that of Belgians, and so on and so forth. The result would be veritable chaos in international relations.

95. But the question becomes still more ridiculous and absurd in the context of the United Nations, where it is well known that Member States are not obliged to indicate exclusively their own citizens as members of their delega-

tions, as was stressed by the Legal Counsel in his opinion presented before the Credentials Committee, which can be found in paragraph 21 of document A/9179/Add.1. Portugal has indeed all along, over the years, followed the tradition of including only its nationals in its delegations; but those delegations which come from various countries, particularly those that have achieved independent status in recent years, have sought the inclusion of foreign nationals among their numbers. Is that right now being challenged?

96. Article 9 of the draft articles on the representation of States in their relations with international organizations affirms the principle that "... the sending State may freely appoint the members of the mission."² And the commentary of the International Law Commission concerning that article emphasized the importance of the principle, stating that:

"The freedom of choice by the sending State of the members of the mission is a principle basic to the effective performance of the functions of the mission."³

97. Are the proponents of this motion now contesting the legitimacy of that principle, or is it that in Portugal's case what is being disputed is the functions discharged by those Portuguese delegates coming from the overseas provinces, as shown by the descriptive designations appearing under their names? And, Sir, I must stress that all of the members of the delegation of Portugal, whether hailing from Europe or from the overseas provinces of Portugal, including the African and Goan delegates, are here, not by the grace of the representative of Tanzania, but in their own right as Portuguese citizens, and their rights as citizens are not open to question.

98. Secondly, it is well to bear in mind that neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the rules of procedure, nor any juridical canon that we know of, lays it down that constituent parts of the delegation appointed by a Member State should be held to represent any part or district of the country in question. Hence the implied assertion to that effect in the proposal before the General Assembly is entirely misconceived and out of place.

99. If, on the other hand, there should be any doubt in the minds of members whether these members of the Portuguese delegation are in fact discharging the functions that they are described as having, the Portuguese delegation would be happy to provide such clarification as might be desired in this matter.

100. If the right of Portugal to represent its overseas territories by choosing its delegates is brought into question, resolutions directed at Portugal in relation to its territories make no sense, and one cannot pretend to invert the situation from a juridical angle in conformity with momentary convenience based on reasons of pure opportunism, devoid of common sense and even of coherence. However, we have no doubt that the true reasons that motivated this obnoxious and extravagant proposal are to be found in the circumstance that there are represented in this Organization countries which have an outright racist outlook, whose

representatives feel embarrassed by the multiracial character of the Portuguese delegation, which in itself provides the strongest single argument for rebuttal of the baseless and vile premises upon which rest the anti-Portuguese campaign, instigated and kept alive by those countries, within the United Nations and outside it. In short, they would be happy to find a means of preventing Portugal from being represented by individuals of different races, colours and ethnic origins, in a manifestation of pure racism that is reprehensible and in gross violation of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

101. Objections have been made by some representatives speaking from this rostrum to one African member of the Portuguese delegation described in the credentials [A/9179/Add.1, annex] as "Director, Institute of Labour, Welfare and Social Action, Province of Guinea" to another described as "Member, Legislative Assembly, Portuguese State of Mozambique"; and to a third described as "Chief, Office of Provincial Credit and Securities Inspection, Portuguese State of Angola"; and so on.

102. What really seems to be objected to here is the glaring truth, which certain representatives coming from countries affiliated to the Organization of African Unity refuse to admit, that there are among the so-called "oppressed peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea" Portuguese nationals of African ethnic origin who occupy such high positions that there is indeed not the least sign of discrimination within the Portuguese system on grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin, and that a great deal of progress is being made, including the giving of opportunities to occupy high positions that are open to local inhabitants, as is now proved by the presence here of those members of the Portuguese delegation to whom objection is made.

103. Are the representatives of the African countries objecting also to the expressions "Portuguese State of Angola" and "Portuguese State of Mozambique"? It would be very strange indeed if they were doing so. The constitutional amendments approved by the Portuguese National Assembly in 1971-1972 conferred on the overseas provinces, especially on those of Angola and Mozambique, an ampler autonomy on the road to full self-government which entitled them to the designation of States, indicating that self-determination is not a mere fiction within the Portuguese system. Those that object to the use of that designation are in fact showing that they are opposed to any form of self-determination except that which is acceptable to their own preconceived notions which are fitted to meet the requirements of certain well-known interests.

104. If proposals such as these are accepted, it will not be long before delegates from the United Republic of Tanzania, Senegal or some other countries friendly to them come before this Organization proposing that the Portuguese delegation should be required to produce for verification the birth certificate of each of its members so as to prove his place of origin in the truest traditions consecrated in the 1930s by the doctrine of nazism. That proposals of this nature should even come to merit the attention of this General Assembly is a sad sign pointing to the growing lack of prestige into which the United Nations has allowed itself to sink and to living proof of the policies that are followed

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 10*, chap. II.

³ *Ibid.*, article 9, para. (1).

here by some involving dangerous concessions made thoughtlessly for reasons of political opportunism and expediency involving initiatives which are contrary to all norms of law.

105. The Portuguese delegation, conscious of the racist philosophy inspiring the authors of this proposal, rejects it outright, not without some sadness as we witness how it is sought to destroy the most sacred precepts of fraternity among men out of eagerness to secure results for meaningless political policies. The fact that in the revised text of the amendment it is proposed to alter this aspect of the question does not preclude my delegation from presenting these arguments because, to all intents and purposes, the original aid of the sponsors remains the same.

106. Having made those observations, my delegation would like to set out for the record what is otherwise self-evident in the Charter. At the time when a country is admitted to membership of the United Nations—as Portugal was 18 years ago—admission is granted in full recognition and knowledge of its political constitution and of the régime by which it is governed. The Portuguese Constitution which was in force at the time of Portugal's admission to the United Nations in 1955 has not undergone any substantial alteration in its basic aspects, and it is not within the competence of the General Assembly or of any other organ of the United Nations to call into question any of its provisions, including the extent and limit of Portugal's national territory described in article I thereof. Such an attempt is a clear violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which expressly prohibits interference in matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State.

107. Since now, for the first time after 18 years of membership in the United Nations, the very basis of which Portugal has been admitted to that membership is sought to be questioned and revised, the question becomes inescapable; does it mean that the presence of Portugal in the United Nations since 1955 has been of no validity seeing that it is sought to invalidate its very admission? In this respect it is well to bear in mind that delegates coming from the overseas provinces of Portugal, including those from Africa and from Goa have invariably participated in the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and other bodies, including the Security Council, during that entire period. I would request representatives here present to ponder well this aspect of the matter.

108. In conclusion, the Portuguese delegation wishes to make it clear beyond all possibility of doubt that its membership is constituted to represent the Portuguese nation as a whole, and that no member in it represents particularly any specific part or parcel of it.

109. As for the reference to the fictitious State of Guinea-Bissau, my delegation has already presented the facts as they are. Those arguments continue to be valid now. Nothing that has been said since then could convert fiction into facts.

110. And lest it should be forgotten, it would be well to stress that Portugal is, by the very nature of its tradition, history and vocation, a country that has dedicated itself to the task of binding together races, religions and cultures and

of removing other differences that separate man from man. My delegation wishes to emphasize that any attempts to undo the results of this historic process will be resisted and are bound to fail.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

112. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I would not wish to take up the Assembly's time. Before putting forward my motion for the closure of the debate, I apologized to all the delegations which had intended to speak. I note that the representative of Portugal was not entirely courteous to my delegation, and I of course regret this. At any rate, I should like to announce that my delegation has become a sponsor of the revised amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1.

113. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker wishing to explain his vote before the vote on the revised amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1. I shall now put that amendment to a vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Greece, Honduras, Israel, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Khmer Republic, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Turkey, Venezuela.

The amendment was adopted by 93 votes to 14, with 21 abstentions.⁴

⁴Subsequently the delegations of France, Honduras and the Netherlands subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as abstentions.

114. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

115. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The delegations of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden voted in favour of the amendment to the recommendation of the Credentials Committee contained in document A/L.720/Rev.1, presented by the Congo, Guinea, Madagascar, Senegal, Tunisia and the United Republic of Tanzania. In so doing we reaffirmed, without prejudice to the existing formal juridical situation, our well-known stand on the question of Portugal's colonial rule in Africa and our firm support for the right of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. As regards the wording concerning Guinea-Bissau in the amendment we have, however, to make reservations. As we stated in our explanation of vote on 2 November [2163rd meeting], when the question of Guinea-Bissau was debated, our Governments' considerations of the questions involved in determining their relations with the newly proclaimed Republic of Guinea-Bissau are not yet concluded. Therefore our vote does not in any way prejudice our Governments' dispositions on this question.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There being no further speakers on this item, we shall now proceed to the amendment which appears in document A/L.719 and the subamendment in document A/L.722/Rev.1.

117. The representative of Senegal wishes to speak on a point of order.

118. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): When the representative of Tunisia just now put forward his motion for closure of the debate, he told us the reasons for that motion. It was not to prevent any representative from taking the floor; nor was it to try to avoid the truth. He gave us to understand quite clearly that we had progressed sufficiently in the discussion at this session, and perhaps more than sufficiently, that we had only one day left to clear up our affairs, that we had other problems to discuss, and that consequently we should as far as possible restrict discussion on this item, which is sufficiently well known to us all and on which everyone has very clear-cut views. For that reason I should like to ask you, Mr. President, to apply the provisions of rule 90 to limit the time allowed to all those wishing to explain their votes on the amendments and the draft resolutions which will be voted on subsequently. You may read out this rule to the General Assembly. It states in part: "The President may limit the time to be allowed for such explanations". I wonder whether you could give a ruling on the time to be allowed to representatives to explain their votes; I would propose five minutes.

119. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Although the General Assembly is at a late stage of its work and the concern of the representative of Senegal is quite understandable, I feel that it is a matter of major importance and that therefore I am not able to limit the time for explanations of vote. However, I can make an appeal to representatives to explain their votes as briefly as possible. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

120. Mr. ZULETA-TORRES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia will vote against the draft amendment now under discussion, because it considers that this amendment, as explained, would intervene in matters that are essentially within the jurisdiction of a sovereign State. Colombia once again wishes to declare its support for the principles of the Charter and particularly in this case for Article 2, paragraph 7, which forbids intervention in the internal affairs of any State. We should not wish to see the mere external formality of the study of credentials serve to create a very grave precedent in the Organization which may affect the sovereignty of any of our States.

121. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): Only a few days ago—on 4 December, to be exact—the General Assembly had before it an agenda item relating to the question of the Khmer Republic. My delegation took part in the debate on the question, and in my statement [2189th meeting] I referred to the joint views on the Khmer situation held by seven Asian and Pacific nations, namely, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, contained in document A/9254 of 24 October 1973. These joint views are:

"1. The Khmer people themselves should be allowed to solve their own political problems peacefully, free from outside interference in whatever form.

"2. Such political settlement should be reached by the indigenous parties concerned.

"3. The United Nations should not take any action which may prejudice the decision of the Khmer people themselves and which may prolong the tragic suffering and the loss of lives and property in the Khmer Republic." [A/9254.]

122. Then on 5 December [2191st meeting], after many delegations had had the opportunity to participate in the debate, the General Assembly decided by a majority vote to adjourn the debate until the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. In so doing, it is obvious, the General Assembly, having heard the opinions and the legal and political arguments of both sides on the issue, considered that any decision on the substance of the question during the present session would not be opportune and that the fate of the parties to the conflict merited further careful thought and judicious consideration. Of course the proper and prudent line of action was to defer the consideration of this important item to the next session.

123. Against that background there can be no denial of the fact that the majority of the General Assembly took into account the joint view of the neighbouring States of the Khmer Republic, that any other course of action—including the one proposed in the amendment in document A/L.719 by the representative of Senegal and others—would prejudice the decision which properly belongs to the Khmer people and would further exacerbate the political friction of various Cambodian factions and unnecessarily prolong the suffering of the Khmer people.

124. The main issue before the General Assembly today is whether, in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure, the credentials of the Khmer delegation were properly issued by the head of the State or Government or by the

Minister for Foreign Affairs. The proposal of the representative of Senegal that the Committee should reject the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic was rejected by 5 votes to 3, with one delegation absent. This appears in paragraph 12 of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/9179/Add. I]. Now the very same proposal—at least similar in substance—has been made in the plenary Assembly.

125. I submit that in scrutinizing and examining the credentials of States Members of the United Nations, the Credentials Committee and, in the final analysis, the General Assembly, should confine itself to the criteria set out in rule 27, to which I referred earlier. It is not the responsibility of the Credentials Committee nor of the General Assembly, in considering this matter, to pass judgement on the legitimacy of Governments or on their policies. The representation of the Khmer Republic must be decided by the Khmer people themselves.

126. The General Assembly has already reached a conclusion on such an aspect in its consideration of another agenda item. My delegation, therefore, feels that the General Assembly should be consistent in all its decisions and actions relating to the question of the Khmer Republic. Some may argue that rule 27 of the rules of procedure requires the Credentials Committee to go beyond a literal consideration of credentials and that what is being challenged now is not the technical nature of the document—the credentials—but is essentially a political disapproval of what a Member State or a Government of a Member State of the United Nations has done.

127. My delegation is naturally prepared to give full weight to such a contention. In the past this kind of flexibility in the application of rule 27 has been expounded and permitted in some exceptional circumstances, but with due respect to the proponents of such a view, the flexibility allowed for in the past merely applied to cases of the policies of Governments of Member States which are clear violations of the letter and spirit of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, particularly in the field of racial discrimination and colonialist actions—policies which are overwhelmingly abhorred by the international community, including my country.

128. But is that the case with the Khmer Republic or the policies of its Government? The answer, of course, is emphatically “No”.

129. For those reasons my delegation opposes the amendment submitted by the delegation of Senegal and others in document A/L.719.

130. My delegation has also given careful consideration to the subamendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia in document A/L.722 and as orally revised. We very much appreciate the good intentions and the friendly sentiments accompanying that proposal, and it is therefore with genuine regret that we are unable to support it, for the following reasons.

131. First, my delegation finds it difficult to agree that the General Assembly is vested, either by the Charter or by any inherent capacity, with the authority or the means to deter-

mine or to ascertain directly or indirectly, or to become aware whether a constituted Government of any Member State wields authority over the majority of its people. It is, in our view, not the function of this Assembly to look behind a State into its internal organs. If Article 4 of the Charter appears to go beyond the State and to impute certain attributes to its Government, the determination involves only specific qualities, namely, its peace-loving nature and its willingness and ability to carry out Charter obligations. The amount or scope of its authority over its own people is not under the purview of our Charter.

132. Secondly, rule 28 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly expressly states that a Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the beginning of each session. This clearly shows that the present Credentials Committee is established by and solely for this session of the General Assembly and cannot presume to relegate to another session its unfinished business. It is evident that the subamendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia would have the effect of leaving the work of this Credentials Committee to a future Credentials Committee.

133. On the basis of the foregoing reasons, therefore, my delegation reluctantly finds itself in opposition to the subamendment proposed by Saudi Arabia.

134. I should like to make an appeal to all delegations here: this is neither the time nor the place to engage in a political and ideological confrontation. A decision based on ideological grounds in this matter will not help the Khmer people, irrespective of their political beliefs. They should not be used as pawns in a political game. It is time that we should commiserate with them in their unfortunate plight and suffering, the dimensions of which are hardly known to the outside world. It is time that their paramount interests, their well-being and their legitimate right to a free existence and peace and self-determination be protected and defended; or else we shall have done a great disservice not only to the people of the Khmer Republic but also to the peoples of the United Nations which, through their representatives in San Francisco, helped to put together the purposes and principles to which we adhere in the document known as the Charter of the United Nations.

135. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): First of all, I wish to assure the representative of Senegal that I shall take less than five minutes of his proposed time in explanation of my vote.

136. Previous meetings of this Assembly have provided us with an opportunity to discuss the political aspects of the question of the representation of the Khmer people in this United Nations. At the conclusion of these discussions it was decided to adjourn the consideration of this question to next year's session of the Assembly.

137. In the view of my delegation, the question now before us—whether to accept the report of the Credentials Committee concerning the credentials of the delegation of the Khmer Republic—is therefore one which should be decided only upon technical grounds. To paraphrase the statement of Mr. Salim of Tanzania, when he discussed the question of the credentials of Portugal, I would say that we should not go into the representativeness or non-representativeness of the Khmer delegation as that is

entirely an internal affair of the Khmer people, a matter on which, in any case, the General Assembly has decided to postpone discussion until next year. Furthermore, as the representative of Barbados observed a few days ago:

“We are estopped . . . 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.” [2200th meeting, para. 64.]

138. The task of the Credentials Committee and of the General Assembly in this case is simply to determine whether the credentials of the Khmer delegation are in accordance with rule 27 of the rules of procedure. Note should be taken of the fact that the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic were examined and approved at each of the three previous sessions of the General Assembly. On each of these occasions their credentials were found to be in order, and upon that basis the seating of the delegation was accepted. Similarly, in the present instance, in the opinion of the Credentials Committee as expressed in its report, the technical requirements for seating have been met by the Khmer delegation.

139. For those reasons my delegation considers that the representatives of the Khmer Republic have met the technical requirements for being seated as prescribed in the rules of procedure, and we shall vote against the amendment proposed by the representative of Senegal in document A/L.719.

140. Now, as regards the subamendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia my delegation believes that it goes against the conclusion of the Credentials Committee. Furthermore, it is for future General Assembly sessions to decide how to treat representatives of the Khmer delegation. It is not for this session of the Assembly to direct how the next session will act on this score. My delegation therefore will vote against this subamendment.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): To speak exclusively on the subamendment in document A/L.722/Rev.1—since rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly forbids him to speak on the other document because he is a sponsor—I now call on the representative of Algeria.

142. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to assure you that I am perfectly well aware of the rule of procedure which you have just quoted, and that consequently it was not my intention to refer to anything but the subamendment of Saudi Arabia contained in document A/L.722/Rev.1.

143. The original version of this subamendment shed a certain amount of confusion on the matter. Undoubtedly the intention of its sponsor was to try to make us all feel satisfied.

144. We have already stated that it is not by resorting to ambiguous positions that we can settle this problem; and in shrinking from today's realities and in not having the courage to face up to them and adapt ourselves to them today we

simply complicate their future solution and make difficulties for the future work of our Organization.

145. When the Saudi Arabian subamendment was presented in its original form, we said that it was vague about the legal status of the credentials of the Khmer delegation and also of the delegation itself. And we said that we could not support that subamendment if it was simply designed to shoot down our own amendment. The doubts which we entertained at the time have now been completely dispelled since the representative of Saudi Arabia has modified his original text. In its new version it is perfectly clear that the subamendment simply strips our own amendment of any substance. Furthermore, it seeks to make our amendment say exactly the opposite of what its sponsors wish to convey. That being the case, we shall vote against the subamendment of Saudi Arabia as revised in document A/L.722/Rev.1. Naturally, if that subamendment is adopted by the General Assembly, to be logical we will also have to vote against the amendment as thus subamended.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): With the same limitation I now call on the representative of China.

147. Mr. CHUANG (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has consistently maintained that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk is the sole legal Government of Cambodia and enjoys the firm support of the vast majority of the Cambodian people. As is known to all, the Lon Nol traitorous clique is imposed on the Cambodian people by foreign forces. Without the aggression, intervention and active support of the United States it would have collapsed long ago and would not have been able to continue to occupy illegally the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations.

148. Based on that position, the Chinese delegation holds that the amendment submitted by 33 countries to the report of the Credentials Committee is fully correct. However, we are opposed to the subamendment just submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia because the Royal Government of National Union is the sole legal representative of the Cambodian people. On this point the Cambodian people have long ago made a clear choice. Yet, the subamendment of Saudi Arabia attempted to prolong the illegal occupation by the traitorous Lon Nol clique of the seat of Cambodia in the United Nations and refused to restore the legal position of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. Thereby, it has confused the true and false in reversing the right and the wrong. This is what the people of Cambodia and all countries that uphold justice and respect the Charter cannot agree to.

149. Based on the foregoing reasons, the Chinese delegation hopes that all justice-upholding countries and their delegations will support the amendment submitted by the 33 countries and, together with the 33 countries, vote against the sub-amendment tabled by Saudi Arabia.

150. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on the question of the credentials of the Khmer Republic. The amendment which has been submitted to the resolution recommended by the Credentials

Committee in document A/9179/Add.1 appears to my delegation, as it must to many others, a petulant and futile gesture. Even if this amendment were to be adopted, it could have no practical effect. We are in the last days of the current session of the General Assembly. The only credentials that have been submitted in respect of Cambodia are those issued by the Government of the Khmer Republic to the delegation which has occupied the Khmer seat in this Assembly throughout this session, and, for that matter, for several sessions past. There are no rival credentials and there is no rival delegation. In similar circumstances, Sir, successive Presidents have ruled that another delegation whose credentials had been rejected was entitled to continue to sit and participate in this Assembly.

151. Thus I say the adoption of this amendment would have no practical effect. But this does not mean that we think it ought to be adopted or even seriously considered. The Assembly has already at this session debated the question of the representation of Cambodia in the United Nations and, after hearing all points of view, decided to adjourn the debate on that question to the next session of the General Assembly.

152. At that time, one speaker claimed that we were reconsidering a decision already taken, and he invoked rule 83 of the rules of procedure. The President very properly took the view on that occasion that rule 83 did not apply. Now we are being asked, in effect, to reconsider the decision we made 12 days ago not to discuss the question of the representation of Cambodia any more this year. But I do not suppose that the sponsors of the amendment will be invoking rule 83 on this occasion. I believe that, in any event, the amendment will be defeated.

153. My delegation has one interest and one interest only in this item. It is our concern that any action the Assembly may take should contribute to the restoration of peace in Cambodia, so as to pave the way for a negotiated settlement, and that it should do nothing to hinder the achievement of that objective. But if the United Nations were now to intervene, blatantly and one-sidedly, when it is not even asked to decide between rival sets of credentials, this would do nothing to promote a settlement and would almost certainly delay one.

154. It was in that belief that New Zealand joined with other countries in the Asian and Pacific region that are neighbours of Cambodia to issue a joint appeal that the Khmer people themselves should be allowed to solve their political problems peacefully without any outside interference; that any political settlement should be reached by the parties concerned; and that the United Nations should not take any action which might prejudice the decision of the Khmer people. That appeal, to which the Assembly responded positively in its procedural decision of 5 December [2191st meeting], is as valid in its application to the credentials issue as it was to item 106.

155. My delegation has considered carefully the sub-amendment in document A/L.722/Rev.1, and it acknowledges freely the constructive intention of its distinguished sponsor. But we have difficulty in envisaging the process by which the Assembly is to become aware whether one Government or another commands majority support. An

attempt to reach a conclusion on that issue could produce curious results in more than one country. For this reason, we regret that we are unable to support the sub-amendment and will be obliged to vote against it if it is put to the vote.

156. I have stressed that the amendment in document A/L.719 would have no practical effect. This Assembly cannot make or unmake Governments or restore exile princes to their countries or their thrones. It was the people of Cambodia, through their legally elected representatives, who deposed Prince Sihanouk. If he is to be restored, only the people of Cambodia can do that.

157. My delegation believes that this Assembly should, therefore, await the unfolding of events within Cambodia which will undoubtedly produce solutions which reflect the wishes of the Cambodian people themselves. It should reject the proposed amendment to the report of the Credentials Committee as a petty and unworthy move. My delegation will therefore vote against the amendment.

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

159. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): I have acquitted my conscience. I have heard several speakers say that they cannot agree with my sub-amendment. The intention of it was to help this house. This house does not want to be helped. It is divided upon itself, and any house divided upon itself will sooner or later fall. I hope I shall not be here when it falls down. A house divided upon itself will fall.

160. The whole question under consideration is irrelevant and unconstitutional. I wash my hands of it and I will not participate in the vote, and I withdraw my sub-amendment. One day you will remind yourselves of the gross mistake that you are making in placing such an amendment to the vote—leave aside my sub-amendment.

161. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has commenced. Thus, since the representative of Saudi Arabia has withdrawn the sub-amendment presented by his delegation in document A/L.722/Rev.1, as President I consider that that sub-amendment is no longer before the Assembly.

162. Mr. ZAKARIA (Malaysia): In view of the decision just announced by the representative of Saudi Arabia to withdraw his sub-amendment, and in view also of your own statement on this matter, Mr. President, I shall now confine my statement to the amendment contained in document A/L.719. This 33-Power amendment, if adopted, would mean that the General Assembly would adopt the second report of the Credentials Committee, except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic. The sponsors of this amendment have repeatedly referred to the situation in Cambodia in advancing their argument that the Government of the Khmer Republic is not the true and legal representative of the Cambodian people.

163. Out of respect for the right of the Cambodian people to non-interference in their internal affairs, my delegation

would have wished that it would not be necessary for it to enter into a debate on the situation in Cambodia. However, since such references have been made repeatedly in the course of this debate by sponsors of the amendment, my delegation feels duty bound once again to state its views.

164. In my statements during the debate last week on the question of the representation of Cambodia, I made the point that the tragic events in Cambodia revolved primarily around the question of contending national leadership, which, obviously, was a matter falling wholly within the domestic jurisdiction of the Cambodian people. That being the case, it is the view of my delegation that final solution of the problem must be left to the Cambodian people themselves to decide.

165. This is consistent with the basic tenets of the United Nations Charter on the sovereign rights of nations and peoples to freedom from foreign interference in their domestic affairs. Unless the people of Cambodia decide otherwise of their own free will, my delegation considers, without any qualification, that the Government of the Khmer Republic based in Phnom Penh is the legally constituted Government of Cambodia, and also the proper authority to issue the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic to the United Nations. My delegation is therefore satisfied that the credentials of the Khmer representatives are fully in order, and we will consequently vote against the amendment in document A/L.719.

166. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the amendment in document A/L.719. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bhutan, Burma, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria,

Peru, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Upper Volta.

The amendment was rejected by 55 votes to 50, with 17 abstentions.

167. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting on the amendment in document A/L.719.

168. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): The question of Cambodia has already been considered by the General Assembly during this session as a separate item on our agenda. As a result of that consideration the General Assembly decided that the debate on this agenda item be deferred to its twenty-ninth session. In the light of this development, we do not find it appropriate that this question should be raised again in connexion with the recommendation of the Credentials Committee. It is for this reason that the Norwegian delegation has cast its negative vote. However, I should like to add that today's vote in no way prejudices the position of my Government with regard to the question of who should represent Cambodia in the United Nations in the future.

169. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran): I should like briefly to explain the vote my delegation will cast on the second report of the Credentials Committee [A/9179/Add.1]. In taking a stand on the sensitive issue of the credentials of the representatives of the Khmer Republic, my delegation has proceeded from the premise that the Credentials Committee performs a limited and essentially procedural function. It does not deal with the credentials of Governments but with those of their representatives, to the extent that they are issued in proper order within the meaning of rule 27 of the rules of procedure of this Assembly. The language of rule 28 in this respect is sufficiently clear to refute contentions to the contrary.

170. Proceeding from this premise, my delegation has voted against the amendment in document A/L.719. This stand is naturally without any prejudice to our position with regard to the substance of the Cambodian representation. Had a vote on this issue been taken within the context of item 106, my delegation would have abstained, as it did on 5 December 1973 on the motion for the postponement of the debate on that item.

171. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): The problem put before the General Assembly in connexion with the report of the Credentials Committee has already been discussed on previous occasions. Its terms, therefore, were quite clear, and if my delegation wished to speak in order to explain its vote it is only to underline that its position is not a political one and that it has been guided solely by legal and constitutional considerations. My delegation, which shares the reservations expressed by previous speakers on this procedural question, has in fact serious doubts about the conformity of the amendments contained in documents A/L.719 and A/L.720/Rev.1 with the principles of the Charter and with the relevant rules of procedure.

172. It is the opinion of my delegation that the Credentials Committee examines the credentials of representatives on the basis of rules 27 and 28 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, for the sole purpose of ascertaining that

they have been issued in the proper form by the Head of State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of each country. It is not within the competence of the Credentials Committee, or of this Assembly when considering the Committee's report, to pronounce itself on the political issue of the legitimacy of the Governments that have issued the credentials or on the decision of the Governments on the persons to be included in their delegations.

173. I should like, however, immediately to add a few words in connexion with the amendment contained in document A/L.720/Rev.1, introduced by the delegations of Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania. We fully understand the reasons that prompted those two delegations to propose that amendment. We think, however, that apart from being improper for the legal reasons that I have explained, it does not seem either to get to the core of the question or to be formulated in such a way as to produce relevant effects. In our view, a statement in general terms to the effect that the approval of credentials does not imply any recognition of any policy pursued or any position held by Governments on territorial questions would have been more to the point, would have been in conformity with the spirit and provisions of the Charter, and therefore would have been acceptable to my delegation and would have produced the more relevant effect of nullifying any attempt at using the approval of credentials for political purposes.

174. On the basis of all these considerations, my delegation could not extend its support to the amendments contained in documents A/L.719 and A/L.720/Rev.1, but we will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, it being understood that this affirmative vote means the approval of all the credentials that have been approved by the Credentials Committee. At the same time, my delegation wishes to emphasize that its approval of those credentials cannot be construed in any way as recognition by my Government of any legal or political position of a territorial nature maintained by Governments that have issued the credentials.

175. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have come to the end of the list of speakers. Before putting to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

176. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): The Secretary-General informed the Credentials Committee that the credentials of Portugal and the Khmer Republic were in order. The Credentials Committee accepted the report of the Secretary-General and approved those credentials. Those credentials were approved by the Credentials Committee because they were in conformity with rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which states, in its relevant part: "The credentials shall be issued either by the Head of State or Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs." Consequently, there is no legal basis for challenging the propriety of either of those credentials. The Khmer Republic is a Member of the United Nations and its credentials are in order. We are pleased to note that the Assembly shares this view. In approving the credentials of the Portuguese delegation, the Credentials Committee did not pass on the acceptability of the policies,

foreign or domestic, of the Government of Portugal. That is not the function of the Credentials Committee, nor is it the function of the General Assembly in the context of its consideration of the report of the Credentials Committee. This is clear from the rules of procedure and from 27 years of practice of this body.

177. Since the credentials of both delegations are in order, and since there is no legal basis for challenging them, we voted against both the amendments to the report of the Credentials Committee. Since the one amendment was defeated and the other has no effect on the credentials of the Portuguese delegation, we shall be able to vote in favour of the recommendation of the Credentials Committee as amended.

178. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 29 of document A/9179/Add.1, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 3181 (XXVIII)).

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

180. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has reservations with regard to the second report of the Credentials Committee. They relate to the credentials of four delegations.

181. This year, as last year, our objections relate first to the representatives of Israel. We have serious objections to the credentials of the representatives of the Zionist authorities because they represent nothing but an expansionist authority that has usurped the territories and the lawful and national rights of the Palestinian people.

182. Secondly, with regard to South Africa we firmly believe that the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the racist authorities of South Africa in itself makes it possible to challenge the credentials of its representatives.

183. Our third reservation relates to the credentials of the Khmer delegation. Just a few days ago my delegation expounded its views on this matter.

184. Our fourth point has to do with the representatives who within the Portuguese delegation at this session of our Assembly claim to represent the Territories under Portuguese occupation in Africa. Those representatives represent only small cliques which are collaborating with Portuguese colonialism.

185. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): My delegation wishes to explain its votes on the substantive amendments submitted to the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee. In the view of the Irish delegation the essential question on which the General Assembly was required to pronounce itself was whether the Credentials Committee had acted correctly in finding, on the basis of a memorandum by the Secretary-General, that all Member States had submitted credentials in due form as provided for in rule 27

of the rules of procedure. My delegation believes the Credentials Committee took a correct decision by reference to the rules of procedure which govern the Committee's mandate. Consequently, we hold that the General Assembly should have approved the report of the Committee [A/9179/Add.1]. We therefore voted against the amendment in document A/L.719.

186. We abstained in the vote on the amendment in document A/L.720/Rev.1. As I just indicated, we would have considered it more in conformity with the role of the Credentials Committee as defined in rule 27 of the rules of procedure to approve the credentials of Portugal without qualification. However, the amendment was couched in terms which, broadly speaking, reflect the attitude of my Government in relation to the African Territories under the domination of Portugal. Over the years the Irish delegation has consistently supported resolutions affirming the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of the peoples of those Territories, and as recently as 12 December last voted for two resolutions in this Assembly in relation to that question.

187. At the same time, we could not approve one element in the amendment—that is, the description of Guinea-Bissau as an independent State. The Irish delegation abstained on the specific resolution adopted on that subject [resolution 3061 (XXVIII)] some weeks ago on grounds we explained at that time. Those grounds are still valid for my Government. We could not, therefore, endorse that feature of the amendment and consequently we abstained.

188. Finally, since the amendment in document A/L.719 was not adopted, my delegation had no difficulty in voting for the draft resolution as amended.

189. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to place on record that our vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole presented by the Credentials Committee is not to be considered as acceptance of the credentials of the régime of the so-called Khmer Republic. In our opinion, the only legitimate representative of Cambodia in this Organization is the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia. All representatives are aware, and the records of our meetings bear this out for posterity, that if the Phnom Penh régime continues to be present in this Assembly hall it is due exclusively to the countless manoeuvres and pressures which their masters, the delegation of the United States, have brought to bear throughout our deliberations. However, in our opinion today's vote illustrates the fact that the international community, and in particular the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, really understand who legitimately represents the Cambodian people and oppose the imperialist interference manifested *inter alia* by their local puppets in Cambodia, who represent nobody.

190. My delegation voted in favour of the amendment in document A/L.720 so as to express our solidarity with the African peoples and to express our disapproval of the Portuguese policy of trying to preserve its colonial empire beyond its European frontiers. Our vote in favour of that amendment did not, of course, imply any judgement in connexion with the credentials submitted by the Government of Portugal, which in our opinion are, in reference to

the State of Portugal, valid under the Charter. Our vote was an expression of repudiation of the pretension of that State to represent Territories which do not belong to it and have the right to independence.

191. Mr. DORON (Israel): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, involving, as it does, the credentials of delegations to this session of the General Assembly. But we voted against the amendments in documents A/L.719 and A/L.720/Rev.1, which introduced considerations extraneous to this matter, which is a procedural one.

192. While I am speaking in explanation of vote I should like also to exercise my right of reply in respect of the diatribe against Israel just made by the representative of Syria. All it shows once more is the blind, all-pervading animosity of his Government towards my country and a stubborn refusal to recognize our rights. The credentials of my delegation were duly issued and submitted in conformity with the rules of procedure, as has been reported by the Credentials Committee. In so far as the statement of the representative of Syria purported to relate to my delegation, it was therefore completely out of order and quite uncalled for. We utterly and emphatically refute that statement in its entirety, and reject the introduction of irrelevant elements into the discussion of the report of the Credentials Committee. My delegation will not be drawn into a debate unconnected with the matter under discussion.

193. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The delegation of Iraq voted in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee. However, it wishes to express its reservation with regard to the credentials of the representatives of the following régimes: those of Israel, Khmer Republic and South Africa. And the Assembly has expressed itself on the credentials of the Portuguese delegation as far as that delegation purports to represent the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau.

194. My understanding is that the exercise of right of reply during an explanation of vote is out of order. It is open to all members of the General Assembly to explain their votes, but it is not for representatives to come here and exercise their right of reply in the course of an explanation of vote.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization

195. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is the custom for the Assembly simply to take note of the annual report, and if I hear no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly wishes to follow that practice.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Report of the International Court of Justice

196. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): If no representative wishes to speak, I propose that the General Assembly should decide to take note of that report.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 28**Appointment of the members of the Peace
Observation Commission**

197. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Peace Observation Commission was created by the General Assembly on 3 November 1950 under its resolution 377 (V). The 13 members of the Commission are the following States: Czechoslovakia, France, Honduras, India, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

198. The two-year mandate of those members will expire on 31 December 1973. They have all indicated that they are ready to continue to serve as members of the Commission. I therefore propose that the General Assembly should reappoint those 13 Member States for the years 1974 and 1975. May I take it that the General Assembly approves that proposal?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.