



United Nations No. 1 (1969)

**Report**  
**On the Proceedings**  
**of the Twenty-third Session of the**  
**General Assembly of the United Nations**  
**held at New York**

24 September to 21 December, 1968

*Presented to Parliament*  
*by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs*  
*by Command of Her Majesty*  
*August 1969*

LONDON  
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE  
14s. 6d. net

Cmnd. 4123

SBN 10 141230 4

**CONTENTS**  
**TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**425**

	<i>Paragraphs</i>
<b>Introduction</b> .. .. .	1-16
<b>General Debate and Procedural Business</b>	
Speech by the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary .. .. .	17
Opening of the Session and Election of Officers .. .. .	18-21
The General Committee .. .. .	22
The Credentials Committee .. .. .	23-28
Elections to the Councils and to the U.N. Industrial Development Board and Election of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees .. .. .	29-33
Admission of New Members .. .. .	34-36
Visits of Heads of State and Heads of Government .. .. .	37
General Debate .. .. .	38-63
<b>Political Items—Plenary Session</b>	
Chinese Representation .. .. .	64-69
The Problems of Human Environment .. .. .	70-72
South West Africa .. .. .	73-79
Fourth United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy .. .. .	80
Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency .. .. .	81-83
The Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples .. .. .	84-87
Report of the International Court of Justice .. .. .	88
Celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations .. .. .	89-91
Resolutions adopted without reference to a Main Committee .. .. .	92
<b>Political Items—The First Committee</b>	
Peaceful Uses of Outer Space .. .. .	93-100
Disarmament Items:	
General .. .. .	101-103
General and Complete Disarmament .. .. .	104-108
Urgent Need for the Suspension of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Tests .. .. .	109
Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in the Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America .. .. .	110
Memorandum of the Soviet Government .. .. .	111
Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States .. .. .	112-118
The Korean Question .. .. .	119-130
The Question of the Sea Bed .. .. .	131-144
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the First Committee .. .. .	145
<b>Political Items—The Special Political Committee</b>	
The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation .. .. .	146-149
Apartheid and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa .. .. .	150-162
Peacekeeping .. .. .	163-170
Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA .. .. .	171-182
Resolutions Adopted on Reports of the Special Political Committee .. .. .	183
<b>Economic Items—The Second Committee</b>	
General .. .. .	184-187
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development .. .. .	188-192
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation .. .. .	193-194
Second United Nations Development Decade .. .. .	195-198
Resources of the Sea .. .. .	199-200
External Financing of Economic Development in Developing Countries .. .. .	201-204
Food and Protein .. .. .	205-207
The Brain Drain .. .. .	208-210
Other Items .. .. .	211-216
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Second Committee .. .. .	217
<b>Social and Human Rights Items—The Third Committee</b>	
General .. .. .	218-221
War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity .. .. .	222-228
Capital Punishment .. .. .	229-235
Draft Declaration on Social Development .. .. .	236-241
Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees .. .. .	242-246

	<i>Paragraphs</i>
Assistance in Cases of Natural Disaster .. .. .	247
World Social Situation .. .. .	248-250
Creation of the Post of a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights .. .. .	251
International Year for Human Rights .. .. .	252-269
Violations of Human Rights .. .. .	270-271
Elimination of Racial Discrimination .. .. .	272-273
Report of the Economic and Social Council .. .. .	274-275
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Third Committee .. .. .	276
 <b>Trusteeship and Colonial Items—The Fourth Committee</b>	
Rhodesia .. .. .	277-284
Equatorial Guinea .. .. .	285
The Portuguese Territories .. .. .	286-291
The General Debate .. .. .	292-296
Information Transmitted under Article 73(e) of the Charter and offers of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories .. .. .	297-299
Fiji .. .. .	300-301
Oman .. .. .	302-306
Foreign Economic Interests .. .. .	307-310
Implementation of Resolution 1514 (XV) by the Specialised Agencies and International Institutions, and Report of the Economic and Social Council .. .. .	311-314
Report of the Trusteeship Council .. .. .	315-316
Territories not considered separately:	
Ifni and Spanish Sahara .. .. .	317-318
Gibraltar .. .. .	319-323
Territory of the Afars and Issas (French Somaliland) .. .. .	324
Other Territories not considered separately .. .. .	325-327
United Nations Training and Educational Programme for Southern Africa .. .. .	328-330
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Fourth Committee .. .. .	331
 <b>Administrative and Budgetary Items—The Fifth Committee</b>	
Introduction .. .. .	332-333
Supplementary Estimates for 1968 .. .. .	334-335
Estimates for 1969 .. .. .	336-337
Unforeseen and Extraordinary Expenditure .. .. .	338
Revenue-Producing Activities .. .. .	339
Implementation of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to examine the finances of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies .. .. .	340
Report of the Committee on the Re-organisation of the Secretariat .. .. .	341
Staff numbers .. .. .	342
Salary scales .. .. .	343
United Nations accommodation .. .. .	344-347
United Nations Bond Issue .. .. .	348
Part V of the Budget .. .. .	349
Personnel Questions .. .. .	350-353
Regulation of Conferences and Documentation .. .. .	354
United Nations Scale of Assessments .. .. .	355-356
Enlargement of the Committee on Contributions .. .. .	357
Conclusion .. .. .	358
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Fifth Committee .. .. .	359
 <b>Legal Items—The Sixth Committee</b>	
Report of the International Law Commission on its Twentieth Session .. .. .	360-368
Convention on Special Missions .. .. .	369-383
Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression .. .. .	384-394
Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on its First Session .. .. .	395-403
Consideration of the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations .. .. .	404-414
United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law .. .. .	415-419
Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Sixth Committee .. .. .	420

I.	Statement by the Minister of State, Lord Caradon, in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 3 December, 1968: The Problems of Human Environment .. .. .	117
II.	Statement by Mr. I. F. Porter in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 20 December, 1968: Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.	121
III.	Statement by the Minister of State, Lord Caradon, in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 16 December, 1968: Colonialism. .. .. .	123
IV.	Statement by Mr. D. H. T. Hildyard in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 17 December, 1968: Peaceful Uses of Outer Space ..	126
V.	Statement by the Minister of State, The Rt. Hon. Fred Mulley, M.P., in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 18 November, 1968: Disarmament .. .. .	129
VI.	Statement by Mr. I. F. Porter in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 6 December, 1968: Disarmament .. .. .	134
VII.	Statement by Mr. I. F. Porter in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 17 December, 1968: Non-Nuclear Conference .. ..	136
VIII.	Statement by Sir Leslie Glass in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 11 December, 1968: Korea .. .. .	138
IX.	Statement by Mr. D. H. T. Hildyard in the First Committee of the General Assembly, 1 November, 1968: The Sea Bed .. .. .	141
X.	Statement by Sir Leslie Glass in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly, 15 November, 1968: Apartheid .. .. .	145
XI.	Statement by Mr. D. H. T. Hildyard in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly, 18 December, 1968: Peacekeeping .. ..	147
XII.	Statement by the Minister of State, Lord Caradon, in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly, 18 November, 1968: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees .. ..	149
XIII.	Statement by Mr. J. H. Lambert in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly, 2 December, 1968: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees; Report of the Commissioner-General ..	154
XIV.	Statement by Mr. Mark Allen in the Second Committee of the General Assembly, 5 November, 1968: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development .. .. .	157
XV.	Statement by the Minister of State, Lord Caradon, in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 13 December, 1968: UNCTAD; Membership of South Africa .. .. .	160
XVI.	Statement by Lady Gaitskell in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 26 November, 1968: War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity ..	162
XVII.	Statement by Lady Gaitskell in the Third Committee of the General Assembly, 2 December, 1968: International Year for Human Rights ..	164
XVIII.	Statement by Lady Gaitskell in the Third Committee of the General Assembly, 12 December, 1968: Human Rights in Southern Africa ..	168
XIX.	Statement by Mr. D. E. T. Luard, M.P. in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, 25 November, 1968: Decolonisation .. .. .	169
XX.	Statement by Mr. D. E. T. Luard, M.P. in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, 29 November, 1968: Gibraltar .. .. .	176
XXI.	Statement by the Minister of State, Lord Caradon, in the Plenary of the General Assembly, 18 December, 1968: Gibraltar .. .. .	181
XXII.	Statement by Mr. J. I. M. Rhodes in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, 20 December, 1968: United Nations Budget Estimates, 1969	182
XXIII.	Statement by Mr. H. G. Darwin in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, 20 November, 1968: Question of Defining Aggression ..	183
XXIV.	The United Kingdom Delegation to the Twenty-third Session .. ..	186

#### **ASTERISKS**

Where voting figures are given in this report, an asterisk indicates that the figure in question includes the vote of the United Kingdom delegation. Votes are given in the following order: for, against, abstentions.

**TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**  
**24 September to 21 December 1968**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly took place from 24 September to 21 December, 1968. The period of the General Debate at the beginning of the Session was once again an opportunity for intensive diplomatic exchanges between Heads of Governments and Foreign Ministers visiting New York to address the Assembly. The United Kingdom was represented during the Session by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and by Lord Caradon, Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs. Mr. Mulley, Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, represented the United Kingdom in the discussions of Disarmament issues. Lady Gaitskell represented the United Kingdom on Social and Human questions in the Third Committee, and Mr. Evan Luard, M.P. was the United Kingdom representative on Trusteeship and Colonial questions in the Fourth Committee.

2. The year leading up to the Twenty-third Session had been an eventful one. It had already seen at the United Nations the resumed Session of the Twenty-Second Session at which agreement was finally reached on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (Cmnd. 3683).

3. The Security Council in January had been called to deal with the situation arising from the seizure by the North Koreans of the United States Ship "Pueblo".

4. In May the Council had, in a unanimous vote, imposed comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the illegal regime in Rhodesia.

5. In the Middle East, Dr. Jarring continued with his mission under the Security Council's Resolution 242 of 22 November, 1967.

6. The scene in Africa had been darkened by the continuing civil war in Nigeria, and the absence of any progress on the racial problems of southern Africa.

7. But the event which transcended all others was the invasion of Czechoslovakia by forces of other Warsaw Pact countries on 20 August. The Security Council was immediately seized of the matter but after bitter debate, in which the Communists were isolated, action in the Council was blocked by a Soviet veto on 23 August.

8. The invasion of Czechoslovakia was the turning point of the year. Coming as it did a matter of weeks before the Assembly was due to meet, it overshadowed the Session which followed. In the General Debate at the beginning of the Session, condemnation of the invasion was widely expressed and there was deep concern at its implications for international relations generally. But in the absence of any sign that those responsible for the invasion would be influenced by Assembly action, and the Security Council being still seized of the matter, no specific item was inscribed on the Assembly's agenda; the Assembly adopted no resolution on Czechoslovakia.

9. Other major issues raised by speakers in the General Debate were Vietnam, the Middle East and Nigeria. While hopes had been raised by the start of the Vietnam peace talks in Paris there was growing concern at lack of progress. There was similarly deep concern that nearly a year after the adoption by the Security Council of Resolution 242 of 22 November, 1967, a settlement in the Middle East appeared no nearer. The Assembly also had much in mind during the General Debate the suffering in Nigeria, and many delegations emphasized the need for all possible humanitarian measures.

10. A major part of the time of the First Committee was again taken up by disarmament questions. Some anti-climax after the achievement of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was inevitable, but there was intensive debate on a number of issues and further evidence of the determination of the non-nuclear countries not to be excluded from participation in and resolution of disarmament questions. In a resolution stemming from a United Kingdom initiative in the conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was asked to undertake a study on the effects of chemical and biological weapons.

11. The other item before the First Committee of greatest interest to delegations was the question of the peaceful uses of the sea bed, both because of its intrinsic significance for all members of the United Nations and as a matter on which there are good prospects for the United Nations to make progress. The Assembly took note of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee which had met during the year and constituted a Committee to be composed of 42 states to continue the work. In addition to consideration of the sea bed problem as a whole, there was also examination of the particular questions of pollution, exploration and exploitation, and separate resolutions were adopted dealing with these.

12. The other Main Committees also once again had full agendas. The Fourth Committee held a lengthy debate on Rhodesia and adopted two resolutions. But the matter remains in the hands of the Security Council and of the Committee established by the Security Council to supervise the mandatory sanctions measures imposed against the illegal régime. The Fourth Committee also adopted another resolution on Gibraltar which the United Kingdom was compelled to reject. There were, however, fewer contentious items before the Committee than in previous years and signs of some moderation of extreme positions. This was reflected in the terms of some of the resolutions.

13. In the Second (Economic) Committee useful work was done to set up machinery to plan for the Second Development Decade. While progress at the UNCTAD Conference in New Delhi early in 1968 had been very limited, there was no attempt at the Twenty-third Session to re-open the main matters of disagreement. The atmosphere in the Second Committee was in general one of cooperation to find agreed solutions to common problems, recognising the economic interdependence of the developing and developed countries, and current economic and financial realities.

14. The Third Committee dealing with Social, Humanitarian and Cultural matters adopted 25 resolutions and made a start on a declaration on social development which is to be completed at the Twenty-fourth Session. It also



adopted a Convention on War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which was intended to preclude time limits on prosecutions for such crimes. But the terms of this Convention, in so far as it also attempted to redefine war crimes and crimes against humanity and did not respect the principle of non-retroactivity in criminal law, were unacceptable to many delegations, and the United Kingdom Delegation voted against it.

15. An entirely new issue brought before the United Nations at the Twenty-third Session was an item introduced by Sweden on the problems of human environment. This led to a unanimous decision by the General Assembly on 3 December to convene a United Nations Conference on this subject in 1972, and meanwhile to commission a report to be prepared under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

16. While the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly was not marked by any outstanding single achievement, useful work was done. The Assembly continued to fulfil its role as a forum for world opinion, and a centre for international diplomacy. While there continue to be on the agenda of the Assembly items on which the United Nations has not succeeded in advancing, on other matters there has been some modest progress, and the United Nations is increasingly active in new fields, such as the sea bed, outer-space and the human environment, of significance for the future.

## GENERAL DEBATE AND PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

### Speech by the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary

17. The Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary addressed the General Assembly on 14 October, 1968. The full text of this authoritative statement of Government policy towards the United Nations follows.

*Text of the speech by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, The Rt. Hon. Michael Stewart C.H., M.P., to the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, New York, 14 October, 1968.*

### INTRODUCTION

I want first to congratulate our President on his election and to wish him success, and to express our goodwill and our support. And I would want also to express our gratitude to the retiring President, Mr. Manescu, the Foreign Minister of Rumania, whose country I had the honour to visit recently. I believe that the way he handled our affairs earned the admiration of us all.

The President, in his opening address to this Assembly, reminded us that the United Nations is not a separate body with an existence of its own, apart from its members. And if, in what I have to say, I use the words United Nations, I shall try to keep in my mind, as I think we ought all to do, that this is simply a way of saying we ourselves, acting in and through the United Nations. Its successes are our successes, and its failures are our failures. It is ourselves.

Now it is not possible at this Assembly to make a complacent speech, because we all know that we meet in an atmosphere of frustration—a frustration not confined to us but felt by citizens and peoples all over the world. A frustration which is in part the cause of the unrest we find among the younger generation in almost every country in the world. We have therefore to ask ourselves certain fundamental questions.

### *PURPOSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS*

First of all, what is the United Nations for? What are we here for?

First among its purposes, I suppose, is the prevention of armed conflict, and that means preventing it, not merely in the way in which a policeman may stop a brawl in the street, but going further than that and getting to the causes of conflict. The United Nations should not exclusively and does not mainly act as a policeman. It must also try to act as a conciliator.

But beyond the task of preventing conflict and making it possible for people to live, there is the further task of making life worth living. And that we endeavour to do in our social, our humanitarian and our economic activities.

And if that is the answer to the question what are we here for, we have to admit we have had so far only very limited success. We can mark some successes, but we are conscious all the time of great problems where we have not fulfilled yet either of those purposes—either to make life safe, or to make it worth living.

So a further question we have to ask is, what are the conditions of successful action? What, in fact, do we have to do?

### *RESPONSIBILITIES OF MAJOR POWERS*

Now, these are questions that face all of us, but they face with particular intensity those who are permanent members of the Security Council. For this Organisation has to work on the assumption that its real effectiveness depends on a considerable measure of agreement among those permanent members.

Do we do enough to make a systematic attempt to see that that agreement, necessary to the work of the United Nations, is forthcoming?

The Secretary-General has addressed a letter to four of us, which suggests ways in which we could get somewhat nearer to the answer to this problem. I believe that letter deserves from all those to whom it was addressed sympathetic and constructive attention, and that is the spirit in which our Government will approach it.

### *Czechoslovakia*

But the permanent members cannot have that degree of unity necessary for the success of this Organisation unless there is a measure of confidence among them. And we must say straight away that that confidence, which many of us had hoped was growing, which we had some reason to believe was growing, has been sadly shaken by events in Czechoslovakia, because the conscience of the whole world was affronted by that invasion, and an indignant world made its feelings plain here in the United Nations.

The delegate who was here before me took a rather different view. I ask him to notice that what I say now is not just some prejudice of the British delegate: it expresses, as we know from proceedings in the Security Council, the overwhelming view of mankind. For the Security Council's resolution would have been overwhelmingly adopted but for the Soviet veto. Now, we in Britain respect and admire the Government and people of Czechoslovakia in this tragic and testing time, and we assure them of our sympathy and our goodwill.

I said, Mr. President, that hope had been growing of progress, progress in relations between States and progress in meeting some of the new challenges posed by scientific development and discoveries, say in outer space or on the sea-bed. But this progress can best be founded on a wider respect for international law, based on the principles of the Charter. And it is here that the effect of what happened in Czechoslovakia is most disturbing. It is clear from the Charter that members of the United Nations are required to oppose aggression: to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms: to recognise the sovereign equality of all member States: to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. These words are familiar to us all, because they come from the first two Articles of the Charter. But almost equally familiar are repeated protestations of the representatives of the Soviet Union, and of Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland, of their devotion to these objectives. Let me quote one example. In his speech to the Assembly on the 23rd of September, 1966, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, said—and I quote—‘Acts of interference in the domestic affairs of independent States wherever they are committed are a threat to peace and to the security of all peoples . . . the Soviet Union, a firm adherent to the principle of non-interference . . . vigorously opposes those who disregard the sovereign rights of peoples and seek to implant lawlessness in international relations’.

Now, I would like to ask how can this be reconciled with some other words used by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union in this Assembly on the 3rd of October—and again I quote—‘The Soviet Union deems it necessary to proclaim from this rostrum that the Socialist States cannot and will not tolerate a situation where the vital interests of Socialism are infringed upon and encroachments are made on the inviolability of the boundaries of the Socialist commonwealth’. Now, set those words side by side with what has been done in Czechoslovakia and we see that this doctrine of a so-called ‘Socialist commonwealth’ is an assertion that the Soviet Union will judge for itself what the interests of certain other States may be and will, if it sees fit, take military action outside its own territory in accordance with its judgment of what the interests of other States may be. Now that is wholly repugnant to the Charter. And may I add this: speaking as a socialist and representing a country which belongs to a real Commonwealth, I reject both the doctrine and the perversion of language in which it was expressed.

#### *Work for East-West understanding*

However, the United Kingdom still earnestly seeks to develop understanding with the nations of Eastern Europe as with all others. We must

hope that the Soviet Union, and the other Governments concerned in the invasion, will come to realise and to repair the harm they have done to the authority of international law and order. By far the most significant step they could take would be to withdraw their troops from Czechoslovakia. There is no external threat to Czechoslovakia and never has been, except a threat from her allies in the East.

Despite this tragic setback to all our efforts to bring understanding between East and West, the British Government remains convinced that this is the path, the continued search for détente, which we must still try to follow. In the West we have helped to arrest conflict in recent years through a collective defence organisation which is within the terms of Article 51 of the Charter. This has preserved the peace in Europe and the North Atlantic area for 20 years. But it is not enough to prevent conflict. We must also work to relax tension and work for lasting security. That is one of the reasons why the British Government has repeatedly made clear that we remain dedicated to the aim of closer integration in Western Europe. But this movement to closer integration in Western Europe—although it has the support of almost all the Governments and a great majority of the peoples of Western Europe—has so far been frustrated. We all know why, and we deplore the fact.

And meanwhile the people of Germany remain divided and unrepresented in the United Nations and the efforts of the Federal Republic to develop a new relationship with her neighbours in the East have been rebuffed and misrepresented. It is symptomatic of the bankruptcy of Soviet policy that Moscow should have embarked on the clumsy diversion of threatening West Germany with Articles of the United Nations Charter framed in completely different circumstances. I should say one other thing on Germany. I repeat here once again the solemn commitments undertaken by the British Government with its allies to uphold the security of the Federal Republic and of West Berlin.

### *Disarmament*

I have spoken about Czechoslovakia and its effects on the European scene. But even now there is some work that it is possible to do to try to re-create confidence, and that can be done particularly in the field of disarmament.

And here I would say that I welcome the emphasis given by many speakers—including the speaker for the Soviet Union, and from the Ukraine who preceded me here—to disarmament. The signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was an important step forward. But it is a step that will rapidly lose its value if it is not followed by further measures in the disarmament field.

Our aim is general and complete disarmament. We know by experience that if we are to get there we have got to seize hold one after another of the steps to disarmament that can practically be taken now. It was because we approached the problem that way that we got the Non-Proliferation Treaty signed, that we got the draft agreed upon.

Where do we go next? Well, my own country has put forward proposals at Geneva for making the Test Ban Treaty comprehensive. There have been difficulties in this. We have put forward a proposal which, we believe,

finds a way through those difficulties. We have also put forward proposals with regard to chemical and biological warfare. My country is in a position to claim that a substantial part of the ideas now before the 18 nations in Geneva have been brought forward by the British Government.

If, Mr. President, we can get as far as withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia, and if we can proceed to make workmanlike progress on disarmament, we can still promote that confidence which is needed if there is to be some measure of agreement between the permanent members and if, in consequence, the United Nations is to be able to get on with its work.

### *SEEKING SOLUTIONS : SUCCESSES AND FAILURES*

Now I said that its work was in the first place concerned with preventing conflict. I want to look at some particular problems to try to chalk up where we have been successful, where we have not, and see if we can draw from that some conclusion as to what the conditions of success are and how therefore we ought to approach our problems in the future.

#### *Cyprus*

I believe one could say, to take a first example, that on the question of Cyprus, although this still remains unsolved, the United Nations is entitled to feel that it has made real progress and that it is not foolish or over-optimistic to hope for a real settlement. Now we have got that far, partly because there was an efficient United Nations force to help in the immediate task of keeping the peace. And one of the lessons we must draw, a very homely one, is that if we want to do our job properly we have got to have efficient administration. And I would say this particularly applies in those circumstances, limited in number but important, where it is desirable for there to be a United Nations force organised. Beyond that—again, as I put it earlier, beyond the work of the policeman to the work of the conciliator—I think we have noticed with gratification the way in which the parties concerned have engaged in serious discussion of the dispute. By so doing they have shown respect for the principles of the Charter and for the work of the United Nations, and I wish them success in those discussions.

So there are two conclusions to be drawn from this: that if we want the United Nations to be successful it has got to be efficient administratively, and its members have got to mean what they say and they have got to show respect for those parts of the Charter that require all nations to seek peaceful methods of solving disputes.

#### *Middle East*

I turn next to the Middle East, where we cannot congratulate ourselves, at least not as much as we might be entitled to in the example of Cyprus. We have not got so far. Last year the United Nations was unable to keep the peace. Nor, so far, have we succeeded in creating the conditions of peace.

And when many of us came to New York for this Assembly we were gravely concerned by the outlook. Without greater readiness of the parties to enter into substantial discussions on the basis of the unanimously approved resolution, without that there seemed no hope of avoiding a further

drift to disaster. Dr. Jarring's skill and persistence have earned the admiration of all, but no one would expect him to continue his efforts if there were not a new readiness on all sides to enable him to go forward. Dr. Jarring is in the position of a man asked to solve a jigsaw puzzle, a hard enough thing to do at any time. But if people don't give you the pieces of the puzzle to start on it becomes harder still.

At this critical point, however, the means for a solution are available. The Security Council resolution deals with everything which must accompany a lasting settlement, and Dr. Jarring is still here to assist in working out how the resolution is to be put into effect.

There are so many complicated matters to be settled that it would be unrealistic to regard this resolution as self-implementing. But it would be equally unrealistic to be dogmatic about the way agreement should be hammered out, and unreasonable and dogmatic to preclude any one method of hammering out agreement.

The parties concerned have accepted the resolution, we understand that they are ready to continue to discuss with Dr. Jarring the means of carrying it out. It is recognised that all aspects of the resolution must be accepted. That there should be agreement on all of them, and on the programme under which all of them will be put into effect.

But in the work which will be necessary I believe much emphasis must be laid on the problem of the refugees. I am glad to note that the Israel Government intends to introduce new measures to hasten the return to their homes of those who fled during the fighting last year. I very much hope these new measures will lead to the speedy return, before the rigours of the winter, of all those who wish to go back.

But the greater task is to help the large body of refugees who have suffered so tragically for the last 20 years. To give them again the opportunity to live in the dignity which should be the right of every human being. The task, in which Her Majesty's Government will be ready to assist, will inevitably take long to complete. But I believe that if an early agreement could be reached about how this problem should be tackled, this could transform the atmosphere. We can't see the end of the problem all at once. If we had the conviction there was going to be a real beginning in solving it, that would transform the atmosphere and we should be in sight of that real, just and lasting peace that all in the Middle East so urgently need.

But there must be no more delay. I see no effective alternative to Dr. Jarring's work.

It is for the countries directly concerned to move from words to action: to lay proposals before Dr. Jarring: and to seek with him to bridge the differences between their proposals and to widen the area of the agreement. It is the duty of all members of the United Nations to use whatever influence they possess, not as partisans of one side or the other, but as partisans of peace and in support of Dr. Jarring's mission. And in anything that the British Government has been able to contribute, this has been its consistent purpose.

*Vietnam*

I have spoken of Cyprus, of the Middle East. I turn to the problem of Vietnam. And here, we have to say, not only has the United Nations made no progress in solving this problem, but all important discussion about it has been outside the framework of the United Nations. And eyes are turned now, if they look for hope, not here but to the talks in Paris.

I would say one word about the talks in Paris. Some months ago the United States took action which removed something like 80 per cent of the territory of North Vietnam from the dread of attack and war. I would have thought it reasonable that the Government in Hanoi should be prepared to take at least some measure to reduce the scale of the war. And if anyone says that in these circumstances—whatever one may think of the rest of the dispute—if anyone says that he thinks the Government of Hanoi is entitled to continue the war with unabated ferocity I cannot see how he can claim that he really wants peace in this matter. But why is our attention turned to Paris and not here, for Vietnam? Why has the United Nations not been able to handle it?

One reason certainly is that the People's Republic of China is not represented in this Organisation. And I draw from this another conclusion as to the conditions for the success of our work—that we must seek to be a universal Organisation, not excluding particular States or Governments, provided they are genuine States, on the ground that we don't happen to like their régime.

*Rhodesia*

I move from that problem to one which goes to the heart of the United Nations Charter, and which I believe very many of us here have been following with acute interest in the last week. I refer to Rhodesia, and I want to say this.

The talks which took place in Gibraltar between the Prime Minister and the leaders of the illegal régime have ended. I regret to say they have ended because of fundamental disagreements on major issues. A wide gulf between the two positions remains. But I am sure it was right that this attempt should have been made at the highest level in order to discover whether a settlement could be made. We would not have wanted this dispute to continue merely because the British Government had not made every reasonable effort to get a settlement. But throughout the talks Mr. Wilson made it plain that a settlement would have to be a settlement on the basis of the six principles which were and are the basis of our policy. In the absence of such a settlement, it is important that all of us here should continue resolutely with our policy, with the mandatory sanctions on which we are agreed. When a settlement which the world can accept is reached, it will be that policy which has played a great part in reaching it. In the absence of settlement, we must continue with that policy. And why have we an agreed policy? Not because everybody when we first began to discuss this problem had exactly the same view as to the best way of dealing with it, but because we were all prepared to work out the highest common factor of agreement and concentrate on getting ahead with that.

And I draw from that yet a further conclusion as to one of the requirements for success in the United Nations: that is to say, we must have a practical appreciation of what can be done and what can't. We don't always remember that.

*Must be practical—*

We have sometimes passed resolutions which, quite frankly, are not only of no effect in themselves, but can be dangerous to the United Nations because of their obvious impracticability. And they devalue the currency of United Nations action. I am thinking, for example, of resolutions which call on us to do things that we know quite well are beyond the capacity of this Organisation. Such was the resolution on South-West Africa, or resolutions which are in conflict with things clearly laid down in the Charter. I refer there to the resolution on Gibraltar, which conflicted in my judgment and that of many with the requirement in the Charter that when you are dealing with colonial or former colonial questions the interests of the inhabitants should be paramount. We want to avoid, I think, resolutions of that kind: not only don't they tell the world anything useful, but they damage the credibility of the United Nations.

As a British judge once said, about a wildly unlikely statement by a witness, "This is like the thirteenth stroke of a clock that is out of order: it is not only incredible in itself, but it discredits all previous utterances".

*—And exercise foresight*

I have spoken so far of present and past problems, but we are beginning to notice that we ought to try and seize certain problems by the forelock when they begin to appear on the world horizon. That is why it is good that we are already beginning to consider the problem of the uses of the sea-bed, and there is similarly the initiative of Sweden that we ought to consider the effects of modern industrial civilisation on human environment. For all any of us know, in 10 years' time the question of the use of the sea-bed might have grown to be one of the major questions affecting either human prosperity or human security. If we don't get on with our consultations on it now, we might find that a situation had arisen when the problem had assumed great importance and when, because of that, country after country in the world had already taken up fixed position as to how it should be handled and had got vested interests in solving it one way rather than another. And once that happened it would be very difficult to get a solution. It is important therefore that these problems should be seized as quickly as possible, and I am glad to see that we are doing that, and that I think shows that another condition for the success of the United Nations is that it should exercise foresight.

*MAKING LIFE WORTH LIVING*

Now, I said that our job was not only to prevent conflict but to make life worth living. And I think it is important for me to stress that. You see, Mr. President, I have the good fortune to live in one of the richer countries of the world, a country free from internal strife, a country which, if the peace



of the world is kept, can look forward to a rising standard of life year after year. It is quite easy therefore for me to say that I believe in peace, order and stability.

#### *Human Rights and Rule of Law*

But what about large sections of the human race to whom at present peace means the continuation of poverty, the continuation of oppression, the continuation of injustice? The virtues of peace and stability will not be quite so obvious to them. If we want men to love peace we shall want to make sure that peace means something more to them than the continuation of poverty, oppression and discrimination. Well, we try to tackle that, we try to tackle it in the field of human rights. And Article 56 of the Charter makes it clear that no country can say that the human rights of its citizens are an exclusively domestic matter. A country that denies its citizens the basic human rights is by virtue of Article 56 in breach of an international obligation.

Now, human rights are many and widespread, and if we set to work I don't doubt that we could all of us point out to each other ways in which our neighbours fell short of a full realisation of human rights. But it would probably be more profitable if instead of reproaching each other we asked ourselves, each one of us, the question: is my own country doing enough to establish human rights? Well, Mr. President, in the United Kingdom we are trying to do so. We have enacted recently, for the first time in our history, an act dealing with relations between people of different races in the United Kingdom. And in order to establish further our regard for the whole principle of international law we shall, at the beginning of next year, withdraw most of our reservations to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

I sometimes think some of our discussions on human rights are spoilt by the vice of partiality: a tendency sometimes for one country to attack another for breach of human rights without having asked itself first sufficiently what the state of affairs is in its own country. Another condition therefore for the success of our work is that fairness of judgment that causes a man or a nation to apply that same standards of conduct to himself as he requires of other people.

#### *Relief and Humanitarian Work*

Further in the field of trying to make life worth living, there is relief and humanitarian work. And here we think particularly of the tragic events in Nigeria. We have the Secretary-General's report on the work our Organisation and other international organisations are doing there. My country has contributed and will contribute to that work. We have had from Mr. Arikpo the assurance of the Nigerian Government's desire to co-operate with internationally organised relief work. And the international community therefore must, in co-operation with Nigeria, continue this work until the need for it is at an end.

#### *Economic Work*

Among other things needed to make life worth living is to get on with the economic side of our work. For many millions the personal problems

of poverty and hunger are of much greater urgency than the political problems which I have described. You have reminded us, Mr. President, that economic and social work is 85 per cent of our efforts. This is as it should be. Britain is trying to do, within its financial limitations, all it can to contribute to this work. We have increased our contribution to UNICEF, we have contributed to the Secretary-General's Trust Fund for Population, and I am glad to say that, within our existing aid ceiling, the United Kingdom Government will increase its contribution to the United Nations Development Programme in 1969 by an increase of rather more than one million dollars.

But of course a further cause of frustration is the slow progress in bridging the gap between the developed and developing nations of the world. And we haven't yet been able to get the results through UNCTAD which we had hoped to get. But the second conference of UNCTAD did mark some useful achievements and brought into focus the practical possibilities in the years ahead. There is an increasing awareness everywhere that development is the concern of all countries, developing and developed alike—a complex joint enterprise calling for the closest co-operation of all in the patient search for agreement on what the Secretary-General of UNCTAD has called “convergent action”.

### *CONCLUSION*

My conclusion, therefore, Mr. President, is that if we are to escape from the frustration that now surrounds us and carry out the purposes for which we are supposed to be here, we must have regard to the universality of membership, to respect for the Charter, to efficiency of administration, to a sensible concern with what is practical and concentration of our efforts on that, to the exercise of foresight, and to the exercise of fair judgment. And, Mr. President, we had better hurry up. Every year the scientists produce some new device or idea which is either pregnant with promise of greater prosperity for mankind, or pregnant with the threat of more appalling disaster. Every year, therefore, the prize for success in our work in the United Nations is enlarged, and every year the penalty for failure, failure to keep the peace, becomes more terrible. It is at that crisis of human affairs that we now stand.

### Opening of the Session and Election of Officers

18. The Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly was opened on 24 September, 1968, by the President of the Twenty-second Session, Mr. Corneliu Manescu of Rumania. After the appointment of the Credentials Committee (see paragraph 23) the Assembly proceeded to elect its President. Only one candidate had been formally announced, Mr. Emilio Arenales, Foreign Minister of Guatemala, who was duly elected in a secret ballot by 119 votes.

19. In his opening address to the Assembly, Mr. Arenales analysed both the nature of the United Nations and existing trends. He pointed out that the United Nations was never intended to be a super-state, but rather a parliament with many limitations. The veto system in the Security Council enabled the Great Powers to yield part of their sovereignty without becoming "victims of the dogma of the legal equality of states". It was not the use but the abuse of the veto which was wrong. The weaknesses and limitations of the United Nations were not those of an entity with an independent life of its own, but the direct responsibility of its founders and of its present membership. He pointed out that resolutions of the United Nations were no more than recommendations to sovereign national states. The United Nations could not by itself solve the world's problems: it was up to the member states to implement in the national sphere what they proposed in the international forum. Mr. Arenales also stressed the danger of allowing the United Nations to become choked with excessive pressures and demands on its limited resources. He suggested that it was equally essential to recognise the limitations of the human and financial resources of most of the member states. The international community must not deceive itself that problems could be solved merely by passing resolutions which were rarely complied with or carried out at the national level and rarely meant the same thing to all parties to a dispute.

20. The seven Chairmen of the Main Committees were then elected as follows:

- First Committee: Piero Vinci (Italy)
- Special Political Committee: Abdulrahim Abby Farah (Somalia)
- Second Committee: Richard M. Akwei (Ghana)
- Third Committee: Ernst Nettel (Austria)
- Fourth Committee: P. V. J. Solomon (Trinidad and Tobago)
- Fifth Committee: G. G. Tchernouchchenko (Byelo-Russia)
- Sixth Committee: Dr. Krishna Rao (India)

21. The seventeen Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly elected were: Bulgaria, Canada, China, France, Guinea, Guyana, Iran, Lebanon, Mauritania, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America.

### The General Committee

22. The General Committee, which acts as a Steering Committee, is composed of the President, the 17 Vice-Presidents and the Chairmen of the seven Main Committees. The General Committee met on 25 September,

17 October, 1 and 15 November, 9 and 18 December to make recommendations to the Assembly on the inclusion of items on the agenda and their allocation to Plenary or to one of the seven Main Committees for debate. At its meeting on 18 December it considered the question of the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, which is covered separately in this report (see paragraphs 70–72).

### **The Credentials Committee**

23. At its meeting on 24 September the General Assembly appointed a Credentials Committee for its Twenty-third Session, consisting of Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Liberia, Mongolia, New Zealand, the USSR, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States. The Committee met on 19 December and elected the representative of Austria to be Chairman.

24. In the course of the Committee's discussions, the representative of the USSR introduced a draft resolution deciding to consider invalid the credentials "of the persons calling themselves 'the representatives of the Republic of China'". The representatives of Mongolia and Tanzania spoke in support of the draft resolution. The representatives of the United States, Costa Rica and New Zealand opposed it. The draft resolution was rejected in a vote by 5 votes to 3 with one abstention.

25. The representative of Tanzania formally proposed that the Credentials Committee declare "invalid the credentials of the representatives of the Government of South Africa". The representatives of the USSR and Mongolia supported the Tanzanian proposal. The representatives of the United States, Costa Rica, New Zealand and Austria, while rejecting the *apartheid* policies of the Government of South Africa, expressed their opposition to the Tanzanian proposal. The proposal submitted by Tanzania failed by 5 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

26. The representative of Tanzania, addressing himself to the question of the credentials submitted by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, expressed his delegation's view that those credentials should not be taken as including the credentials of the Republic of Biafra.

27. In the light of the discussion, the Credentials Committee adopted a resolution by 6 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions, recalling the different views expressed during the debate and accepting the credentials of all representatives to the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly. The Committee further recommended that the General Assembly should approve its report.

28. The report of the Credentials Committee was taken by the General Assembly in Plenary on 21 December and was adopted by 82 votes to none, with 24 abstentions. A number of representatives made reservations on the credentials of the representatives of China and South Africa and the representatives of China and South Africa made statements in reply. The representative of Nigeria rejected as baseless the remarks made by the Tanzanian representative at the meeting of the Credentials Committee with regard to the credentials submitted by the delegation of Nigeria as recorded in the report of the Credentials Committee.

## **Elections to the Councils, and to the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation**

### *Elections to the Security Council*

29. On 1 November the General Assembly, acting in accordance with the geographical pattern for the distribution of seats in the Security Council established by General Assembly Resolution 1991(A) (XVIII) of 17 December, 1963, elected Colombia, Finland, Nepal, Spain and Zambia as members of the Security Council for a period of two years commencing on 1 January, 1969, to fill the seats vacated by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ethiopia and India, whose terms of office were due to expire on 31 December, 1968. None of these elections was contested.

### *Elections to the Economic and Social Council*

30. On 19 November, the General Assembly, acting in accordance with the geographical pattern for the distribution of seats established by its Resolution 1991 (B) (XVIII) of 17 December, 1963, elected Jamaica, Norway, Pakistan, Sudan, Uruguay and Yugoslavia to the Economic and Social Council to fill the seats vacated by Czechoslovakia, Iran, Morocco, Panama, Philippines, Sweden and Venezuela, whose terms of office were due to expire on 31 December, 1968. Neither of the candidates for the second Asian seat (Ceylon and Pakistan) achieved a two-thirds majority at the 19 November ballot. After another inconclusive ballot on 25 November, Ceylon withdrew and Indonesia was elected on the third ballot. The United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose terms of office also expired on 31 December, 1968, were re-elected to the Council on 19 November.

### *Elections to the Industrial Development Board*

31. In its Resolution 2152 (XXI) of 17 November, 1966, the General Assembly established the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) and decided that the Industrial Development Board, its principal organ, should comprise 45 members elected for three year terms (with one third of the membership retiring each year) according to the following pattern: 18 from the developing countries of Africa and Asia; 15 from the developing countries of Western Europe, Pacific region and North America; 7 from Central and South America and the Caribbean; and 5 from the countries of Eastern Europe. The terms of Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Finland, France, India, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Netherlands, Rumania, Sudan, Thailand, the United Arab Republic and the United States of America were due to expire at the end of 1968.

32. On 19 November, the General Assembly elected or re-elected the following states for a three-year term: Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, France, India, Iraq, Japan, Kuwait, Netherlands, Poland, Sudan, Thailand, the United States of America and Upper Volta.

### *Election of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*

33. By its Resolution 2294 (XXII) of 11 December, 1967, the General Assembly had decided to extend the mandate of the Office of the High

Commissioner for a further five years from 1 January, 1969. On 18 November, the General Assembly, on the nomination of the Secretary-General, renewed the term of Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan of Iran as High Commissioner for the period of the renewed mandate.

### **Admission of New Members**

34. On 6 September, upon attaining independence, Swaziland applied for membership of the United Nations. The application was considered by the Security Council on 11 September and the Council adopted unanimously a resolution co-sponsored by Algeria, Canada, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Senegal and the United Kingdom recommending to the General Assembly the admission of the Kingdom of Swaziland. The Assembly unanimously approved the Security Council recommendation on 24 September and Swaziland immediately took its seat in the Assembly.

35. On 25 October, having attained independence on 12th October, Equatorial Guinea applied for membership of the United Nations. The application was considered by the Security Council on 6 November and the Council adopted unanimously a resolution co-sponsored by Algeria, Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Paraguay and Senegal recommending to the General Assembly the admission of Equatorial Guinea. The Assembly unanimously approved this recommendation on 12 November and Equatorial Guinea immediately took its seat in the Assembly.

36. The admission of Swaziland and Equatorial Guinea brought the total membership of the United Nations to 126.

### **Visits of Heads of State and Heads of Government**

37. The General Assembly was addressed by one Head of State and three Prime Ministers: Prince Makhosini Doamini, the Prime Minister of Swaziland (on 24 September); M. François Tombalbaye, the President of the Republic of Chad (on 7 October); Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India (on 14 October); and Mr. Keith Holyoake, the Prime Minister of New Zealand (also on 14 October).

### **General Debate**

38. The General Debate opened on 2 October and lasted until 25 October. The Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Michael Stewart, addressed the Assembly on 14 October (text at paragraph 17). There were 111 speakers in the General Debate, mostly Foreign Ministers, and, as usual, a wide range of subjects was covered.

39. The Debate was overshadowed by the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia which had taken place in August, although the Vietnam war and the Middle East crisis also featured prominently in almost every speech. Under the theme of increasing world tension and the need for *détente* most speakers dealt with disarmament and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

#### *Czechoslovakia*

40. The great majority of the speakers in the General Debate made more or less direct references to the invasion of Czechoslovakia and its implications. The representatives of the NATO countries, almost all the speakers

from Latin America, except Cuba, and many from Asia and Africa strongly criticised the invasion. The Czechoslovak Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Pleskot, told the Assembly on 4 October that in August his country had found itself faced with a "new reality" when troops of five "socialist" states entered Czechoslovakia. He hoped that no action would be taken in the United Nations which might hinder attempts to solve the situation on the basis of the Moscow talks.

41. The only speakers who defended the invasion were those from the Soviet Union and the countries who participated in the invasion. Mr. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the USSR, speaking on 3 October, declared that the Soviet Union would not tolerate any attempt to roll back the "socialist commonwealth" and that there was no contradiction between the Soviet determination to defend the security of this "commonwealth" and their determination to uphold the cause of peace and international security.

42. Mr. Stewart said on 14 October that the confidence which was growing among the Permanent Members of the Security Council had been badly shaken by events in Czechoslovakia. It was clear that the doctrine of a so-called "socialist commonwealth" was an unacceptable assertion that the Soviet Union would judge for itself what the interests of certain other states might be and would, if it saw fit, take military action against them. There had never been any threat to Czechoslovakia except from its allies in Eastern Europe. M. Debré, the Foreign Minister of France said on 7 October that Europeans in the east and in the west had been shocked when they learned of the intervention in Czechoslovakia which was a violation of numerous solemn commitments. Mr. Rusk, Secretary of State of the United States, said on 2 October that the leaders of Czechoslovakia had set out to devise new policies closer to popular needs and wishes. The Soviet invasion was designed to reverse these policies and to subject Czechoslovakia again to Moscow's will. There had been no attempts from the West to foment "counter-revolution" in Czechoslovakia and no request for Soviet troops from any Czechoslovak authority.

43. The representatives of Rumania and Yugoslavia both stressed the importance of respect for the independence and sovereignty of states.

#### *Middle East*

44. The Middle East was again one of the main topics in the General Debate. Most speakers deplored the fact that no settlement had yet been reached, that the Security Council Resolution 242 of 22 November, 1967, had still not been implemented and Dr. Jarring—in the value of whose mission they reaffirmed their faith—had not yet made much progress in helping the parties to reach a solution. The Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Eban, and Arab speakers devoted the main part of their statements to the current situation.

45. The Arabs asserted their readiness to implement the Security Council resolution and to do all in their power to assist the Jarring mission; Israel's refusal to implement the Security Council resolution and to accept a representative of the Secretary-General under the humanitarian resolutions was proof of her expansionist designs and of her inhumane treatment of Arabs in the occupied areas. They were bitter about the continuing plight of the Palestinian refugees and about American support for Israel. Mr.

Riad, Foreign Minister of the UAR, suggested that Dr. Jarring should propose a timetable for the implementation of the Security Council resolution. Syria, Algeria and Iraq did not support the Jarring mission.

46. Mr. Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel, said that a settlement should be based on a permanent peace, secure and recognised boundaries and freedom of navigation. He suggested that there should be an international conference to discuss the question of the refugees and that the Holy Places in Jerusalem should be the responsibility of those who held them in reverence. He put forward nine principles for the achievement of peace and criticised the Arabs for not making detailed comments on specific and concrete issues.

47. The communist countries, except for Rumania, which maintained its neutral position, placed the blame for the failure to achieve a settlement upon Israel. They said that Israel should withdraw from the occupied territories, so that a settlement based on the territorial integrity and political independence of all concerned could be reached.

48. Mr. Rusk said that while so many Foreign Ministers were in New York the parties should try to progress from disputes on procedure to the discussion of substance. Mr. Stewart regretted the fact that the United Nations had not been able to keep the peace. He said that the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, dealt with all the ingredients of a lasting settlement and that Dr. Jarring was there to assist in working out how the resolution was to be put into effect; it was unrealistic to regard the resolution as self-implementing. He emphasised the problem of the refugees, on which some agreement ought to be reached before the onset of winter; Her Majesty's Government were ready to do all they could to assist. It was for the countries directly concerned to lay proposals before Dr. Jarring and to seek with him to bridge their differences. All members of the United Nations should use their influence to assist.

49. At the closing session in Plenary on 21 December, the President of the General Assembly said that consultations he had carried out with various delegations had given him to understand that the general feeling was that the agenda item "The situation in the Middle East" should be deferred until the next regular session, in whose provisional agenda it would be included. It was so agreed.

### *Vietnam*

50. Most speakers regretted the fact that the war in Vietnam was still continuing and that the hopes that had been placed in the Paris peace talks had still to be realised. Many countries called for a total cessation of the bombing. Some mentioned the important role that the United Nations could play in rehabilitation of the country when the war ended. Mr. Rusk restated the American position on Vietnam and said that his country was ready to stop all bombing the moment that they felt that this would lead to peace. It was up to Hanoi, which had so far rejected all proposals, to get down to the serious business of making peace in Paris. Mr. Stewart reminded the Assembly that the Americans had already freed 80 per cent of the country from the fear of bombardment. It was reasonable that the government in Hanoi should be prepared to take at least some measure to reduce the scale of the war. He drew attention to the fact that the



United Nations had played no part in the attempts to bring about a peace settlement. One reason for this was the exclusion of Communist China from United Nations membership; the aim should be a universal Organisation. Australia and other countries with national contingents fighting in South Vietnam spoke strongly in support of their policies. The Foreign Minister of Laos spoke of his country's hopes for the Paris peace talks. Mr. Gromyko called for an unconditional withdrawal of American troops and a settlement based on the Geneva agreement and on the self-determination of the Vietnamese people, in accordance with the proposals of the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Cambodia accused the United States of attacks on Cambodian territory and called for a recognition of its borders as established by an international treaty confirmed by the International Court of Justice.

### *African Problems*

51. The problems of Africa were discussed by most speakers. Mr. Stewart spoke of the talks between Britain and the leaders of the illegal régime in Rhodesia held at Gibraltar and emphasised that any settlement would have to be based on the six principles laid down by the United Kingdom Government. In the absence of a settlement, the policy of mandatory sanctions should be resolutely pursued. Many African speakers pointed to the failure of sanctions and called on Britain to use force to bring down the illegal régime in Rhodesia which was moving towards a policy of *apartheid*. A number of African speakers also cast doubt on Britain's sincerity in negotiating with the Smith régime. The Foreign Minister of Uganda, Mr. Odaka, said that the recent talks between Britain and Rhodesia had confirmed apprehensions about Britain's attitude towards her responsibilities to the people of Zimbabwe.

52. *Apartheid* in South Africa and Portuguese rule in Angola and Mozambique were strongly attacked by speakers from a variety of countries. South Africa and Portugal were also attacked for their help to the illegal régime in Rhodesia and many speakers referred to the existence of a Pretoria, Salisbury, Lisbon axis. Many speakers condemned the failure of South Africa to comply with the Assembly's resolutions on South West Africa. Mr. Stewart said that resolutions such as that of 1966 on South West Africa, devalued the currency of the United Nations, since they called for action which was well known to be beyond the capacity of the Organisation. The representatives of Lesotho, Botswana, Malawi and Swaziland explained that their policies towards South Africa were dictated by economic and geographical considerations.

53. The civil war in Nigeria was referred to by many speakers in the General Debate, particularly by the Africans and representatives of western delegations. Mr. Arikpo, Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs, spoke of the indivisible entity of his country and condemned support of Biafra which he claimed was governed by financial interests. He spoke of Nigeria's readiness to co-operate with humanitarian organisations in the rehabilitation of the country. Most western speakers stressed the need for humanitarian assistance to the area of conflict and many said that it was here that the United Nations could play a role. Mr. Stewart said that the international community must co-operate with the Federal Government of Nigeria in

bringing relief to the suffering people. Most African speakers endorsed the resolutions of the conference of the OAU, held in Algiers, and condemned outside interference in the affairs of Nigeria. Many of them emphasised that if the movement towards secession was successful in Nigeria it could spread to the rest of Africa and lead to fragmentation and renewed exploitation of the continent. Many African speakers particularly condemned the sale of arms to the rebel forces. The Foreign Ministers of France and Zambia explained their countries' support for Biafra. Tanzania and Honduras referred to the conflict as "genocidal".

### *Colonial Problems*

54. Although colonial questions were touched on by many speakers in the debate, nearly all confined their remarks to Rhodesia and Portuguese African territories (see above paras. 51 and 52). Colonialism generally was given less prominence in the debate than in previous sessions. A few speakers mentioned Gibraltar. Mr. Stewart said that the General Assembly resolution on Gibraltar conflicted with the requirement of the Charter that the interests of the inhabitants should be paramount. The Foreign Minister of Spain, Mr. Castiella, said that his country was the only one in the world which, while it was decolonising, was itself the victim of colonialism.

### *Territorial and Other Disputes*

55. Various territorial disputes were also raised by the parties concerned. A number of exchanges took place between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and the Farakha barrage; between Pakistan and Afghanistan over Pakhtunistan; and between the Philippines and Malaysia over Sabah. Spain and Morocco spoke of their negotiations on Ifni and the Spanish Sahara; Guyana and Venezuela referred to their border dispute; and Guatemala and Argentina affirmed their claims to British Honduras and the Falkland Islands respectively. Austria referred to its continuing negotiations with Italy on the Alto Adige. Turkey, Greece and Cyprus all spoke on the Cyprus situation with guarded optimism. The representative of Laos complained of the continuance of military operations in his country by the Neo Lao Hak Xat in alliance with North Vietnamese battalions. Cambodia accused the United States of armed incursions into Cambodian territory and the bombing of Cambodian villages.

### *Chinese Representation*

56. The question of Chinese representation at the United Nations was not emphasised in the general Debate. Many speakers did, however, continue to refer to it, particularly in the context of the desirability of universal membership of the Organisation. Some speakers also considered the admission of the People's Republic of China essential if disarmament measures were to be effective. Mr. Stewart said that the absence of the People's Republic of China from the Organisation was one reason why the United Nations had not been able to contribute to a settlement of the Vietnam conflict. Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Rusk made only brief mention of this question and Mr. Debré made none at all.

*Germany*

57. Mr. Gromyko and other communist speakers denounced the supposed expansionist policies of the Bonn Government. Mr. Gromyko went on to say, however, that the Soviet Union did not object to good relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and was ready to co-operate with it in various fields. He called for recognition of the two German states and the admission of both states to the United Nations. The Foreign Minister of Rumania noticeably refrained from any attack on the policies of the Federal Republic of Germany. Many of the members of NATO, including the United States and the United Kingdom, made clear that the enemy states Articles of the Charter, Articles 107 and 53, did not give the Soviet Union a right to intervene unilaterally in the Federal Republic of Germany. Mr. Stewart repeated the solemn commitments undertaken by the British Government with its allies to uphold the security of the Federal Republic and of West Berlin.

*Disarmament*

58. Most speakers discussed disarmament. Many stressed the great importance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, though it was emphasised that this Treaty must be considered to be only the first in a series of steps towards complete disarmament. The Treaty was some evidence that the Great Powers could co-operate with one another and many West European speakers hoped that the Czechoslovak crisis would not compromise future cooperation, though recognising the inevitable damage to confidence caused by the events in Czechoslovakia. The smaller nations, in particular, hoped that if progress could be made towards disarmament, this would release money and resources for development. Some speakers were doubtful about the guarantees of security offered to non-nuclear countries in the Treaty. They feared that the Treaty would tend to confirm the domination of the nuclear countries and doubted its effectiveness as China and France were not signatories. Some countries expressed support for the work of the Non-Nuclear Conference in Geneva. Concern was expressed over biological, chemical and conventional weapons, which many felt should also come under international control.

58. Most Soviet bloc speakers spoke at some length on disarmament, commending the Soviet memorandum concerning urgent measure to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament. They urged once again that a conference of all European states should be held to discuss collective security. Mr. Gromyko, who devoted a large part of his statement to disarmament, reaffirmed that his Government were prepared to start an exchange of views on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear-weapon delivery vehicles with the Government of the United States. Mr. Stewart said the United Kingdom's aim was general and complete disarmament. To achieve this, it was necessary to take, one after another, the steps to disarmament which could be practically taken now. The United Kingdom had put forward proposals for making the Test Ban Treaty comprehensive and on biological and chemical warfare. Mr. Rusk said disarmament was an overriding interest of all. His government were prepared to work for a number of measures now pending in the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. They were also ready to discuss the question of the

prohibition of weapons on the ocean floor. Mr. Hartling, Foreign Minister of Denmark, said that his Government wished to introduce a draft resolution possible registration of all imports and exports of conventional arms. Senator Medici, Foreign Minister of Italy, revived the Italian proposal for an *ad hoc* Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. Mr. José de Magalhães Pinto, Minister for External Relations of Brazil, said that his country favoured the idea of a world-wide convention guaranteeing states against aggression by nuclear weapons.

### *Economic Problems*

60. The problems of development and economic assistance were discussed by most speakers in the debate. Disappointment was expressed, particularly by the developing countries, at the meagre results of the first development decade and the second UNCTAD Conference in New Delhi. Many of the poorer nations were bitter at the failure of the richer nations, except the Netherlands and France, to reach the promised target of one per cent. of their gross national product devoted to economic aid. They contrasted the vast sums which richer nations spent on such matters as defence with the little they were prepared to give for development; the balance of trade was entirely in favour of developed countries and agreement must be reached soon to counteract this and to narrow the rapidly widening gap between richer and poorer nations, which was a source of tension and potential danger in the world. The need for assistance in the development of resources, particularly human resources, was stressed, and Italy and Canada outlined plans for the training of personnel in management and technology. Some countries expressed the hope that valuable lessons would be drawn from the first development decade. Others spoke of the need for more effective overall planning. A few Members, in particular Singapore and the Philippines, said that the main effort for development must come from within the developing countries themselves, which must take advantage of new techniques. Some delegations urged the need for regional cooperation and the formation of trade groups in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

### *Social Problems*

61. Most speakers discussed social problems, particularly in connection with the International Year for Human Rights. Some representatives deplored that, in this International Year, human rights were being blatantly violated in Czechoslovakia, Africa and the Middle East. Mention was made of the Tehran Conference on Human Rights and its resolutions on the subject of Palestinian refugees and on racial matters. A few speakers supported the appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights and some stressed that social problems should be taken more into account when economic aid programmes were being planned, so that more comprehensive policies could be formed.

### *The Sea Bed*

62. Many speakers emphasised the need to preserve the sea bed for peaceful uses. Representatives of developing countries, in particular, said that all mankind should benefit from the resources of the sea; some said that these should be used primarily to help solve the problems of developing nations. They hoped that more advanced nations would not leave them

behind in the field of technology. The representative of Paraguay said that those countries which did not possess a sea coast should be given first priority in exploitation of the riches of the sea.

### *Human Environment*

63. Mr. Nilsson, Foreign Minister of Sweden, introduced a new subject to the General Debate by proposing a study of the human environment, a proposal formally submitted by his delegation as an item on the Agenda. He said that it was necessary to focus public opinion on the urgency of the need to protect and improve man's physical and social environment and that his delegation would submit a proposal for an international conference when the question was considered.

## **POLITICAL ITEMS—PLENARY SESSION**

### **Chinese Representation**

64. In a letter of 16 September the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Rumania, Southern Yemen and Syria requested inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of an item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations". The explanatory memorandum accompanying the request said that the refusal to restore the seat of the People's Republic of China was a denial of justice and inconsistent with the principle of universality. To entrust the representation of the Chinese people to the "Chiang Kai-Shek clique" constituted a refusal to recognise realities. China had amply demonstrated its desire for peace and peaceful co-existence. The memorandum added that restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China implied the immediate expulsion of the representatives of the "Chiang Kai-Shek clique" from the United Nations and bodies affiliated to it.

65. The General Committee recommended inclusion of the item in the agenda and allocated it for discussion in Plenary. This was approved by the General Assembly on 27 September.

66. On 29 October a draft resolution was circulated by Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the United States, subsequently joined by Italy. On the lines of similar resolutions in previous years, this affirmed the continuing validity of the Assembly's decision, first taken in 1961, that any proposal to change the representation of China at the United Nations was an important question under Article 18 of the Charter, requiring a two-thirds majority for adoption.

67. On 7 November a draft resolution was circulated by Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Rumania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, subsequently joined by Yemen. This repeated the terms of draft resolutions introduced by Albania and others in previous years. After recognising that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China were the only lawful representatives of China to the

United Nations, the draft resolution would decide to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognise the representatives of its Government as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai Shek from the place which they unlawfully occupied at the United Nations and in all the organisations related to it. On 11 November a further draft resolution was circulated by Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Italy and Luxembourg, which would decide to establish a Committee of Member States, to be appointed by the General Assembly, with the mandate of exploring and studying the situation in all its aspects in order to make the appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly, at its Twenty-fourth Session, for an equitable and practical solution to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

68. The General Assembly debated the question between 11 and 19 November. The debate followed closely earlier debates on the subject, with speakers divided on traditional lines. The U.K. representative spoke in explanation of vote before the vote. After stating that his votes would be the same as at the previous Session, he emphasised that the United Kingdom had constantly urged that all the efforts of the international community should be directed not to keeping the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations but to persuading it to come in. The United Kingdom's own relations with the People's Republic of China had not been easy, and the treatment of British subjects in China had formed a particularly unhappy feature in those relations. But this deplorable situation did not alter the United Kingdom's belief that the People's Republic of China should take its place in the United Nations. This was an issue of fundamental importance and the Assembly should, by the necessary majority required by the Charter, decide without further delay in favour of the seating of the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

69. The three draft resolutions were voted upon on 19 November. The resolution tabled by Australia and others was adopted by 73\* to 47, with 5 abstentions. The resolution sponsored by Albania and others failed by 44\* to 58, with 23 abstentions. A motion was then put by Cambodia, supported by Zambia and Pakistan, that the draft resolution proposed by Belgium and others should be regarded as an "important question" requiring a two-thirds majority for adoption. This motion was adopted by 63 to 32\* with 29 abstentions. The draft resolution sponsored by Belgium and others was then voted upon and failed by 30 to 67, with 27\* abstentions.

### **The Problems of Human Environment**

70. By its resolution 1346 (XLV) of 30 July, 1968, the Economic and Social Council recommended *inter alia* that the General Assembly, at its Twenty-third Session consider the desirability of convening a United Nations Conference on problems of the human environment. An item was accordingly inscribed on the provisional agenda of the Assembly, and the subject was discussed in Plenary on 3 December. The representative of Sweden introduced a draft resolution on behalf of a group of sponsors who eventually numbered 55 (including the United Kingdom). After noting that the relationship between man and his environment was undergoing profound and potentially dangerous changes, the draft resolution decided to convene

a Conference on this subject in 1972 ; and requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session on the work at present being undertaken on the subject, on the main problems facing developed and developing countries in this field, on possible methods of preparing for the conference as well as a possible time and place for the conference and its financial implications for the United Nations.

71. Introducing the draft resolution, the representative of Sweden gave an account of the dangers threatening the human environment. International co-operation was necessary if the problem was to be tackled effectively, and a framework for its consideration should be provided within the United Nations. Other speakers in the debate, including the United Kingdom, welcomed the Swedish initiative and spoke of the particular problems affecting their countries. The full text of Lord Caradon's speech is at Annex I. Most speakers recognised the need for international action if the problem was to be tackled effectively.

72. The resolution was adopted without objection by the General Assembly on 3 December.

### **South West Africa**

73. By its Resolution 2145 (XXI), on which the United Kingdom abstained, the General Assembly decided that South Africa's mandate over South West Africa had terminated. Resolution 2248 (S-V), on which the United Kingdom also abstained, set up a United Nations Council for South West Africa to administer the territory, and called upon South Africa to transfer the administration of the territory to this Council. In its Resolution 2372 (XXII) the General Assembly decided to use the name "Namibia" for the territory, and the Council was renamed The Council for Namibia ; the United Kingdom again abstained.

74. On 27 September the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, inscribed an item entitled the "Question of Namibia" on the agenda and decided to debate it in Plenary on the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia. This report stressed that the South African Government would not co-operate with the Council. It described the establishment of separate homelands (Bantustans) in South West Africa, various actions of the South African Government bearing on the non-white inhabitants, and the activities of the Council. The Council were considering, the report said, the questions of issuing travel documents to South West African refugees and of providing them with educational assistance. The report concluded that only by the removal of South Africa's presence from the territory could the Council be expected to discharge its primary functions effectively. It recommended that the General Assembly should request the Security Council to take effective measures, including those provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter if necessary, to secure the withdrawal of South Africa from South West Africa so as to enable the people of the territory to achieve their independence at the earliest date.

75. The Fourth Committee, at three meetings between 15 October and 5 November, heard petitions from the Rev. Michael Scott, Mr. Karina and Mr. Geingob. Plenary noted its report on the hearing of the petitioners on 25 November.

76. The Question of South West Africa was debated in Plenary between 25 November and 16 December. On 12 December the representative of Somalia introduced a draft resolution on behalf of 50 other co-sponsors. The draft would have the Assembly reaffirm the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle against foreign occupation; condemn the South African Government for its defiance of the authority and resolutions of the UN and for its refusal to withdraw from Namibia, and for its policy and actions in the territory, draw the attention of the Security Council to the serious situation which had arisen as a result of South Africa's illegal presence and actions in the territory, and recommend that it take all effective measures to ensure immediate South African withdrawal; commend the recommendations of the Council on Namibia, and request the Council to continue to discharge its mandate.

77. Speakers in the debate, who were mostly representatives of Afro-Asian countries, deplored the failure of South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and urged that the Security Council should take immediate action, including mandatory action under Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure South Africa's withdrawal from the territory. The application of the Terrorism Act to Namibia and the creation of separate Homelands (Bantustans) were also strongly condemned. Many speakers blamed South Africa's principal trading partners for their failure to bring pressure to bear on the South African Government in order to make it change its policies. The representative of the Soviet Union said that South Africa and its Western supporters should be made to pay back to the United Nations the expenses which it had incurred over South West Africa.

78. On 16 December the Assembly adopted the 51-power draft resolution by 96 votes to 2, with 16\* abstentions.

79. Speaking in explanation of his vote, the representative of the United Kingdom said that the United Kingdom believed that the action proposed by the Assembly since the termination of the mandate had been mistaken and could not succeed. His delegation had, therefore, been obliged to abstain and would have to abstain on the present resolution. The United Kingdom shared the aim of the Assembly: to enable the South West Africans freely to decide their own future. But to do this, practical and effective means must be found, within the capacity of the United Nations. The United Kingdom was concerned about the Homelands Act and other recent actions by the South African Government.

#### **Fourth UN Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy**

80. At its Twenty-second Session the General Assembly adopted a resolution asking the Secretary-General to plan for the holding of such a conference in 1970 or 1971. The Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly at its Twenty-third Session a report containing proposals for the holding of a conference in 1971. The item covering this report was considered in Plenary on 16 December and a draft resolution, of which the United Kingdom was one of the co-sponsors, was adopted unanimously without vote. It asked the Secretary-General to start preparations for the proposed conference and to report again to the Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session.



81. The Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency for 1967-68 was presented to the Assembly on 15 November by the Director-General, Dr. Eklund. He spoke of the atmosphere of revived interest in atomic energy following the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Conference of Non-nuclear Weapon States, and emphasised the Agency's growing responsibilities in the field of nuclear safeguards and the need for increased financial resources to enable it to foster the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The Assembly had before it a draft resolution sponsored by Canada, Iran and Poland by which the Assembly would take note of the Report of the IAEA and would request the Director-General to include in his Report to the Twenty-fourth Session a statement on the progress achieved in implementing resolutions of the General Conference of the Agency relating to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, to nuclear explosions for peaceful uses and to the composition of the Board of Governors of the Agency. The representative of Mexico proposed that consideration of the item be postponed to allow study of the draft resolution, and because it was related to the item on the Conference of Non-nuclear Weapon States then under discussion in the First Committee. The motion for postponement was adopted by 81 votes to none with 8\* abstentions.

82. Consideration of the item was resumed on 20 December when the Assembly had before it an amended version of the draft resolution co-sponsored by Canada, Iran and Poland. Many speakers commended the work of the Agency. The UK representative outlined the contribution made by the United Kingdom to the work of the Agency. He expressed the full confidence of the British Government in the ability of the Agency to carry out the important new task assigned to it by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The full text of his statement is at Annex II.

83. The draft resolution was adopted by the Assembly on 20 December by 93\* votes to none with 4 abstentions.

### **The Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples**

84. The General Assembly discussed in Plenary, as it had done in previous years, the report of the Committee of Twenty-Four (the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples). The chapters of the report of the Committee which dealt with individual territories were again referred to the Fourth Committee. The general question of decolonisation, and the Committee's report as a whole, were discussed by the General Assembly between 16 and 19 December.

85. As in earlier debates much emphasis was placed on the problems of southern Africa, and most of the speakers were again representatives of African, Asian and Communist countries. The Tunisian representative, as Chairman of the Committee of 24, stressed the importance of securing the co-operation of the colonial powers in achieving decolonisation. A few speakers referred to the question of the smaller territories, and argued for a

flexible approach with regard to their decolonisation. On 16 December the United Kingdom representative, Lord Caradon, also laid emphasis on the problems which the smaller territories faced. This was the main question which remained in the field of decolonisation, now that the immense work of decolonising the larger territories had, with the exception of a few special cases, been all but accomplished (the full text of Lord Caradon's statement is at Annex III.)

86. On 17 December the Argentine Ambassador referred to the question of the Falkland Islands, and Lord Caradon, in reply, said that the United Kingdom Government did not accept the Argentine statement in so far as it disputed British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. He also quoted the statement made in the House of Commons on 11 December by the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary.

87. On 20 December, the Somali representative introduced a draft resolution which was adopted on the following day by 87 votes to 7\*, with 17 abstentions. A number of paragraphs were approved by separate votes. The resolution, comprising 32 paragraphs, included the following main provisions: approval of the report of the Committee of 24; a reiteration of the view that the continuation of colonial rule threatens international peace and security; a commendation of national liberation movements; a request to all states and international bodies to withhold assistance from the Portuguese and South African Governments and the illegal régime in Rhodesia; a declaration that the use of mercenaries against national liberation movements is punishable as a criminal act and that the mercenaries are outlaws; a call on the colonial powers to dismantle their military bases in colonial territories; a renewed invitation to the Committee of 24 to pay particular attention to the small territories; a call on the Administering Powers to allow visiting missions to colonial territories; and the establishment of a Preparatory Committee for the Tenth Anniversary of the Declaration on Decolonisation.

### **Report of the International Court of Justice**

88. The International Court of Justice presented to the General Assembly at the Twenty-third Session a Report outlining its judicial and other activities during the year. This was the first occasion on which the Court submitted such a Report to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, on 21 December, took note of this Report without debate.

### **Celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations**

89. In the introduction to his Annual Report, the Secretary-General suggested that the President of the General Assembly might appoint a committee which could make recommendations to the Assembly, before the end of the Twenty-third Session, as to how the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations should be celebrated in 1970. The representatives of Sweden and fifteen other countries took up the Secretary-General's suggestion and, in a letter dated 30 October, requested the inclusion of the necessary additional item in the agenda of the Session. On 1 November, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, approved the inclusion of an item in the agenda and allocated it for discussion in Plenary.

90. The item was considered in Plenary on 7 and on 12 November, when it was decided that the General Committee should be entrusted with the task of considering measures for the celebration of the anniversary. Delegations not represented on that Committee were asked to submit any suggestions they might have by 29 November. On the basis of these and other suggestions the Secretary-General circulated a Note to the General Committee on 5 December. This suggested that a Preparatory Committee be set up to prepare recommendations for the celebration of the anniversary to be submitted to the Assembly early in its Twenty-fourth Session. The Secretary-General proposed that, as the Charter was signed on 26 June, 1945, the commemoration might be held during the week ending 26 June, 1970. His Note suggested some ways in which the anniversary might be celebrated.

91. On 18 December, the General Committee decided to recommend the appointment by the General Assembly of a Preparatory Committee, as proposed by the Secretary-General, consisting of all the Member States represented in the General Committee of the Twenty-third Session. On 19 December, the General Assembly adopted the recommendation of the General Committee without a vote.

### Resolutions adopted without reference to a Main Committee

92. The following resolutions were adopted at the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly without reference to a main Committee:

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by the General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2376	Admission of Swaziland to membership in the United Nations .. .. .	24 Sept.	By acclamation		
2384	Admission of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea to membership in the United Nations .. .. .	12 Nov.	By acclamation		
2389	Representation of China in the United Nations .. .. .	19 Nov.	73*	47	5
2398	The problems of human environment ..	3 Dec.	Without objection		
2403	“ Question of Namibia ” .. ..	16 Dec.	96	2	16*
2404	“ Question of Namibia ” .. ..	16 Dec.	Without objection		
2405	Report of the Security Council .. ..	16 Dec.	Without objection		
2406	Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy ..	16 Dec.	Without objection		
2457	Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency .. .. .	20 Dec.	93*	0	4
2465	Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples .. .. .	20 Dec.	87	7*	17
2492	Credentials of representatives to the 23rd Session of the General Assembly ..	21 Dec.	82	0	24

## POLITICAL ITEMS—THE FIRST COMMITTEE

### Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

93. During 1968 the Legal Sub-Committee of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space met from 4 to 28 June at

Geneva. It discussed mainly the draft Convention on Liability for Damage arising from Space Objects. The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee did not meet during 1968 in view of the holding of the U.N. Outer Space Conference at Vienna (see below). The Main Outer Space Committee (UNCPUOS) met in New York from 15–18 October.

94. The UN Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space convened at Vienna from 14 to 27 August in accordance with General Assembly Resolutions 2221 (XXI) and 2261 (XXII). The purpose of the Conference was to publicise the practical applications of activities in Outer Space, particularly those which might benefit the developing countries. Some 190 papers of general and specialised interest were presented to the Conference, of which eleven papers and an Evening Lecture were given by United Kingdom representatives. 79 nations and more than 600 delegates and Observers participated in the Conference, which was presided over by Dr. Kurt Waldheim, Foreign Minister of Austria and a former Chairman of the Outer Space Committee. The United Kingdom delegation to the Conference was led by Sir Robert Cockburn, Director of the Royal Aircraft Establishment, Farnborough.

95. At the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly the debate on Outer Space was held in the First Committee on 17 and 18 December. On 3 December the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union had announced their ratification of the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts and the Return of Objects launched into Outer Space, which thereupon entered into force.

96. In the debate in the First Committee the United Kingdom representative spoke on 17 December (the full text of his statement is at Annex IV). He summarised the extent to which the UK was co-operating with other countries in space activities, and mentioned British projects in the space field which were of practical interest to the developing countries. He referred to the work of the Legal Sub-Committee and expressed the hope that agreement would soon be reached on the draft Convention on Liability for Damage arising from Space Objects. He expressed United Kingdom support for the establishment of a Working Group to study the technical feasibility of communications by direct broadcasting from satellites. He also referred to the forthcoming negotiations on definitive arrangements for INTELSAT and welcomed the clarification of arrangements for the Conference given in the statement of the United States representative.

97. Many other speakers also expressed disappointment at the lack of progress in drafting a convention on liability for damage. The Soviet representative reported that the USSR and other Socialist countries proposed to set up an international communications system, based on democratic principles, and on a footing of full equality. It would be composed of artificial earth satellites and be called INTERSPUTNIK. The US representative said that the proposals made at the Vienna Conference, that the UN should establish a body to provide objective information on the applications of space technology, as well as the suggestion that a Working Group should study the technical feasibility and implications of communications by direct broadcasting satellites, should be studied by the Committee on Outer Space in 1969. The US Government had invited all 63 members of

INTELSAT to a plenipotentiary Conference starting on 24 February, 1969. Other states members of the UN or of one or more of its specialised agencies could take part as observers. The representatives of Sweden, Canada and France expressed concern about the division of INTELSAT and INTER-SPUTNIK and urged that the goal should be the establishment of a universal system. The Italian representative pointed out that at present there was only one system in operation, INTELSAT. The Indian representative recalled Indian proposals concerning technical assistance, education and training in the field of Outer Space, and a liability convention.

98. On 17 December the Austrian representative introduced a draft resolution on behalf of his own and twenty-five other delegations. The first part of the draft dealt with the Vienna Conference, welcoming the intention of the Outer Space Committee to consider all proposals arising from the discussions at the Conference, in particular concrete proposals for possible follow up action. It also urged all member states to avail themselves of the information presented at the Conference, and requested the Secretary-General to bring it to the attention of all member states.

99. The second part of the draft resolution dealt with the Outer Space Committee's work in 1968 and laid down guidelines for its work in 1969. It endorsed the recommendations and decisions contained in the Committee's report. On the further elaboration of the Law of Outer Space, it requested the Committee to complete urgently the preparation of a draft convention on Liability, and to submit it to the Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session. It took note of the entry into force of the Agreement on Rescue and Return of Astronauts, and urged all countries to become parties to this Agreement and to the Outer Space Treaty. It reaffirmed the principle that communications by means of satellites should be available to all nations without discrimination. It approved the establishment by the Committee of a special Working Group to study and report on the various aspects of communication by direct broadcast from satellites. It approved continuing UN sponsorship of the Thumba rocket launching station in India, and provided for preparations for similar sponsorship, at the appropriate time, of the proposed Mar del Plata station in Argentina. It requested the specialised agencies and IAEA to inform the Committee of their work in the field of the peaceful uses of Outer Space, and asked the Committee to report to the next session of the General Assembly.

100. The twenty-six power resolution was adopted unanimously without a vote by the First Committee on 18 December, and by Plenary on 20 December.

## **Disarmament Items**

### *General*

101. On 27 September the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, inscribed on the agenda three items concerned with disarmament and allotted them to the First Committee. These items related to questions which had been referred by resolutions of the Twenty-second Session of the General Assembly to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC), and were covered in the

Report of that Committee. They were : the question of general and complete disarmament ; the urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests ; and the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In addition, on 27 September and 17 October the Assembly inscribed two new disarmament items. In a letter of 16 September to the Secretary-General the Soviet Foreign Minister had requested the inclusion in the Agenda of an item on the Soviet Memorandum of 1 July on disarmament. The last item was inscribed at the request of the Secretary-General, in a note dated 14 October. It concerned the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States, which was held in Geneva from 29 August until 28 September, 1968, and thus finished after the opening of the General Assembly. These five items were discussed together in the First Committee at 27 meetings, which lasted with two interruptions from 12 November until 17 December.

102. On 18 November in a speech in the General Debate in the First Committee on disarmament items, the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Mulley, gave the views of Her Majesty's Government (text at Annex V). In addition to discussing the individual items under consideration, he emphasised the importance attached by Her Majesty's Government to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The representative of the United Kingdom announced on 27 November that the United Kingdom had that day ratified the Treaty.

103. Discussion of the individual disarmament items is described below.

#### *General and Complete Disarmament*

104. Three draft resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on this item. One was not pressed to a vote but the other two were adopted.

105. The Report of the ENDC recorded that members of the Committee had exchanged views on the question of general and complete disarmament and had emphasised the importance of resuming consideration of this question. A draft resolution, eventually adopted as Resolution 2454B(XXIII), was tabled by the eight non-aligned members of the ENDC (Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, UAR), subsequently joined by Rumania and Bulgaria. This requested the ENDC to pursue renewed efforts towards achieving substantial progress in reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament, and urgently to analyse the plans already under consideration and others that might be put forward to see how, in particular, progress might be made in the field of nuclear armament, the draft also requested the ENDC to continue its urgent efforts to negotiate collateral measures of disarmament. It forwarded the relevant records of the First Committee to the ENDC with a request to resume work so soon as possible and to report to the General Assembly, as appropriate, on the progress achieved. The sponsors accepted a United Kingdom proposal to include in its preamble a paragraph noting with satisfaction the agreement of the United States and the Soviet Union to enter into bilateral discussions on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles. The preamble of the resolution also contained references to the documents presented to the ENDC and annexed to its Report, including those presented

by the United Kingdom. The draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee on 10 December and in Plenary on 20 December, both by 109\* votes to none with four abstentions.

#### *Chemical and Biological Warfare*

106. The report of the ENDC contained a recommendation that the Secretary-General should appoint a group of experts to study the possible use of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare. This recommendation had its origin in a proposal made by the United Kingdom to the ENDC for such a study of chemical warfare. In the Introduction to his Annual Report the Secretary-General expressed the view that too little attention had been given to chemical and biological weapons in disarmament negotiations and welcomed the recommendation of the ENDC.

107. In his speech on 18 November (Annex V) the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Mulléy, explained the proposals that he had made in the ENDC. He had proposed a study of chemical weapons, since an international scientific consensus was a necessary preliminary to further consideration of their control; and he had urged immediate consideration in the ENDC of measures to ban biological means of warfare, because they were universally regarded with horror. He had, however, accepted the recommendation of the ENDC for a study of both on the clear understanding that it was an earnest of the ENDC's desire to consider urgently his proposals on biological warfare. A draft resolution on chemical and biological warfare was tabled on 18 November under the item on general and complete disarmament by ten countries, including the United Kingdom, later increased to 21 co-sponsors. It requested the Secretary-General to prepare a concise report in accordance with the proposal in his Annual Report and the recommendation of the ENDC; and to transmit the report to the ENDC, the Security Council and the General Assembly at an early date, if possible by 1 July, 1969. The draft resolution also reiterated the call in Resolution 2162B(XXI) for strict observance of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (Cmd. 3604). Malta and Trinidad and Tobago tabled amendments to the draft resolution, which would have given greater detail about the background and scope of the proposed study; but they agreed in the end not to press them to a vote. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on 10 December by 112\* votes to none with one abstention and in Plenary as General Assembly Resolution 2454A(XXIII) on 20 December by 107\* votes to none with two abstentions.

#### *Registration of Conventional Arms Transfers*

108. The representative of Denmark introduced on 21 November a draft resolution, co-sponsored by Iceland, Malta and Norway, on the registration of transfers of conventional arms. It would have asked the Secretary-General to ascertain the views of member Governments on undertaking an obligation to register with him all imports and exports of conventional arms, ammunition and implements of war; on authorising him to publish information on such transfers; and on the practical measures to be taken to that end. This draft Resolution was criticised by a number of delegations, mainly on the grounds that it discriminated against countries without the capacity

to manufacture arms and that it would still further reduce their security. It was not pressed to a vote on the understanding that the relevant records would be among those forwarded to the ENDC.

#### *Urgent Need for the Suspension of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Tests*

109. The Report of the ENDC recorded that a useful and valuable discussion had taken place on this important matter. To it was annexed a Memorandum by the eight non-aligned members, expressing concern that tests were continuing and calling for renewed and urgent efforts to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty. In his speech of 18 November (Annex V) the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Mulley, said that he would give particular priority to the prohibition of underground tests. He outlined two proposals that he had made in the ENDC to facilitate agreement on this subject. Many other speakers in the debate expressed the view that the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty should be the priority task in the field of nuclear disarmament, now that the Non-Proliferation Treaty (Cmd. 3683) had been concluded. On 21 November the eight non-aligned members of the ENDC, subsequently joined as co-sponsors by five other countries, tabled a draft resolution which urged all states to adhere without further delay to the Partial Test Ban Treaty (Cmd. 2245); called on nuclear-weapon states to suspend nuclear weapon tests in all environments; and expressed the hope that states would contribute to an effective international exchange of seismic data. Finally, it requested the ENDC to take up as a matter of urgency the elaboration of a treaty banning underground nuclear weapons tests and to report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. This resolution was adopted in the Committee on 10 December by 108\* votes to none with 6 abstentions and in Plenary as General Assembly Resolution 2455(XXIII) on 20 December by 109\* votes to none with 5 abstentions. In an explanation of vote the representative of the United States stated that his support for the resolution was on the understanding that suspension of tests would be in accordance with an adequately verified treaty.

#### *Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in the Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America*

110. The Report of the ENDC recorded that delegations had made statements on this topic. There was little discussion of this item in the First Committee and no draft resolution was tabled. Resolution 2454B (XXIII) on general and complete disarmament contained a paragraph recalling *inter alia* Resolution 2344(XXII), which had requested the ENDC to resume consideration of the subject.

#### *Memorandum of the Soviet Government*

111. When the Non-Proliferation Treaty was opened for signature on 1 July, 1968, the Soviet Government communicated to Her Majesty's Government and other Governments a "Memorandum concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament". It proposed nine measures of arms control to follow up the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The memorandum was tabled by the representative of the Soviet Union



in the ENDC as a working paper on 16 July and attached as an annex to the ENDC Report. On 12 November the representative of the Soviet Union tabled in the First Committee a draft resolution by which the General Assembly would have transmitted the Memorandum to the ENDC with a request to undertake urgent negotiations on the measures contained in it. It was pointed out in the debate that the Memorandum had already been considered in the ENDC and taken into account in drawing up its agreed programme of work. The draft resolution on general and complete disarmament, later passed as General Assembly Resolution 2454B(XXIII), which was tabled after the Soviet draft, contained a preambular paragraph noting the Soviet Memorandum and providing for transmission of the relevant records of the First Committee to the ENDC. In view of this fact, the representative of the Soviet Union did not press his draft resolution to a vote.

### *Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States*

112. The proposal for a Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States was made by Pakistan at the Twenty-first Session of the General Assembly, which approved it in Resolution 2153B(XXI) of 17 November 1966. Its objects were to consider the following and related questions :—

- (a) How can the security of non-nuclear states best be assured?
- (b) How may non-nuclear powers co-operate among themselves in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons?
- (c) How can nuclear devices be used for exclusively peaceful purposes?

The Conference was postponed by Resolution 2341B(XXII) of 9 December, 1967, and took place in Geneva from 29 August until 28 September, 1968, under the Presidency of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. It was attended by representatives of 92 non-nuclear-weapon states and by four nuclear-weapon states, the United Kingdom, United States, Soviet Union and France, which participated without the right of vote. The Conference adopted a Final Declaration and fourteen resolutions. These were transmitted to the Secretary-General by the President of the Conference in a letter dated 28 September.

113. Most of the disarmament debate in the First Committee centred on this item, on which four resolutions were passed. The main question at issue was the action to be taken on the invitation of the Conference to the General Assembly to consider, at its present session, the ways and means for the implementation of the work undertaken and, at a subsequent session, whether to convene a Second Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. On 3 December a draft resolution was tabled by Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan and the Netherlands, by which the General Assembly would endorse the Declaration and take note of the resolutions of the Conference; invite the bodies to which the recommendations of the Conference were addressed to report to the Secretary-General on the action taken by them; and request the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report and place the subject on the provisional agenda of the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. Under an alternative draft resolution tabled on 5 December by Argentina, Brazil, Italy, Pakistan and Chile, the General Assembly would have endorsed not only the Declaration but also some

of the resolutions of the Conference. It would also have decided to convene the United Nations Disarmament Commission, either in 1969 or before March, 1970, to consider both further measures in the field of disarmament and security assurances, and also further international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. On 13 December the co-sponsors of these two draft resolutions withdrew them and tabled jointly a compromise draft, eventually co-sponsored by 14 countries which, like the former, endorsed the Declaration and took note of the resolutions of the Conference; and requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly based on the information supplied by those concerned on the progress achieved. The joint draft also requested the Secretary-General to place on the provisional agenda of the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly the question of the implementation of the results of the Conference including (a) the question of convening early in 1970 a meeting of the Disarmament Commission to consider disarmament and the related question of the security of nations, and (b) the question of further international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy with particular regard for the special need and interests of developing countries. The draft resolution, like the two drafts on which it was based, also requested the Secretary-General, in accordance with a resolution of the Conference, to appoint a group of experts to prepare a full report on all possible contributions of nuclear technology to the economic and scientific achievement of developing countries, taking advantage of the experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in preparing the report. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on 17 December by 87\* votes to 8, with 6 abstentions. In a separate vote, operative paragraph 1, which endorsed the Declaration of the Conference, was adopted by 84 votes to 8 with 10\* abstentions. The resolution was adopted in Plenary as General Assembly Resolution 2456A(XXIII) on 20 December by 103\* votes to 7 with 5 abstentions.

114. In a statement on 6 December (Annex VI) the representative of the United Kingdom expressed support for the broad objectives of the first draft resolution tabled by Finland and her co-sponsors and in a further statement on 17 December (Annex VII) explained his vote in favour of the draft resolution adopted on the same grounds. He explained that he was abstaining on operative paragraph 1 because the United Kingdom could not subscribe to some of the wording of the Declaration of the Conference.

115. Two other draft resolutions were submitted on this subject but not pressed to a vote. One, co-sponsored by Bulgaria and Hungary, differed from that adopted in not referring to the Declaration of the Conference or taking note of its resolutions. Instead it requested the bodies concerned to give careful consideration to the recommendations addressed to them by the Conference and to include the results in their Annual Reports to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. The other draft resolution was submitted by Cyprus under this item and under that on general and complete disarmament. It was later revised and would have called on the Disarmament Commission to consider the problem of disarmament in relation to international security with a view to presenting an integrated solution to the Twenty-fifth Session of the General Assembly.

116. On 13 December the representative of Mexico introduced a draft resolution, eventually co-sponsored by 27 countries, which reiterated the recommendations of a resolution of the Conference on nuclear-free zones, especially the urgent appeal to nuclear-weapon States to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, whereby they would undertake not to use nuclear weapons against the parties to the Treaty. The resolution of the Conference had also recommended non-nuclear-weapon States in other parts of the world to study the possibility of a military denuclearisation of their zones. This resolution was adopted by the First Committee on 17 December by 83\* votes to none, with 13 abstentions, and in Plenary as General Assembly Resolution 2456B(XXIII) on 20 December by 98\* votes to none, with 16 abstentions. In his explanation of vote (Annex VII) the representative of the United Kingdom recalled that the United Kingdom had expressed support for the Latin American nuclear-free zone by signing the two Additional Protocols.

117. On 13 December the representative of Mexico introduced a draft resolution, eventually co-sponsored by 24 countries, on peaceful nuclear explosions. It requested the Secretary-General to prepare, with the co-operation of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a report on the establishment, within the framework of that Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, under appropriate international control, in time for discussion at the Twenty-fourth Session. This resolution was adopted by the First Committee on 17 December by 59 votes to 9\*, with 35 abstentions, and in Plenary as Resolution 2456C(XXIII) on 20 December by 75 votes to 9\*, with 30 abstentions. In explanation of his negative vote, the representative of the United Kingdom said on 17 December (Annex VII) that he shared with the sponsors of the resolution the desire to initiate as soon as possible the preparatory work to determine the principles and international procedures to be adopted in order that benefits under Article V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty could be made available. He could not, however, support a resolution on this subject which did not refer to the Treaty, and he saw no need for this study since the General Conference of the IAEA had commissioned a similar study two months earlier.

118. On 13 December the representative of Pakistan introduced a draft resolution, eventually co-sponsored by 13 other countries, urging the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States to enter at any early date into bilateral discussions on the limitation of offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles. This resolution was adopted by the First Committee on 17 December by 97\* votes to none, with 5 abstentions, and in Plenary as Resolution 2456D(XXIII) on 20 December by 108\* votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

### **The Korean Question**

119. The Korean Question was again automatically inscribed on the provisional agenda for consideration by the General Assembly on the basis of the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). The Report showed once again that while UNCURK had received the full co-operation of the Government of

the Republic of Korea, its efforts to carry out the objectives of the United Nations in Korea had been limited by the continual refusal of North Korea to recognise the authority and competence of the United Nations.

120. In a letter of 22 August, the representatives of Cambodia, Hungary, Mali and Syria (subsequently joined by eight others) requested the Secretary-General to include in the agenda an item entitled "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". The explanatory memorandum stated that, after almost 20 years, no progress had been made in solving the Korean problem and that UNCURK, which had become an instrument of the aggressive policies of the United States in Korea, was one of the major obstacles to the unification of the country. The question of the unification of Korea was a domestic matter to be settled by negotiation between the two Koreas.

121. In a letter of 23 August the representatives of Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syria, the Ukraine and the USSR (subsequently joined by Algeria, Congo (Brazzaville) and Rumania) requested the Secretary-General to include in the agenda a further separate item entitled "Withdrawal of the United Nations and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations". The explanatory memorandum accompanying the request stated that the responsibility for the situation in Korea must be borne by the United States whose forces continued their occupation of South Korea. The main task was to eliminate any foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people.

122. The General Committee considered inscription of the three items at its meeting on 25 September. The representative of the Soviet Union objected to a proposal by the United States to combine the three items under a single heading "The Korean Question", stating that the item on the report of UNCURK should be excluded from the agenda and that the other two items should be considered separately. The Committee decided by 17\* votes to 3, with 4 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion of the Report of UNCURK on the agenda and subsequently by 16\* votes to 3, with 5 abstentions, to combine the three items under the single heading "The Korean Question", recommending allocation of the combined item to the First Committee. A proposal by the Soviet Union to delete from the combined item the sub-item on the Report of UNCURK was rejected in the General Assembly on 27 September by 63\* votes to 19, with 29 abstentions. The Soviet representative said discussion of the question of Korea in the United Nations without the participation of representatives of North Korea was inadmissible and urged that, before the Korean item was taken up in the First Committee, a timely decision should be taken on issuing simultaneous invitations to the representatives of North Korea and the Republic of Korea. When the First Committee met on 18 October to discuss the organisation of its work, a procedural debate took place on whether the Committee should deal immediately with a draft resolution tabled by Bulgaria and 17 other delegations (broadly the signatories of the letter of 23 August) reflecting the Soviet proposal. After two days of inconclusive debate, and following informal consultations, it was agreed that the Committee would first discuss the item on the sea bed and subsequently interrupt debate of the Disarmament items to consider the invitation aspects of the Korean question.

123. The Committee began discussion of the question of invitations to representatives of the Republic of Korea and of North Korea on 25 November. In addition to the Bulgarian draft resolution, the Committee also had before it a draft resolution, on the lines of those of previous years, submitted by Australia, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the United States. This proposed that the Committee should invite a representative of the Republic of Korea and should reaffirm its willingness to invite a North Korean representative provided that North Korea first unequivocally accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. The debate on the question of invitations lasted two days. The United Kingdom representative, Sir Leslie Glass, said that all were agreed that it would be useful to have representatives of both sides to take part in the debate. But, whereas the Republic of Korea had from the beginning fully co-operated with the United Nations, North Korea considered everything which the United Nations had done in Korea as illegal. The United Kingdom had consistently voted for the resolutions expressing the Committee's willingness to invite representatives of North Korea on the basis of their acceptance of the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. That remained the position of the United Kingdom.

124. On 27 November the draft resolution tabled by Bulgaria and others failed by 40 votes to 55\*, with 28 abstentions. The draft resolution tabled by Australia and others was adopted by 67\* votes to 28, with 28 abstentions. A third draft resolution submitted by Saudi Arabia, which *inter alia* requested the United States and the Soviet Union to prevail on the two Koreas not to set prior conditions to the appearance of their respective representatives before the United Nations, was not pressed to a vote.

125. In a letter dated 3 December the representative of Cuba requested the Secretary-General to include in the agenda, as an urgent and important matter, an additional item entitled "Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea". The accompanying explanatory memorandum stated that 20 years of discussion of the Korean question on the basis of the reports of UNCURK had not contributed to a solution of the problem. By ending the discussion of the unification of Korea the General Assembly would create more favourable conditions for the solution of the Korean problem.

126. The General Committee on 9 December decided by 7 votes to 3\*, with 11 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The United Kingdom representative opposed inscription because, under the rules of procedure, only items of an important and urgent nature could be proposed for inclusion in the agenda without the required prior notice. Moreover, the Cuban item was not so much a new agenda item as a proposal for dealing with the Korean question, which was already inscribed on the agenda. A proposal by the United States that the item should be included on the agenda as sub-item (d) of the Korean question and discussed in the First Committee together with the other sub-items was adopted by 13\* votes to 3, with 8 abstentions. The General Assembly, in a series of votes on 10 December, approved by substantial margins the inscription of the item and the recommendation of the General Committee for its handling in the First Committee.

127. The First Committee began its debate on the substance of the Korean question on 11 December. The representative of the Republic of Korea was invited to participate and spoke first. Three draft resolutions were before the Committee. The first, sponsored by Australia and 14 others, including the United Kingdom, expressed concern at reports of recent events in Korea which could hamper efforts to achieve the peaceful unification of the country; reaffirmed the objectives of the UN in Korea; expressed the belief that arrangements should be made to achieve these objectives through genuinely free elections; called for co-operation in the easing of tensions in the area and approved the efforts of UNCURK to this end; requested UNCURK to pursue its efforts to achieve the UN's objectives in Korea and keep members of the Assembly informed on the situation through regular reports to the Secretary-General and to the General Assembly as appropriate, the first report to be submitted to the Secretary-General within four months; and noted that the sole objective of the remaining UN Forces in Korea was to preserve the peace and security of the area, and that the governments concerned were prepared to withdraw their remaining forces whenever so requested by the Republic of Korea, or whenever the conditions formulated by the General Assembly for a lasting settlement had been fulfilled. The effect of the passage requesting UNCURK to report to the Secretary-General or to the General Assembly as appropriate is that in future years an item on the Korean Question need not automatically appear on the Assembly's agenda. The second draft resolution, sponsored by Algeria and fourteen others (including the East European delegations) called for the withdrawal within six months of all American and other foreign military personnel deployed in South Korea under the title of "United Nations Forces". The third draft resolution, which had the same sponsorship as the second, called for the dissolution of UNCURK within two months. On 13 December Cuba and the same group (except Mauritania) introduced a fourth draft resolution by which the General Assembly would decide that the Korean question should no longer be discussed in the United Nations.

128. The debate followed the pattern of previous years. Communist speakers condemned all UN involvement in Korea, whilst speakers supporting the UN's aims in Korea urged the United Nations should not abandon its responsibilities, particularly in view of the increasing evidence of the aggressiveness of North Korea. (The text of Sir Leslie Glass's statement on 11 December is at Annex VIII.)

129. The draft resolutions were voted on in the Committee on 16 December. The draft resolution of which the United Kingdom was a co-sponsor was adopted by 72\* votes to 23, with 26 abstentions. The second draft resolution (see above) failed by 25 votes to 67\*, with 29 abstentions; the third failed by 27 votes to 68\*, with 27 abstentions; and the fourth by 24 votes to 70\*, with 28 abstentions.

130. In Plenary on 20 December, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, calling for co-operation in the easing of tensions in the area, was adopted by 73\* votes to 15, with 28 abstentions, and operative paragraph 5, requesting UNCURK to pursue its efforts to achieve the UN's objectives in Korea, was adopted by 71\* votes to 25, with 20 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was then adopted by 71\* to 25, with 20 abstentions.

131. By its Resolution 2340 (XXII) of 1967 the General Assembly set up an *Ad Hoc* Committee to study the peaceful uses of the sea bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and requested it to report to the General Assembly at its Twenty-third Session.

132. In its report the *Ad Hoc* Committee summarised its activities. Its Economic and Technical Working Group had undertaken an assessment of the mineral resources of the sea bed, of possible technical developments in their exploitation and of the effect of such exploitation on world markets and prices. The Legal Working Group, apart from dealing with the legal status of the sea bed and other related problems, had considered the need for a definition of the area of the sea bed beyond national jurisdiction. The elaboration of agreed principles to regulate activities in the area was widely discussed and, although no unanimous agreement was reached, two sets of principles which had attracted broad support were incorporated in the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report.

133. On 25 September the General Committee considered inscription of this item and recommended its allocation to the First Committee. This recommendation was approved by the General Assembly on 27 September.

134. The First Committee took up consideration of the item on 28 October. A draft resolution was introduced by Belgium, on behalf of a group of sponsors who eventually numbered 66 (including the United Kingdom), which sought to establish a Standing Committee on the sea bed, in place of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. This Committee would, *inter alia*, study the elaboration of the legal principles which would promote international co-operation in the exploration and uses of the area and also ways and means of promoting international co-operation in the exploitation of its resources. The Committee, which would also study the reservation of the area exclusively for peaceful purposes and the prevention of pollution, would make recommendations to the General Assembly and would submit reports to it at each Session. On 1 November the United States (with eventually 28 co-sponsors, including the United Kingdom) circulated a draft resolution welcoming the concept of an International Decade of Ocean Exploration beginning in 1970, and inviting member states to formulate proposals for activities during the decade and to transmit them to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission which would report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly on progress made in these activities. On 5 November a further draft resolution was introduced by Iceland and eventually co-sponsored by 40 other states (including the United Kingdom). After speaking of the threat to the marine environment from pollution and recording the progress already achieved towards concerted action on the problem, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to undertake a study designed to clarify all aspects of the problem of pollution arising from the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea bed and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly and to the Standing Committee.

135. The general debate on this item lasted from 28 October to 6 November. Most speakers commended the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and expressed support for the three main draft resolutions. There was general support for the concept that there exists an area of the sea bed beyond

national jurisdiction which should not be subject to claims of sovereignty by any state and should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The question of the elaboration of a set of principles to guide future activity on the sea bed was raised by almost every speaker and during the course of the debate three draft resolutions incorporating sets of principles were submitted to the Committee. A draft resolution was also submitted by Cyprus, and later co-sponsored by Uruguay and Liberia, which would urge all states to give priority to the question of clarifying the definition of the "continental shelf" in Article 1 of the Geneva Convention of 1958 and would request a freeze on claims of sovereignty over the area beyond national jurisdiction pending such clarification.

136. The United Kingdom representative spoke on 1 November (full text at Annex IX). After commending the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, he stressed that much remained to be done and that hasty decisions should be avoided; it was only by securing general agreement at each stage that progress could be achieved. After expressing support for the idea of a decade of ocean exploration and of a study of pollution, he commented on the second set of principles contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. The United Kingdom, which had played a leading part in the formulation of these principles, favoured their adoption because they provided a simple outline of the direction which future activity on the sea bed should take.

137. A further draft resolution, submitted on 11 November by Thailand and 38 other co-sponsors, requested the Secretary-General to undertake a study on the question of establishing in due time appropriate international machinery for the promotion of the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea bed and the use of these resources in the interests of mankind.

138. During the discussion of this item several amendments had been proposed to the various draft resolutions. Those voted upon were: amendments to the draft resolution on the Decade of Ocean Exploration submitted by Trinidad and Tobago and Tanzania (subsequently joined by Guyana, Somalia, Yugoslavia, Barbados and Venezuela, after the amendments had been revised in negotiation with the sponsors of the draft resolution); an amendment to the same draft resolution submitted by Malta (in itself an agreed revision of another amendment); an amendment submitted by Spain to add pollution of coasts to the scope of the study proposed by the Icelandic draft resolution. Amongst amendments not pressed to a vote was one to the 66-power draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, which advocated the reservation for peaceful purposes of all the sea bed outside territorial waters.

139. Voting on draft resolutions was postponed until 19 and 20 December, while informal consultations took place amongst delegations to reach agreement on the various texts.

140. Before the First Committee began voting on 19 December the Chairman read an agreed statement on the composition of the Standing Committee. He said that, in principle, one-third of the membership would change every two years. Informal arrangements for rotation would be worked out amongst states or groups of states. The initial composition of the Committee would be: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil,



Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, France, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, USSR, UAR, UK, Tanzania, US, Yugoslavia.

141. On the proposal of Malta, the three draft resolutions on principles and the draft resolution calling for a freeze on claims of sovereignty over the sea bed were not pressed to the vote, on the understanding that they would be referred to the Standing Committee.

142. On 19 December the 66-power draft resolution, setting up the Standing Committee, was adopted by 96\* votes to none with 6 abstentions. Following the adoption of the Spanish amendment, the 40-power draft resolution on pollution was adopted by 101\* votes to none, with 1 abstention. The 39-power draft resolution, on "international machinery", was adopted by 77 votes to 9, with 18\* abstentions.

143. On 20 December the Committee voted on the 28-power draft resolution, dealing with the Decade of Ocean Exploration. The Maltese amendment was adopted by 90\* votes to none, with 4 abstentions; the amendment of Trinidad and Tobago and others was adopted by 102\* votes to none, with no abstentions; the revised draft resolution was adopted by 100\* votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

144. On 21 December these four resolutions were adopted by the Assembly in Plenary with the following votes: Standing Committee, 112\* votes to none with 7 abstentions; pollution study, 119\* votes to none with no abstentions; study of international machinery, 85 to 9, with 25\* abstentions; Decade of Ocean Exploration, unanimously, without vote.

### Resolutions adopted on the Reports of the First Committee

145. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on the reports of the First Committee.

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by the General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly			
			For	Against	Abstained	
2453	International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space .. .. .	20 Dec.	A and B	Unanimous		
2454	Question of general and complete disarmament .. .. .	20 Dec.	A	107*	0	2
			B	109*	0	4
2455	Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests .. .. .	20 Dec.		109*	0	5
2456	Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States .. .. .	20 Dec.	A	103*	7	5
			B	98*	0	16
			C	75	9*	30
			D	108*	0	7
2466	The Korean question .. .. .	20 Dec.		71*	25	20
2467	Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind .. .. .	21 Dec.	A	112*	0	7
			B	Unanimous		
			C	85	9	25*
			D	Without objection		

## **POLITICAL ITEMS—SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE**

### **The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation**

146. By Resolution 2258 (XXII) of 1967 the General Assembly took note of the report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation and requested it to continue its programme in co-ordination with other organisations and United Nations agencies to increase knowledge of the levels and effects of atomic radiation from all sources.

147. The Special Political Committee considered on 21 October the report of the Scientific Committee on its 18th Session, which had been held in New York in April, 1968. A draft resolution, in similar terms to that adopted at previous Assemblies, and co-sponsored by seventeen nations including the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, France and Japan, was introduced jointly by the representatives of Canada and Czechoslovakia. This resolution noted with appreciation the Scientific Committee's report; drew the attention of member states to the review of information required to continue the Committee's assessment of worldwide levels of radiation from nuclear tests; requested the Committee to complete its current programme of work and to formulate plans for its future activities; and noted the Committee's intention to hold its 19th Session in May, 1969, and to report further to the General Assembly.

148. During the debate, concern was expressed about the effects of contamination from nuclear tests on seas and oceans and about France's continuation of nuclear tests. The United Kingdom representative spoke as co-sponsor of the draft resolution to welcome the Scientific Committee's report and to express appreciation of the work it was doing.

149. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the Special Political Committee on 21 October, and by Plenary on 1 November.

### **Apartheid and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa**

150. Between the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the General Assembly the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa continued its work. On 21 March, designated by the Assembly as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Committee held a special commemorative session at which the United Kingdom was represented. The Committee visited Stockholm, London and Geneva between 14 and 29 June, 1968. In London they saw Mr. Goronwy Roberts, Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, and representatives of the United Nations Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of bodies concerned with southern African questions.

151. In addition to the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, the Assembly had before it at its Twenty-third Session the report of the sub-Committee on Information on Apartheid, set up by the Special Committee in pursuance of Operative paragraph 13 of General Assembly Resolution 2307 (XXII) of 1967, which requested the Special Committee to intensify

its efforts to promote an international campaign against apartheid. The Assembly also had before it replies from certain governments to the note of the Secretary-General of 3 January in which he drew attention to Operative paragraph 9 of Resolution 2307 (XXII) of 1967 inviting states to encourage the establishment of national organisations to enlighten public opinion on the evils of apartheid; the report of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa; and a study entitled "Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa" published by the Unit on Apartheid in accordance with Operative paragraph 14 of Resolution 2307 of 1967, which requested the Secretary-General to publish periodically information on economic and financial relations between South Africa and other states.

152. On 25 September, 1968, the General Committee recommended the inscription of the Apartheid item on the agenda of the Twenty-third Session and subsequently recommended its allocation to the Special Political Committee. On 27 September, despite an objection by the representative of South Africa that the item concerned matters within the domestic jurisdiction of his country, these recommendations were approved by the General Assembly.

153. The Special Political Committee considered the question at 17 meetings between 23 October and 15 November. South Africa was not present in the Committee at any time throughout the debate and did not take part in the voting in the Committee. On October 23 the acting Chairman (Nepal) of the Special Committee on Apartheid introduced the report of the Special Committee. On the same day, the Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa (the representative of Sweden) introduced the report of the Trust Fund. He asked for more contributions to the Fund in view of the increasing need for humanitarian assistance. He said that a draft resolution would be introduced to redefine the terms of reference of the Trust Fund as recommended in paragraph 9 of the report of the Fund, so as to cover more clearly some of the humanitarian needs for which the Fund had been established by the Assembly. On 25 October the Committee also heard a statement by Canon Collins, as President of the International Defence and Aid Fund (based in the United Kingdom). He described the work of the Fund and appealed for contributions.

154. In the course of the debate, the majority of African and Communist delegations attacked those countries which maintained trade relations with South Africa in disregard of the Assembly's resolutions. The representatives of some countries, in particular the Latin American countries doubted the effectiveness of a policy of isolating South Africa, called for encouragement of dissident white groups within South Africa, and stressed the need for an information campaign aimed at the young people in that country. The representative of the United States said that it had been the view of the United States that by maintaining normal diplomatic and economic relationships with South Africa, they would be in a better position to urge upon South Africa the reform of its policy. But he referred also to a current of opinion in the US Congress, that the United States should disengage itself from South Africa in trade and investment as long as South Africa continued its policy of apartheid. He could not

predict the outcome of that current of opinion because there were diverse views and because the new U.S. administration would want to review the situation.

155. On 13 November the representative of Southern Yemen, acting as Chairman of the Afro-Asian group, introduced a draft resolution which was eventually sponsored by 49 states. A minor amendment was circulated by Ecuador on the same day and was accepted by the co-sponsors. Certain other small amendments were proposed from the floor, which were also accepted. Bulgaria asked that the main trading partners of South Africa should be referred to by name in the resolution but this was not accepted.

156. The draft resolution went somewhat further than General Assembly Resolution 2307 of 1967 although it followed the same general lines. The main new provisions were:—

- (i) it condemned the government of South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and its military intervention in Southern Rhodesia ;
- (ii) it condemned the government of South Africa for its inhuman treatment of political prisoners ; called for their release ; declared that “freedom-fighters” should be treated as prisoners of war under international law, particularly the Geneva Convention of August, 1949 ; and requested the Secretary-General to establish a register of persons executed, imprisoned, arrested or deported for their opposition to apartheid ; and a register of information about acts of brutality in South African prisons ;
- (iii) it requested all states to discourage emigration to South Africa and to suspend cultural, educational, sporting and other relations with South Africa.

157. Immediately following the introduction of the Afro-Asian resolution on 13 November the representative of Malaysia introduced a draft resolution extending the terms of reference of the Trust Fund on the lines recommended in the Trust Fund Report (see paragraph 153 above).

158. On 15 November, the Committee voted upon both draft resolutions. A request by the representative of Mexico for separate voting on operative paragraphs 7 and 8 (c) of the 49 power resolution, relating to assistance to liberation movements and treatment of “freedom-fighters”, on which Mexico and certain other Latin American countries had reservations, was opposed by the sponsors. In view of the Afro-Asian objection to separate paragraph voting, the representative of the United States tabled formal amendments to delete operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft ; operative paragraph 4 drew the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation in South Africa and requested the Council to resume, urgently, consideration of the question of apartheid, “with a view to adopting, under Chapter VII of the Charter, effective measures to ensure implementation of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa” ; operative 5 condemned the trading partners of South Africa for their political, economic and military collaboration with the Government of South Africa.

159. The voting on the Afro-Asian draft resolution was as follows:—

- (a) The Mexican motion to have separate votes on operative paragraphs 7 and 8 (c) failed by 29\* votes to 60, with 8 abstentions ;

- (b) The US amendment to delete operative paragraph 4 failed by 9\* votes to 80, with 21 abstentions ;
- (c) The US amendment to delete operative paragraph 5 failed by 9\* votes to 77, with 21 abstentions ;
- (d) the resolution as a whole was adopted by 95 votes to 1 (Portugal), with 15\* abstentions.

160. The Trust Fund resolution was then adopted unanimously by 107\* votes to none, with no abstentions. The representative of Portugal announced after the vote that his delegation had not participated in the vote.

161. The representative of the United Kingdom spoke in explanation of vote after the voting. He said that his delegation would have wished to see a unanimous vote in condemnation of apartheid. However, each year, the resolutions were so framed as to make it impossible for some delegations to support them.

The United Kingdom did not consider that the situation in South Africa justified the invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter and this was, in any case, a matter for the Security Council to decide ; nor could the United Kingdom contemplate an economic war with South Africa. The resolution was not capable of implementation and therefore would serve only to debase the currency of United Nations resolutions and reduce their influence in the world. The United Kingdom representative welcomed the work of the Trust Fund and the United Nations Education and Training Programme for South Africa and announced, subject to Parliamentary approval, an additional United Kingdom contribution of £41,600 to the Education and Training Programme (full text of his speech is at Annex X).

162. The main Afro-Asian resolution was adopted in the General Assembly, on the report of the Special Political Committee, on 2 December by 85 votes to 2 (Portugal and South Africa) with 14\* abstentions. The Trust Fund Resolution was adopted by 102\* votes to none with 2 abstentions (Portugal and South Africa).

### **Peacekeeping**

163. By its Resolution 2308 (XXII) of 1967, the General Assembly requested the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to continue its review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all its aspects. The Assembly further considered that the preparation of a study on matters related to facilities, services and personnel which member states might provide for United Nations peacekeeping operations would be appropriate, and it requested the Special Committee to prepare by 1 July, 1968 its report on progress made, including the study referred to.

164. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations adopted a progress report to the General Assembly on 27 June, 1968. According to the report, in addition to statements made in the Committee, written contributions to the study called for by the Assembly had been received from Sweden, the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and the Netherlands, who were members of the Committee, and from Denmark, Finland and Norway, who were not members of the Committee. The Committee had decided to set up a Working Group composed of officers of the Committee (Canada, Czechoslovakia, Mexico and the UAR) and the UK, US, USSR and France, as Permanent Members of the Security Council. The task

of the Working Group was to prepare working papers for the study to be submitted to the General Assembly from the documents submitted and statements made in the Special Committee and appropriate UN documents and material of a factual nature which it might request from the Secretary-General. The Working Group had approved as the first model in its programme of work a study of UN military observers established or authorised by the Security Council, and the Secretary-General had been requested to prepare a compilation of statements made in the Security Council and the Special Committee, and all documents and material available in the Secretariat referring to military observers established or authorised by the Security Council.

165. On 12 December, 1968, the Special Committee reported that, in addition to contributions submitted by member states including now a contribution by Austria, its Working Group had received two volumes from the Secretariat containing the material outlined above. Requests had, however, been made within the Working Group for alterations and additional factual information and the Secretary-General had informed the Committee that additional material would be provided to the fullest extent possible by February 1969. The Special Committee's report stated that there were different opinions in the Working Group on the ways and forms in which the material could be made available to the Special Committee or to all members of the United Nations. The Working Group had undertaken to report regularly to the Committee on the preparation of a draft for the study of military observer missions and expected to proceed, when appropriate, to the study of other mutually acceptable models of peacekeeping operations. The Special Committee, for its part, stated its intention to keep the General Assembly informed regularly of progress and to submit a comprehensive report on UN military observers established or authorised by the Security Council as soon as possible and not later than the Twenty-fourth Session of the Assembly.

166. The General Assembly item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects: Report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations" was debated in the Special Political Committee at the Twenty-third Assembly session between 16 December and 18 December, 1968.

167. On 17 December a draft resolution was introduced by Nigeria with the co-sponsorship of Afghanistan, Algeria, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Mauritania, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the United Arab Republic. This requested the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to continue its comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects; to keep the General Assembly regularly informed about its progress and to submit to the General Assembly a comprehensive report on United Nations military observers established or authorised by the Security Council not later than its Twenty-fourth Regular Session. A first preambular paragraph was added to this draft resolution recalling previous resolutions on peacekeeping. A second amendment to the operative part of the draft, based on a US suggestion, asked for a progress report on such work as the Special Committee might be able to undertake on any other models of peacekeeping operations.

168. In the course of the debate some delegations, including the United States, expressed disappointment at the small amount of progress reflected in the reports of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and drew attention to the fact that no progress had been made on the basic constitutional and financial questions. The representative of the USSR adhered strictly to the Soviet position that peacekeeping operations could only be carried out in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter, but accepted that disagreement on matters of principle should not prevent discussion of limited practical aspects of peacekeeping. Several delegations, in particular Iran, urged that the material prepared for the Working Group of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations should be made available to all members of the United Nations. A statement was made by the Chairman on this to say that an understanding had been reached that as soon as the Secretary-General had made available to the Working Group the additional factual material which had been requested, appropriate steps would be taken by the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to make the material available without delay, for information, to any other interested delegations.

169. The United Kingdom representative spoke in the Special Political Committee on 18 December. He said that he could not share the views expressed by the USSR on the principles of peacekeeping and these were issues which one day had to be resolved. But meanwhile it was necessary to take what practical steps were possible. It could not, however, be overlooked that resolution of the problems of financing peacekeeping was fundamental and had always to be kept in mind. The results achieved by the Committee of 33 were far from impressive but there had at least been some advance and some evidence of a new readiness to make progress. The United Kingdom was prepared to make a constructive contribution to the studies of the Working Group and the Committee of 33. (The full text of Mr. Hildyard's speech is at Annex XI).

170. The Committee adopted the Nigerian sponsored resolution (as amended) on 18 December by 85\* votes to none, with 3 abstentions. On 19 December the General Assembly considered the report of the Special Political Committee on the peacekeeping item and the resolution was adopted in Plenary by 101\* votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

### **Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA**

171. In 1967 the General Assembly adopted Resolution 2341 (XXII), part A of which noted that repatriation or compensation of the Palestinian refugees as provided for in an Assembly resolution of 1948 had not been effected; commended the efforts of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA); called attention to the critical financial position of the Agency; and called upon governments to contribute or increase their contributions to the Agency's budget. Part B of the Resolution related to refugees displaced by the Arab/Israel war of 1967; it endorsed the efforts of the Commissioner-General to provide them with humanitarian assistance on an emergency basis, and appealed to all for special contributions for this purpose.

172. At the Twenty-third General Assembly, the debate in the Special Political Committee began on 11 November. U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, initiated the debate with a statement urging that the mandate of UNRWA should be renewed for a suitable period; stating that the only remedy which appeared practical for the problem of the displaced persons was their early return to their former places of residence, whether homes or camps; and calling for support from all for the mission of Dr. Jarring. Dr. Michelmore then introduced his annual report. He said that even on the most optimistic forecast, many thousands of families on the West Bank of the Jordan would have only canvas tents to shelter them during the coming winter and would face the dangers of exposure and disease. UNRWA could provide better care and at less cost, if the newly displaced refugees could return to the homes and camps where they were living before the June, 1967, hostilities. He estimated that the continuation of the present programme of assistance to the refugees would cost about \$42.5 million, i.e. about \$5 million more than the level of expenditure before the June war. The budget deficit for 1968 and the estimated deficit for 1969 would be considerable. However the UNRWA budget included very little provision for those displaced during and after the June war who had not been previously registered with UNRWA. The responsibility for those persons had been taken almost entirely by the various Arab Governments concerned.

173. The debate in the special Political Committee, as in previous years, ranged over the whole question of Palestine. On 18 and 19 December, the Chairman proposed that the delegations representing the Palestine Arab Delegation and the Palestine Liberation Organisation should be heard on the understanding, as in the three previous years, that this did not imply any degree of United Nations recognition of the organisations concerned. This was agreed, though the Israel representative formally reserved his country's position on the decision.

174. The United Kingdom representative, Lord Caradon, spoke on 18 November (text at Annex XII) to discuss the problem of the newly displaced refugees. He called on the Government of Israel to permit these refugees to return to their homes and camps on the West Bank of the River Jordan immediately. He called for no more delay in the search for a settlement according to the principles and purposes of the Security Council Resolution 242 of 1967, and expressed support for the efforts of Dr. Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative. In a statement on 2 December covering the main aspects of United Kingdom policy towards UNRWA (text at Annex XIII) the United Kingdom's representative called on those countries which had not yet made voluntary contributions to UNRWA's budget to do so without delay, in view of the plight of the refugees and the near certainty of a substantial UNRWA deficit in 1969. If the deficit occurred, the United Kingdom view was that an immediate review of the Agency's expenditure on administration and services should be undertaken. In expressing support for the US draft resolution (see below), he said that the United Kingdom Government would have preferred to see UNRWA's mandate renewed for a period of five years subject to annual review by the General Assembly, but accepted the majority view that renewal should be for a period of three years.



175. The representative of Israel affirmed that his Government was acutely conscious of the human aspect of the refugee problem. But the return of the displaced persons was affected by the political and security conditions on the spot. The Jordanian Government, he said, fomented border violence and made any large scale repatriation difficult. UNWRA had overstated the numbers involved. Many refugees had been absorbed into the local life and company of Arab states. He affirmed that the Israel Government stood by its offer of 8 October to readmit a further 7,000 persons on the basis of permits issued but not used in 1967, and promised that the processing of "family reunion" and "hardship" applications would be accelerated. Arab speakers and the Soviet representative criticised the proposals and attitude of Israel.

176. On 6 December the United States introduced a draft resolution in similar terms to part A of the resolution adopted in 1967 (see above), but with an additional operative paragraph proposing that the mandate of UNRWA be renewed for three years from 30 June, 1969. In introducing the draft the US representative, Senator Cooper, said that the extension of the mandate for three years would enable the UNRWA effectively to plan, administer and carry out its work and could, if necessary, be reconsidered in the light of future political developments. He said, also, that the return of only twenty thousand refugees since the June war was an inadequate response to the Security Council's Resolution 237, and that the United Nations had the right to expect that Israel would comply with that resolution.

177. On 9 December the Turkish representative introduced a draft resolution co-sponsored by Iran, Pakistan, and Senegal which recalled the "humanitarian" resolutions of the Security Council (237) and of the General Assembly (2252 (ES-V)) of 1967 and called upon the Government of Israel to arrange for the return without delay of the newly displaced refugees. The draft resolution also asked the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly on its implementation.

178. On 10 December the Swedish representative, with seventeen co-sponsors, tabled a draft resolution on lines identical to part B of the resolution adopted in 1967 (see above). On 11 December a fourth draft resolution sponsored by Afghanistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan and Somalia was tabled. It was also identical to one adopted in 1967. It called for the appointment of a UN Custodian to administer Arab property and assets in Israel, and to receive income derived therefrom on behalf of the rightful owners.

179. The Commissioner-General of UNRWA made a further statement on 10 December about measures to combat the estimated deficit of \$5 million for 1969. The Agency's expenditure on administration and operational services, as suggested by the United Kingdom, would be reviewed again. Restrictions in education and training would be avoided if possible. The review of economies would cover a possible reduction of basic rations, of the supplementary feeding programme, medical services and sanitation maintenance, of the construction of shelter and roads, and of university scholarships. Subsidies paid to governments and private schools for the education of refugee children would have to be discontinued. Rectification of ration rolls would continue.

180. On 11 December the Special Political Committee voted on the Turkish-sponsored draft resolution (which was accorded priority as it concerned a matter of urgency) and on the US draft resolution. The Turkish draft was adopted by 91\* votes (including all the permanent members of the Security Council) to 1 (Israel), with 9 abstentions. The US draft was adopted by 101\* votes to none, with 1 abstention (Israel). On 12 December the Swedish draft resolution was adopted by 88\* votes to none, with no abstentions. On 13 December the draft "Custodian" resolution was rejected by 42 votes to 44\*, with 27 abstentions.

181. The resolutions adopted by the Special Political Committee were considered in Plenary on 19 December. The Turkish-sponsored resolution was adopted by 100\* votes to 1 (Jamaica), with 6 abstentions. After the vote the representative of Israel indicated that she had intended to vote against the resolution although her vote had not been so recorded. The US Resolution was adopted by 105\* votes to none, with 3 abstentions. The Swedish draft was adopted by 106\* votes to none, with no abstentions.

182. The UNRWA Pledging Conference was held on 6 December. Thirty-eight countries pledged a total of approximately \$35,750,000 to the finances of the Agency. The United States pledged the same amount as in 1967 (\$22.2 million), in cash and foodstuffs. The United Kingdom pledged a total £1,875,000 to UNRWA's ordinary and administrative budget, subject to Parliamentary approval.

### Resolutions adopted on the Reports by the Special Political Committee

183. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on reports from the Special Political Committee:—

Resolution No.	Title	Date of Adoption by The General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly			
			For	Against	Abstained	
2382	Effects of Atomic Radiation .. ..	1 Nov.	Unanimous			
2396	The Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa	2 Dec.	85	2	14*	
2397	United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa .. .. .	2 Dec.	102*	0	2	
2451	Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects .. .. .	19 Dec.	101*	2	3	
2452	Report of the Commissioner General of UNRWA .. .. .	19 Dec.	A	100*	1	6
			B	105*	0	3
			C	106*	0	0

## ECONOMIC ITEMS—SECOND COMMITTEE

### General

184. The Second Committee had an agenda of sixteen items, which it was able to complete without difficulty, although the need for it to adjourn during the resumed meetings of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the various Pledging Conferences meant that, as usual, a number of questions was dealt with in a rush at the end of the Session. The major theme throughout was the second United Nations Development Decade which is expected to begin in 1971: resolutions under almost every other item

contained some reference to this. Contrary to some expectations, little attempt was made to revive the arguments from the second UN Conference on Trade and Development which took place in New Delhi at the beginning of 1968, except on the question of South African membership of UNCTAD.

185. The general debate, which concluded on 15 October, was combined with the item on the Second Development Decade, and most policy statements as well as the opening speech from the Under Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs concentrated on this subject. The Western countries made no general statements except on the Decade.

186. A number of speakers raised the question of what the proper role of the Second Committee should be, and suggested it should concern itself more with broad policy and with laying down general guidelines than with consideration of unprepared resolutions on matters of detail which had not been examined in the appropriate technical or subordinate bodies. At a later stage, the Committee reverted to this question when Canada produced a short paper which led to a useful discussion during which the Committee took an objective look at itself. This may prove a good point of departure for attempts to improve procedures next year.

187. The Eastern European countries again stressed that the Western world's colonialism was exclusively responsible for the economic difficulties of the third world and spoke of the evils of private foreign investment. Some developing countries, including Tanzania and Indonesia, nevertheless mentioned steps which they were taking to encourage private investment. Only Algeria and the Sudan adopted a strongly polarised "north-south" attitude and attacked the developed countries for an uncooperative attitude, in particular towards the Capital Development Fund and UNIDO.

#### **United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**

188. The Report of the Second Session of the UN Conference on Trade and Development which had taken place in New Delhi early in 1968 was presented to the General Assembly by the President of the Conference, Mr. Dinesh Singh, on 28 October. He ascribed the Conference's relative lack of success to defective political will, but noted that it had achieved something on preferences, on commodities and on the target of 1 per cent of the gross national product of developed countries for the flow of resources to developing countries. There was also now more general recognition of the interdependence of the developed and the developing countries, and the group system was in some ways a hindrance. He thought the Secretary-General of UNCTAD needed increased powers, and he mentioned the possibility of Trade and Development Board meetings being held in future at ministerial level.

189. The Annual Report of the Trade and Development Board was subsequently introduced in the Second Committee by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Dr. Prebisch, who also emphasised the need for international cooperation, without inter-group polemics, in the adoption of convergent measures for a global development strategy. These reservations about the group system were echoed by many delegations including that of the United Kingdom. (The text of the United Kingdom representative's statement is at Annex XIV.) Japan blamed the monolithic approach of the developing countries for the lack of will to negotiate at UNCTAD and questioned the

value of universal targets for growth. The achievement of the new International Sugar Agreement and the work of the International Trade Centre, jointly controlled by UNCTAD and GATT, came in for praise from many delegations. There was no inclination to reopen the old arguments which had been gone over so thoroughly at New Delhi; indeed, there was a welcome readiness to look constructively at the future without recrimination over the past. The Soviet Union, however, maintained its refusal to accept the 1 per cent flow target.

190. When it came to a resolution, the main point of interest proved to be the procedural question arising from a decision of the Trade and Development Board, whether in future *ad hoc* meetings at a high political level might be used to make progress in special situations. Ceylon, India and Mexico on behalf of the developing countries explained that operative paragraph 5 of the resolution meant only that such meetings should be held with the agreement of all the countries concerned, and not otherwise. Similar interpretations were voiced by the United Kingdom, USA and France, and the resolution was adopted unanimously.

191. Meanwhile on 25 November, twenty-six developing countries tabled a resolution following on from Resolution 26 (II) on UNCTAD II, seeking in effect to suspend the Union of South Africa from membership of the Conference, "until it shall have terminated its policy of racial discrimination". On 3 December, the Secretary-General's Legal Counsel (in compliance with a Danish request) circulated a statement in which he concluded that suspension could only be constitutionally effected by action of the Security Council and the General Assembly in accordance with Article 5 of the Charter. Nevertheless, many African delegations criticised the legal opinion and, after the defeat of procedural moves to defer the vote, the resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 22\*, with 23 abstentions. Those opposing the resolution were the Western Europeans, Brazil and Uruguay, while the Eastern Europeans, other Latin Americans and some other countries abstained. The Soviet Union explained that they abstained because the membership formula excluded East Germany.

192. The resolution came before the Plenary on 13 December when a Canadian motion for deferment failed by 47\* to 52 with 23 abstentions. A keynote speech from the delegate of Tanzania sought to identify the issue specifically with racialism, but the delegate of the United States claimed that the issue was not one of race, but an important constitutional question. The United Kingdom representatives said that the policies of apartheid practised in South Africa were rightly detested, but that the proposal to exclude South Africa from a body open to all members of the United Nations raised a fundamental constitutional issue. Political unacceptability could not be the criterion for membership of bodies under the UN which must seek to be a universal organisation. (Text of Lord Caradon's statement at Annex XV.) The delegate of Norway claimed that the question was an important one (which would require a two-thirds majority for adoption) and the President of the Assembly so ruled. His ruling was challenged by Tanzania, but was upheld on a vote by 56\* to 48 with 13 abstentions. Hungarian amendments seeking to avoid the membership issue by simply expressing agreement with the opinion of UNCTAD II "that South Africa should not take part in the work of the conference" were defeated by a

large majority. The delegate of Albania then sought a separate vote on certain words defining eligibility for membership (these would in effect permit the Federal Republic of Germany, but not East Germany, to be a member): the wording was retained by a vote of 73\* to 14, with 21 abstentions. Finally the resolution as a whole was put to the vote and failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority; the vote was 55-33\*-28. Those voting against were the Western countries, many Latin Americans, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi and Swaziland.

### United Nations Industrial Development Organisation

193. The report of the Industrial Development Board at its Second Session which had taken place in Vienna earlier in the year, came before the Second Committee between 25 October and 14 November. The report was introduced by the Executive Director of the Organisation, Dr. Abdel Rahman who insisted on UNIDO's need for separate development funds of its own. A controversial resolution passed by the Board had recommended an increase from \$1 m. to \$1.5 m. in UNIDO's share of Part V of the UN Regular Budget, which is devoted to technical assistance. This resolution had been opposed by developed countries, who considered that UNIDO should rely on the UN Development Programme (UNDP) for financing its field programme, and who had (the previous year) voted against any fixed share of the Regular (assessed) Budget being set aside exclusively for UNIDO's field programme. The developing countries supported the increase in UNIDO's share of the Regular Budget which the Western Europeans opposed, although some (Scandinavians, Netherlands, Austria) said they would be prepared to support an increase in UNIDO's share if the overall level of Part V were to be raised. Some developing countries spoke of the need for UNIDO to have a "larger share" of UNDP projects, implying wrongly that this depended on UNDP, and not on country requests and upon UNIDO's own efforts. The United Kingdom delegation stressed the need to use UNDP funds for industrial projects, and argued the need for UNIDO to have more staff in the field to improve the flow of projects.

194. On 12 November Tunisia introduced a resolution on behalf of 32 other co-sponsors from developing countries, endorsing the increase of UNIDO's share of Part V of the UN Budget by \$½ million and also recommending that UNIDO should have a larger share of UNDP projects. Attempts by Western delegations to modify the text were mainly unsuccessful. The USA suggested omission of the budget increase and a possible conversion of the Special Industrial Services Fund into a revolving fund for UNIDO, reimbursable from UNDP. This idea was not taken up and on 15 November after a series of votes on individual paragraphs the resolution as a whole was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 20\* abstentions. In separate votes, 15\* Western European countries had abstained on operative paragraph 3 which called for voluntary financial contributions to UNIDO. Operative paragraph 5 (on Part V of the Budget) was adopted by 49 votes to 17\*, with 10 abstentions. In Plenary on 17 December paragraph 4 was adopted by 67 votes to 15\*, with 13 abstentions, and the resolution as a whole by 81 votes to 1 (Japan), with 17\* abstentions.

## Second United Nations Development Decade

195. Many of the delegations from developing countries were ready to assume that the First Decade had been an unredeemed failure, whereas the Decade has in fact until the end of 1970 to run, and has a good chance of achieving some of its main targets before then. However, Tunisia acknowledged that this was after all only the first attempt, and the Indian representative emphasised the successes, making reference to helpful measures by the developed countries, including some British ones. Some of the Scandinavians thought the setting of targets for the First Decade had itself played a useful incentive role.

196. Opening the debate, M. de Seynes, the Under-Secretary-General, contended that some kind of continuing machinery would be needed to measure performance through the Second Decade, although without seeking to supervise governments. He argued that the Decade should embrace all aspects of social as well as economic development and that all countries must be involved. It should not just be a matter of capital formation or aid to developing countries. This theme was taken up by France, whose delegation emphasised the interdependence of developed and developing countries and the need to base international planning upon the targets which governments set for themselves. The need for the Second Decade to be prepared much more fully than the First was a recurrent point in the debate.

197. The main argument on this item revolved around the institutional arrangements for preparing the strategy for the Decade. There was no disagreement on the need for a preparatory or guiding committee. Indeed, the Economic and Social Council at its 45th Session in August, 1968, had allotted the main co-ordinating role to its own Economic Committee. But a number of the developing countries wanted the main responsibility to rest with UNCTAD, although others of them, and almost all the developed countries, considered that ECOSOC was the right organ, being responsible under the Charter for co-ordinating the economic and social work of the whole UN system, including the specialised agencies. At the same time there was recognition that the membership of the Council (27 countries) was somewhat too limited for the main task of preparing the Decade. After prolonged negotiations a draft resolution was tabled in the Committee with the support of nearly all the developing countries and of the Western Europeans, proposing the establishment of a Preparatory Committee consisting of 54 members, 27 of whom would be the current members of ECOSOC, the 27 others being designated annually by the President of the General Assembly from among the members of the United Nations, the specialised agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The selection of these additional 27 members should keep in view the composition of the Council itself, equitable geographical distribution and the need to ensure the maximum degree of continuity. A Soviet amendment designed to open the membership to "all States" was defeated by 54\* votes to 14, with 30 abstentions. The resolution was then adopted by 95\* votes to 9: the Soviet Bloc voted against because the formula adopted would permit the participation of the Federal Republic of Germany. The resolution was subsequently adopted in Plenary on 17 December by 97\* votes to 9, with 1 abstention (Cuba).

198. At the end of the Session, on 21 December, the President announced that he would designate the additional members of the Preparatory Committee after receiving nominations and after undertaking the necessary consultations. On 11 January, 1969, the President informed the Secretary-General that he had received nominations from the African, Asian, Latin American and Western European states, but none from the Eastern European states (in spite of a written request to the Chairman of the Eastern European Group). He then proceeded to designate twenty-three states (not including the Federal Republic of Germany or any Eastern European state) and said he had decided to allow a period for further consultations and would designate the remaining four members on 10 February, 1969. Eventually, on 20 February, the President designated the Federal Republic of Germany and three Eastern European states (Poland, Byelorussia and Rumania) to fill the remaining four places. Following the designation of the Federal Republic of Germany, it was announced that the above three Eastern European members and the USSR and Bulgaria (members of ECOSOC) would take no part in the Committee's work. Despite the absence of these five Eastern European States, the Preparatory Committee held its first meeting on 25th February.

#### **Resources of the Sea**

199. The Second Committee considered this item at a series of meetings between 15 October and 12 December. There was inevitably some overlap with the work in the First Committee dealing with the sea bed. The discussion in the Second Committee centred mainly on the administrative arrangements proposed by the Secretary-General in his reports for the UN's work on future development of marine resources. In particular these concerned the future of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, whose Chairman, Admiral Langeraar, addressed the Committee.

200. The Committee passed two resolutions on this item. One of these, submitted by Belgium and 17 other sponsors, mostly from developing countries, was entitled "International Co-operation in Problems Related to the Oceans". It touched on most of the important points made in the Secretary-General's reports and was adopted without objection on 12 December by the Committee and on 17 December in Plenary. A draft resolution on fisheries was introduced by Iceland with 6 other co-sponsors, including the United Kingdom. This invited governments to increase international co-operation in the field of fisheries, and was particularly concerned with conservation and control. The USSR objected to this resolution on the ground that it duplicated part of the subject matter of the more general resolution which the Committee had passed first. The representative of Iceland explained that the subject of fisheries required special treatment and was of particular and separate concern to a number of countries and organisations. The resolution was adopted on 12 December by 60\* votes to none, with 5 abstentions (Syria and 4 from the Soviet bloc). The resolution was adopted in Plenary on 17 December by 99\* votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

#### **External Financing of Economic Development in Developing Countries**

201. The debate on this subject extended from 18 October until 16 November and embraced some fifty speeches. Attention was drawn to the

fall in relative terms of the flow of external finance to developing countries compared with gross national product in advanced countries, and to the problems of debt servicing. Eastern European countries attacked private capital investment on stereotyped lines for extracting huge sums from the developing countries, and claimed that the reverse flow of funds into the United States exceeded total US official aid. They persisted in rejecting any responsibility for remedying the economic backwardness of former colonial dependencies. The Sudan, however, criticised the 40 per cent fall in financial flows from the Soviet bloc to developing countries and demanded that this be reversed, while the French criticised their failures for specious reasons to accept the target of 1 per cent set by UNCTAD II. Finland pointed out that some of the developed countries were still capital importers or had balance of payments problems which needed more flexible treatment. The United Kingdom delegate echoed this point and went on to point out that the 1 per cent. of GNP was a moving target which, despite the best endeavours could not in the case of many countries be reached by a specified date. He said the terms of UK aid were among the best and a Bill had recently passed the House of Commons to authorise payment of the UK share of a substantially increased replenishment of the International Development Association.

202. Malta proposed the establishment of an International Investment Promotion Centre which would seek out potential investors and try to marry them with worthwhile development projects in developing countries, acting as a kind of clearing house for small developing countries which lacked the facilities and knowhow to publicise their own investment opportunities. This secured little support.

203. On 11 December, a resolution was introduced which, amongst other things, recommended the acceptance of 1972 as the target year for the attainment of the aid volume objectives (1 per cent GNP) defined in Decision 27 (II) of UNCTAD. In a separate vote, the United Kingdom, USA, Canada, Belgium and Australia voted against this provision, while the Eastern European countries and other Western countries abstained. The United Kingdom, USA, Japan, South Africa and Eastern Europeans also abstained on a provision proposing the establishment of a target for net official transfers within the 1 per cent figure. But after the United Kingdom and other Western Europeans had explained their votes, the resolution as a whole was adopted by 87\* votes to none, with six abstentions (from Eastern Europe). In Plenary, the vote was 96\* to none, with 9 abstentions.

204. An attempt to attach to the main resolution controversial provisions concerning Special Drawing Rights was abandoned; and a separate, more moderate, resolution on international monetary reform, was subsequently adopted by 55\* votes to none, with 16 abstentions. In Plenary, the vote was 78\* to none with 27 abstentions including the Soviet bloc, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and New Zealand.

### **Food and Protein**

205. The Second Committee considered multilateral food aid and the report of the World Food Programme at a series of meetings between 13 November and 13 December. The Twentieth Session of the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to examine the means and



policies required for multilateral action to combat hunger: this report had been passed on to the Second Committee by the Economic and Social Council without any specific recommendations.

206. A number of delegates pointed out that while the threat of world famine seemed to be receding, the nutritional problem remained. The importance of "burden sharing" was stressed in particular by Australia and New Zealand, and there was general agreement on the need for coordination between bilateral and multilateral aid. A resolution, largely the work of the New Zealand, Australian and Argentinian delegations, was tabled after extensive negotiation on 5 December, but this was subjected to extensive revision and appeared in an amended (and improved) form on 12 December. After further amendments the resolution was adopted on 13 December by 62\* votes to none, with 10 abstentions. In Plenary on 20 December, a further amendment was accepted and the amended resolution was adopted by 102\* votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

207. The question of edible protein was also considered following inconclusive discussion in the Economic and Social Council, which had been unable to resolve a difference between two proposals. The first, by Canada, (which had the general support of the United Kingdom delegation) requested FAO, WHO and UNICEF in consultation with the Secretary-General to consider the adequacy of UN arrangements to focus attention on the world protein problem. The other, by India, asked the Secretary-General to undertake a global study on the application of systems analysis to the protein problem, to initiate country case studies and to set up a five-year protein development campaign. The United Kingdom delegate argued that this was not a field appropriate to the UN Secretariat. After prolonged negotiation, a compromise resolution came before the Second Committee, cosponsored by Canada, India and the United Kingdom as well as others, and was adopted unanimously by the Committee on 2 December, and subsequently in Plenary on 17 December.

### **The Brain Drain**

208. In the United Nations, the subject of the brain drain is treated as a problem hampering the efforts of the developing countries to improve their own economic and social development. The flow comprises not only the migration of trained personnel from developing to developed countries where they find conditions more attractive in a number of ways, but also the failure to return to their home countries of students who have acquired skills and qualifications in advanced countries often under scholarship schemes or technical assistance arrangements. The Secretary-General's report was debated in the Second Committee between 27 November and 6 December. It showed that the United States and Canada were the main "recipient" countries of the flow, despite their efforts to prevent foreign students from taking up permanent residence. But the United Kingdom was also shown as a beneficiary, particularly of doctors and nurses from India, Pakistan and some of the Caribbean countries. The Secretary-General's paper put forward a number of suggestions for consideration by the governments mainly concerned. It observed that adverse effects were felt only by relatively few developing countries, and that since situations varied widely, no particular remedy would be generally applicable.

209. This year the Soviet Union and its associates made no more than a formal attempt to make political capital out of this item. They spoke on predictable lines, demanding that compensation be paid by the countries, particularly the USA, benefiting from the drain. There was a healthy inclination to recognise the need for action at source by the developing countries themselves, and India explained how they were trying to tackle the problem without interfering with the general freedom of movement to other intellectual centres, which they found to be to their general benefit.

210. A draft resolution was tabled on 4 December by Venezuela on behalf of a group of developing countries and the United Kingdom. The resolution was adopted on 6 December by 86\* to none with 2 abstentions; and subsequently passed unanimously in Plenary on 17 December.

### Other Items

211. The item on Operational Activities for Development was introduced in the Committee on 11 November with statements from the Administrator of the UNDP, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and the UN Commissioner for Technical Assistance, Mr. Victor Hoo. There was general approval of the programmes and the Committee took note with satisfaction of the reports of the Governing Council of UNDP at its fifth and sixth Sessions and also of measures taken to promote follow-up investment, and authorised the continuation of the OPEX scheme for operational personnel.

212. A resolution on the Capital Development Fund was tabled by thirty-two developing countries on 12 December, seeking to continue for another year the provisional arrangements whereby the Administrator of the UN Development Programme acts as Managing Director of the Fund. The United Kingdom, like all other Western countries excepting the Netherlands, had opposed the earlier resolution on the grounds that the Development Programme should not be involved in capital development. This time the resolution was opposed by some Western Europeans: Austria, the Scandinavians, Australia, Ireland and Italy abstained, together with the Eastern Europeans. The resolution was adopted in Committee by 68 votes to 9\*, with 18 abstentions; and in Plenary on 17 December, by 76 votes to 8\*, with 19 abstentions.

213. The item on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources was taken in the Committee between 18 and 22 October. The Secretary-General's report was criticised by Eastern European speakers on the grounds that it did not deal with the substance of the question. The delegate of Poland subsequently introduced a draft resolution requesting the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of General Assembly Resolution 2158 (XXI), a resolution strongly inimical to private investment that had been passed at the Twenty-first Session of the Assembly, and on which the United Kingdom had abstained. The United Kingdom delegate criticised the lack of balance in the resolution and the undesirability of asking the Secretary-General to pursue this fruitless subject. Nevertheless the resolution was adopted in Committee by 85 votes to none, with 12\* abstentions and in Plenary on 19 November, by 94 votes to none, with 9\* abstentions.

214. Under the item on the Report of the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly adopted four resolutions on, as usual, a disparate selection of subjects. One of these concerning international monetary reform is dealt with under the heading External Financing (above). A resolution, proposed in the Second Committee by Iran on 11 December, and adopted unanimously, requested the Economic and Social Council to study the feasibility of creating an international corps of volunteers. A resolution inviting ECOSOC to consider the role of the co-operative movement in economic development was introduced by Poland on 21 November, and adopted unanimously. The fourth resolution, introduced by Rumania on 15 November and also agreed unanimously, requested the Secretary-General to report on the actual and potential use of computers in the development process.

215. A recommendation by the Economic and Social Council that the General Assembly Rules of Procedure should be amended to allow for consultation with specialised agencies and the IAEA on the inscription of any new item of concern to these bodies, ran into difficulty with delegations from developing countries in the Second Committee, where it was considered on 9 and 23 October. The matter was deferred until the Twenty-fourth Session. The proposal for an "International Education Year" was debated on 3 and 4 December. A resolution introduced by the United States and cosponsored by eight developing countries designated 1970 as International Education Year and requested the Secretary-General to report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly on progress in preparations for the Year. This was adopted unanimously. The report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research was considered at three meetings between 29 October and 8 November, after being introduced by the Executive Director, Chief Adebó. On 29 October, a draft resolution was tabled which *inter alia* singled out for special mention the studies on the Brain Drain and Evaluation, and supported the Executive Director's case for additional financial support for the Institute. The resolution was approved without objection.

216. Under the item "Conversion to Peaceful Uses of the Resources released by Disarmament" a draft resolution, introduced by Sweden on 22 October, recommended that states should consider devoting any resources from partial (as well as complete) disarmament to development. Despite objections from the USSR, the resolution was adopted in Committee by 75\* votes to none, with 17 abstentions; and in Plenary, on 19 November by 94\* votes to none, with 15 abstentions. A second item, relating to disarmament and entitled "One Day of War for Peace" was inscribed at the request of Madagascar, Cambodia and Gabon and allotted to the Second Committee, which considered it between 2 and 9 December. A resolution was tabled inviting governments to devote a day's military expenditure to development, but the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the item until the Twenty-fourth Session.

## Resolutions adopted on the reports of the Second Committee

217. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on reports from the Second Committee.

Resolution No.	Title	Date of Adoption by The General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2377	Pledging Conference on the United Nations Capital Development Fund ..	14 Oct.	Without objection		
2385	Revision of the lists of States eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board .. .. .	19 Nov.	Without objection		
2386	Permanent sovereignty over natural resources .. .. .	19 Nov.	94	0	9*
2387	Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament ..	19 Nov.	94*	0	15
2388	United Nations Institute for Training and Research .. .. .	19 Nov.	Without objection		
2401	Technical assistance in trade and related fields .. .. .	13 Dec.	Without objection		
2402	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development .. .. .	13 Dec.	Unanimous		
2407	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation .. .. .	17 Dec.	81	1	17*
2408	Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme .. .. .	17 Dec.	Without objection		
2409	Promotion of follow-up investment ..	17 Dec.	Without objection		
2410	United Nations Capital Development Fund .. .. .	17 Dec.	76	8*	19
2411	International development strategy (Second Development Decade) ..	17 Dec.	97*	9	1
2412	International Education Year .. ..	17 Dec.	Unanimous		
2413	Exploitation and conservation of living marine resources .. .. .	17 Dec.	99*	0	8
2414	International co-operation in problems related to the oceans .. .. .	17 Dec.	Without objection		
2415	External financing of economic Development .. .. .	17 Dec.	96*	0	9
2416	Increase in the production and use of edible protein .. .. .	17 Dec.	Unanimous		
2417	Outflow of trained professional and technical personnel at all levels from the developing to the developed countries, its causes, its consequences and practical remedies for the problems resulting from it .. .. .	17 Dec.	Unanimous		
2418	One day of war for peace .. .. .	17 Dec.	Without objection		
2458	International co-operation with a view to the use of computers and computation techniques for development .. ..	20 Dec.	Unanimous		
2459	The role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development ..	20 Dec.	Unanimous		
2460	Human resources for development ..	20 Dec.	Unanimous		
2461	International monetary reform .. ..	20 Dec.	78*	0	27
2462	Multilateral food aid .. .. .	20 Dec.	102*	0	9

## SOCIAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS ITEMS— THE THIRD COMMITTEE

### General

218. The Third Committee had seventeen items on its agenda including three which had not been on the agenda of the Twenty-second Session. It

held ninety-two meetings but, as in previous years, was not able to complete its agenda. It dealt substantively with six items, though resolutions were adopted on other items. Four items were deferred without discussion to the Twenty-fourth Session. More time was spent on the discussion of social items than in the past and over half the Committee's time went on these items.

219. Consideration of the six items dealt with fully led to the adoption of two resolutions on Capital Punishment; a Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity; a preamble and a set of principles of a draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (a new item); a resolution on the World Social Situation; a resolution on the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and ten resolutions under the item on the International Year for Human Rights.

220. The remaining items on the Committee's agenda were dealt with during the last two days of the session. During this time the Committee adopted a procedural resolution relating to the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; a resolution on Assistance in cases of Natural Disasters, (another resolution had been passed earlier in this session dealing with the earthquake in Iran in August, 1968); three resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council dealing with measures for combatting racial discrimination, and the policies of apartheid and segregation in Southern Africa; the treatment of political prisoners in Southern Africa; and measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance. The Committee also adopted a resolution on the work of the United Nations Children's Fund and two resolutions on the control of narcotics.

221. The following items were postponed to the Twenty-fourth Session: Housing, Building and Planning; Town Twinning as a Means of International Co-operation; the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance; and the Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

#### **War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity**

222. A joint working group of the Third and Sixth Committees (on which the United Kingdom was represented) had prepared a draft Convention on the Non-applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity at the Twenty-second Session of the General Assembly, but the Third Committee was unable to consider it at that session. (See paragraphs 207-210 of Cmnd. 3747.) It was agreed that the Committee would use the working group's draft as its basic text and that since there had been a general debate on the issues involved at the Twenty-second Session, it would concentrate on a detailed examination of the draft, beginning with the substantive articles.

223. Article I gave rise to most discussion and occupied seven out of the fourteen meetings spent on the item as a whole between 7 October and 12 November. The first part of this draft Article provided that statutory limitations should not apply to war crimes and crimes against humanity

“irrespective of the date of their commission”. Several Western and Latin American delegations were opposed to this provision which they said was contrary to the principle of non-retroactivity in criminal law, which was guaranteed in their legal systems. They said that the Convention should not cover crimes for which periods of limitation barring prosecution might already have expired. On the other hand, the Eastern European delegations, supported generally by the Afro-Asians, asserted that under existing principles of international law statutory limitations were not applicable to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and that given the serious nature of these crimes an exception should be made to the principle of non-retroactivity so that those responsible for such crimes could be punished at any time. The existing provision was retained. Subsequently the Committee also rejected a proposal by Norway, for which they were strongly criticised by the Eastern Europeans, to add a new Article to the effect that the Convention would not impose any obligation on a contracting party in respect of crimes to which prescription had already applied prior to the adoption of the Convention.

224. The definition of war crimes and crimes against humanity, also contained in Article I, gave rise to much controversy. The original draft of the Convention prepared by the Secretary-General in 1965 had defined these crimes by reference to the definitions in the Charter of the Nurnberg Tribunal as confirmed by General Assembly resolutions at the time, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and, also insofar as crimes against humanity were concerned, the 1948 Genocide Convention. The application of the Convention in respect of war crimes was also limited to crimes of a grave nature. The working group's draft provided, however, for a detailed enumeration of crimes against humanity, including such crimes as “eviction by armed attack or occupation” and “inhuman acts resulting from the policy of apartheid”. This draft also provided that the Convention should apply to all war crimes. Most Western and Latin American delegations took the view that the Secretary-General's original approach to the question of definitions was correct. In particular, they considered that a detailed enumeration of crimes against humanity would create difficulties for those states whose domestic law was based upon existing international law. They further felt that these difficulties would be increased by what they regarded as the imprecise language used to define crimes against humanity, and by the inclusion of elements of an essentially political nature. Most Afro-Asian delegations, with the support of the Eastern Europeans, argued, however, that the draft Convention should apply not only to the past but also to the present and the future. They therefore considered it was imperative to retain examples of current crimes against humanity. In the hope of reconciling this divergence of view, the United Kingdom delegation introduced an amendment proposing that war crimes and crimes against humanity should be defined by reference to international law. The United Kingdom representative explained that this would have made it easy for states to apply the Convention without recourse to new legislation, and would have allowed for the progressive development of international law. The majority of delegations felt that such a general provision would raise difficulties, since states held differing views on the scope and content of international law.

The United Kingdom's amendment was heavily defeated, as were amendments introduced by the United States, with France, the Netherlands and Mexico as co-sponsors, designed to bring the text of Article I back into line with the Secretary-General's original version. Article I (which was virtually in the form drafted by the working group), was passed by 59 votes to 12\*, with 27 abstentions.

225. The remaining Articles of the draft Convention and the preamble to it were disposed of fairly quickly. Article II, which was based on a proposal by Chile, provided that if any of the crimes mentioned in Article I were committed, the provisions of the Convention should apply to the representatives of the state authority and private individuals who, as principals or accomplices, participated in or who directly incited others to the commission of any of these crimes, or who conspired to commit them, irrespective of the degree of completion, and to representatives of the state authority who tolerated their commission. Article III, which introduced a new element, and was also based on a proposal by Chile, provided that the Parties to the Convention should undertake the necessary domestic measures, with a view to making possible the extradition of the persons referred to in Article II. Article IV provided that the Parties to the Convention should undertake the necessary measures to ensure that statutory or other limitations should not apply to the prosecution and punishment of the crimes referred to in Article I and II and that where they existed, such limitations should be abolished. These three Articles were adopted by the positive vote of a small minority of delegations only.

226. The remaining Articles of the Convention (there are eleven in all) consisted of standard treaty provisions. An amendment by the Ukraine to allow "all states" to become Parties to the Convention was defeated. Ten ratifications or accessions only are required to bring the Convention into force. (As of 15 May, 1969, seven Eastern European countries had ratified the Convention and two others had signed.)

227. The Convention was adopted in the Third Committee on 15 October by 58 votes to 6\*, with 32 abstentions, and in Plenary on 26 November, by 58 votes to 7\*, with 36 abstentions. (The text of Lady Gaitskell's statement in explanation of vote in Plenary is at Annex XVI.)

228. Following the adoption of the Convention the representative of Saudi Arabia tabled a draft protocol which provided *inter alia* that persons accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity should be tried by a tribunal consisting of judges of states not parties to a given war, and that the right of asylum should not be denied to a person accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity where the charge against him was open to substantial doubt. It was generally felt that this draft protocol raised substantial issues which could not be considered at that time. The representative of Saudi Arabia accepted this and introduced a draft resolution whereby the General Assembly would decide to take up the draft protocol at such time as it resumed consideration of the question of international criminal jurisdiction (which has been discussed in the Sixth Committee in the past), or at such other time as it deemed appropriate. This draft was adopted in the Third Committee by 82\* votes to none, with 10 abstentions, and in Plenary by 80\* votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

## Capital Punishment

229. The Third Committee took this item first and devoted six meetings to it. About half the time was spent considering a draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council. The discussion, which cut across the normal geographical groups, centred on three questions. First, it was generally held that agreement on an ultimate total abolition of capital punishment would not be possible at this time, given the diverse attitudes still held on this matter. It was noted, however, that there was a trend towards the abolition or decrease in the application of the death penalty, and that the Consultative Group of the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of offenders had expressed the view at its meeting in August, 1968, that the deterrent effect of capital punishment had not been proved; in the debate doubt was cast on the validity of this view. Some delegations urged that the review of the use of the death penalty suggested in the draft resolution should apply to political as well as common crimes. Several delegations, notably Sweden, Venezuela, Austria and Italy, who had co-sponsored the proposal in the Human Rights Commission earlier in the year, indicated that they thought the draft resolution did not go far enough, but they supported it as a first step towards the abolition of the death penalty.

230. Secondly, on the question of specific safeguards for persons on trial for their lives, many delegations stressed the need for careful trial procedures, respect of the right to appeal and the need for legal aid. Some delegations felt that statutory time limits, before the expiry of which the death sentence could not be carried out, were necessary to ensure that the accused was able to avail himself of all legal possibilities for appeal; others considered that such time limits might be inhumane where all opportunities of appeal had been exhausted before the time limit expired.

231. Thirdly, legislation carrying a mandatory death sentence was criticised and the need to focus greater attention on the rehabilitation of prisoners was stressed.

232. Subject to amendments by Sweden, the Philippines and Upper Volta, the resolution was adopted in the Third Committee by 90\* votes to none, with three abstentions. There were four more votes in favour of the resolution in Plenary. In the resolution the General Assembly invited member states to ensure the most careful legal procedures and the greatest possible safeguards for the accused in capital cases in countries where the death penalty obtained, giving special attention in the case of indigent persons, and to consider fixing time limits before which no death sentence would be carried out. The Assembly also asked the Secretary-General to invite member states to inform him of their present attitude to possible further restriction of the use of the death penalty or its total abolition, and of recent or contemplated changes in their policies on this matter, and to present a report to the Economic and Social Council in 1971.

233. Having adopted this general resolution the Third Committee went on to consider a second draft resolution concerning the use of threatened use of capital punishment in Southern Africa, introduced by Upper Volta and co-sponsored by Cyprus, Ghana, India, Kuwait, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Pakistan, Senegal, Syria and Tunisia. In introducing this draft resolution the representative of Upper Volta recalled the illegal execution by the Smith régime of five Rhodesian Africans in March, 1968. He also stated that the



latest official statistics published by the Government of South Africa showed that there had been a number of executions in 1965 for acts related to apartheid. Some of those executed might have been inhabitants of South West Africa. He also declared that life imprisonment was tantamount to the death sentence given the treatment of African prisoners in South African prisons.

234. This draft resolution attracted much sympathy and there was criticism of the use of capital punishment in Southern Africa as a means of suppressing resistance to apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism by liberation movements and to execute freedom fighters. A number of Western delegations considered that certain paragraphs were imprecise, legally or factually, and the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted some amendments introduced by the United States. A further United States amendment, designed to remove the implication in the original draft that the authorities in Southern Africa were already resorting to the use of the death penalty to suppress the peoples of Southern Africa, was rejected by a vote. The resolution was adopted in the Third Committee by 87 votes to 1, with 7\* abstentions, and in Plenary by 89 votes to 2 (South Africa and Portugal), with 7\* abstentions. In the resolution the General Assembly condemned the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, the South African régime in South West Africa and the government in South Africa for the threat or use of capital punishment to suppress the natural aspirations of the peoples of South Africa to social and economic justice, civil rights and political freedom; called upon the Government of South Africa to renounce the execution of any persons sentenced to death for their opposition to apartheid; and requested the Human Rights Commission and the Economic and Social Council to keep this matter under constant review.

235. In explaining the United Kingdom abstention in the Third Committee vote, Lady Gaitskell stated that the United Kingdom Government had deplored the executions carried out in Southern Rhodesia in March, 1968, and the trial of thirty-seven South West Africans in Pretoria. The United Kingdom delegation had therefore approved the spirit of the draft resolution. But the draft did not accurately reflect the position in South Africa. The South West Africans in question had not been sentenced to death. Capital punishment had been applied in respect of criminal cases only, even though the motives for the crimes may have been political.

#### **Draft Declaration on Social Development**

236. This was a new item on the agenda. In its Resolution 2215 (XXI) of 1966 the General Assembly called upon the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission for Social Development to prepare a Declaration which would define the objectives of social development and the means and methods of achieving them. The Commission for Social Development began this work at its eighteenth session in March 1967 and completed the draft of a Declaration at its nineteenth session in February 1968. The Economic and Social Council reviewed the draft at its forty-fourth session in May 1968 and agreed to send it forward to the General Assembly at its Twenty-third Session, together with amendments and other comments made by twenty-one governments.

237. Mr. Jansson, Deputy Director of the Social Development Division, introduced these documents. He said that the Declaration would emphasise the need for integrated development planning, which should take into account social as well as economic needs, and would give governments practical guidance in achieving this objective. This would be of particular importance as the Second Development Decade was approaching.

238. The discussion of this item occupied thirty-one meetings, in the course of which it was agreed that the title should be "Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development". The debate was lively, the main interest arising from its political rather than its social content. The draft before the Committee consisted of a Preamble of fourteen paragraphs; Part I, Principles, consisting of 13 paragraphs; Part II, Objectives, 12 paragraphs, and Part III, Means and Methods, 30 paragraphs. The United Kingdom was one of a large number of delegations which criticised the style and drafting of the Declaration, particularly for its repetitiveness, and overlap between the three Parts. The East Europeans, and the Afro-Asian delegations, however, made it clear from the outset that despite the imperfections of the draft Declaration, they were prepared to adopt it; they attached importance to its political content, particularly those parts which identify colonialism and racism as obstacles to social development, and which drew attention to the need for aid for the developing countries to be without strings.

239. Lady Gaitskell rejected the proposition that social development was incompatible with colonialism, and the United Kingdom delegation abstained on the paragraphs in which it occurred.

240. The Third Committee completed work only on the Preamble and Part I, Principles, of the Draft Declaration. The Preamble contains paragraphs about the inter-dependence of economic and social development; the political circumstances required for the promotion of social development, such as peaceful co-existence, the elimination of evils such as exploitation, war, colonialism, racism; and the responsibility of the economically advanced states for assisting the developing countries. The nine Articles of Part I include references to the elimination of colonialism, racism, nazism, apartheid; to the family as a basic unit of society and the exclusive right of parents to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children; to the participation of all members of society in productive and socially useful labour, and the establishment of equal rights to property; to the responsibility of governments for planning social development measures for introducing necessary changes in the social structure; to the exploitation of outer space, the sea bed and the ocean floor exclusively for peaceful purposes and in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

241. The Third Committee approved the Preamble unanimously. "Part I: Principles" was adopted by 90\* votes to none, with 1 abstention (Portugal). The General Assembly approved unanimously the recommendation of the Third Committee that the Assembly should endeavour to complete the draft Declaration at its Twenty-fourth Session.

242. In his statement to the Third Committee the High Commissioner, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan reported that 1968, a year of consolidation and progress, had been marked by considerable success in three essential fields. In the field of protection, 55 countries had now signed the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (Cmnd. 9171) and 27 had become parties to the 1967 Protocol to the Convention (Cmnd. 3906). In international co-operation encouraging results had been achieved by the Organisation of African Unity's Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees and inter-agency co-operation between his Office and other members of the United Nations family, particularly the United Nations Development Programme, had functioned well. Thirdly, with regard to the resettlement of African refugees in rural areas, more than 80 per cent of the refugees who were his concern were now at work and in a position to take care of themselves. Unfortunately the number of refugees in Africa was steadily increasing and more than 40,000 had arrived in various African countries since the beginning of the year. As far as Europe was concerned, the refugee problem had not been urgent until the "events of Eastern Europe" had made assistance necessary.

243. The High Commissioner said that in 1969 he intended to concentrate his efforts on certain particular areas and drew attention in this connection to the importance of providing an adequate legal status to refugees in implementation of the international instruments and to the need to facilitate voluntary repatriation and naturalisation. It was also essential, if refugees were to play a full part in the life of the society of their adoptive country or their country of origin, should they return there, that they should enjoy the same educational facilities as nationals. To this end his office had begun to provide assistance in the field of primary education. With the help of a generous contribution from the Scandinavian countries he hoped to extend this assistance in 1969 to secondary and vocational education.

244. Turning to the financing of the programme, the High Commissioner said that the increasing needs of refugees particularly in Africa had led to the target of the assistance programme being raised by \$1m. to a total of almost \$5.7m. (Governmental contributions for 1969 amounting to \$2.84m. were later pledged at the *ad hoc* meeting of the General Assembly held on 6 December for the announcement of voluntary contributions to the High Commissioner's programme).

245. In the debate which followed the High Commissioner's statement several delegations observed that the main function of his Office was to serve as a catalyst for action by Governments, and other international bodies. Satisfaction was expressed that during the year under review the situation of most of the African refugees had passed beyond the initial emergency stage. Many delegations expressed concern, however, that the number of new refugees was increasing; some African delegations expressed the view that insofar as Africa was concerned this was linked to the continuation of colonial and minority regimes on that continent. The Portuguese authorities were singled out for particular criticism. Some Western delegations expressed concern that the invasion of Czechoslovakia had led to a reopening of the refugee problem in Europe. The representative of Austria expressed his

gratitude for the help being given by the High Commissioner in caring for the influx of Czechoslovak refugees into his country. Asian delegations similarly expressed concern about the refugees in their area of the world including the problem of the refugees from Tibet. The representative of China praised the help being given in Hong Kong to refugees from the mainland of China. The United Kingdom representative, Lady Gaitskell, expressed the United Kingdom Government's continuing support for the work of the UNHCR which she said had been demonstrated by their contribution of £120,000 to the High Commissioner's assistance programme in 1968 and by their accession to the Protocol to the 1951 Convention on 4 September, 1968.

246. In a resolution passed unanimously, both in the Third Committee and in Plenary, the General Assembly, *inter alia*, requested the High Commissioner to continue to provide international protection and assistance to refugees who were his concern, while giving special attention to new groups of refugees, in particular in Africa; and urged member states to continue to lend their support to the High Commissioner's humanitarian task by facilitating the voluntary repatriation, local integration or resettlement of refugees, by improving the legal status of refugees residing in their territory, by providing the High Commissioner with the necessary means, including financial assistance, for accomplishing his task, and by drawing the attention of the governing bodies of other organs in the United Nations system to the need to ensure that full account was taken of the requirements of refugees, including education and training.

#### **Assistance in Cases of Natural Disaster**

247. Two resolutions were adopted under this item. Early in the session the Third Committee interrupted its consideration of the Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development to consider a draft resolution introduced under this item by Morocco with 34 co-sponsors, including the United Kingdom, designed to assist the Government of Iran in the work of reconstruction following the earthquake in Iran in August, 1968. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously. In it the General Assembly expressed its deep sympathy to the people and Government of Iran; invited Governments and non-governmental organisations to consider ways and means of rendering further assistance to Iran; and asked the Secretary-General and competent United Nations organisations to bear in mind the needs of the Government of Iran in connexion with its plans for reconstruction. The second draft resolution was submitted by the Economic and Social Council. Its main purpose was to have the General Assembly extend for another three years the authority given to the Secretary-General in 1965 to draw on the Working Capital Fund in the amount of \$100,000 in any one year for emergency aid in connexion with natural disasters, with a normal ceiling of \$20,000 per country in the case of any one disaster. This proposal was readily agreed to in the Third Committee. The draft resolution also provided for the Secretary-General to use the balance of any funds remaining at the end of the year to assist Governments in pre-disaster planning, in amounts not exceeding \$10,000 per country. The United Kingdom delegation joined some others in expressing reservations about the use of the Working Capital Fund for pre-disaster planning. It was suggested that other United Nations sources of finance,

particularly the United Nations Development Programme, should be drawn upon for this purpose. A few delegations (not the United Kingdom) abstained on this particular proposal but the draft resolution was adopted unanimously in the Third Committee and in Plenary. In addition to the provisions referred to, the General Assembly made various recommendations in this resolution designed to enlarge the role of the UN in providing assistance in cases of natural disaster.

### World Social Situation

248. The Third Committee devoted twelve meetings to this item. The Committee had before it the Report on the World Social Situation 1967, the first of a new triennial series of report which, as requested by the General Assembly in its Resolution 2215 (XXI) of 19 December, 1966, is a review of social conditions and trends in social development in different regions of the world, including the economically advanced regions. Also before the Committee was a report by the Secretary-General containing conclusions and suggestions related to the main report, and the report of the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare held in New York from 3 to 12 September, 1968.

249. Mrs. Thorsson, Director of the Social Development Division, introduced and wound up the debate. She drew attention to the slow progress made in agricultural production, employment and housing and to the unevenness of progress in fields of improvement such as health. She also drew attention to some of the economic effects of the population increase and to the obstacles to family planning services caused by the slow change in values and attitudes. Mrs. Thorsson commented on the widespread unrest and disillusion among young people and to the contribution they could make to the ideals and purposes of the United Nations. She drew attention also to the increase in the gulf between the rich and the poor parts of the world, and also between different sectors of society within a nation which she described as a set-back to the principle of social justice. She said that so long as the richer nations of the world were prepared to give the equivalent of only 4 per cent. of what they spent for military purposes as aid to the poorer countries, progress in eradicating the chronic problems of hunger, malnutrition, unemployment, illiteracy and poverty would be slow. Mrs. Thorsson said that the United Nations system was determined to put to use in planning the strategy of the Second Development Decade the knowledge gained during the current Development Decade of what constituted, influenced, and facilitated over-all development.

250. After the general debate, in which delegations mainly described the achievements in their own countries in the field of social development, the Committee considered a draft resolution introduced by Afghanistan with 25 co-sponsors. This was an ambitious draft which sought to lay down guide-lines to member states for their development planning, and included recommendations on such controversial subjects as population problems, the distribution of income, and the level of assistance from the developed to the developing countries. There was much criticism of the draft but, in the absence of a Declaration on Social Development, it was adopted so that

social development would be taken fully into account by those planning the Second Development Decade. The resolution was adopted by the Committee by 87\* votes to none, with 2 abstentions. It was adopted in Plenary by 109\* votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

### **Creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

251. This item has been on the General Assembly's agenda since 1965, but has not yet been considered in substance. Once again the Third Committee was unable to find time to deal with a draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council in 1967 which recommended the establishment of the Office of UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and specified the High Commissioner's functions and powers. A draft procedural resolution was introduced by Costa Rica with eight co-sponsors, by which the General Assembly would decide to accord high priority to the item at the Twenty-fourth Session. This gave rise to objections from those delegations, notably the Eastern European, the Arabs and India, which have declared their opposition to the creation of the post of High Commissioner. The resolution was, however, adopted in the Third Committee by 61\* votes to 14, with 15 abstentions, and in Plenary by 83\* votes to 15, with 16 abstentions. A number of delegations indicated that their vote in favour of the resolution should not be regarded as committing them on the substance of the proposal.

### **International Year for Human Rights**

252. The Third Committee devoted twenty-three meetings to this item from 26 November to 16 December. The item fell into two parts.

#### *(I). Measures and activities undertaken in connexion with the International Year for Human Rights*

253. In its resolution 1961 (xviii) of 1963, the General Assembly designated 1968 as International Year for Human Rights. Subsequently it approved a programme of measures and activities envisaged for member states, the United Nations, the specialised agencies and national and international organisation. The Assembly also asked the Secretary-General to co-ordinate the measures and activities undertaken, and in particular to collect and disseminate at regular intervals, information on the celebration of the International Year.

254. At the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly the Third Committee had before it a report on the measures and activities undertaken; this contained an account of the celebrations in the United Kingdom.

255. In his statement introducing this item Dr. Schreiber, the Director of the Human Rights Division, stated that perhaps the most impressive effort made during 1968 to focus attention on human rights had been the wide distribution of the text of the Universal Declaration in many languages. The International Year had also seen a marked increase in the number of signatures, ratifications or accessions to various international Conventions designed to safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms in different fields. In

the general debate which followed, representatives described how their countries had celebrated the International Year. It was widely recognised that despite the efforts made by the United Nations and others during 1968, much remained to be done to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights. In this connexion almost every delegation referred to violations of human rights in Southern Africa, and in particular to the policy of apartheid. Some delegations, particularly those representing Arab countries, stated that violations had occurred in the territories in the Middle East occupied by Israel as a result of the war in June, 1967. There were also some references to infringements of human rights elsewhere. In particular, some Western delegations and a few Afro-Asian delegations referred to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. The situation in Vietnam was also mentioned by Eastern European delegations and some Afro-Asian delegations. Some Western delegations referred to discrimination in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in Eastern Europe against Jews and other religious groups. The United Kingdom Representative, Lady Gaitskell, spoke on 2 December (text at Annex XVII).

256. It was generally agreed that member states and others should be encouraged to continue to focus attention on human rights beyond 1968. A draft resolution designed to meet this need was introduced by New Zealand with Brazil, Ghana, Guyana and the Netherlands as co-sponsors. This draft resolution also provided for the Secretary-General to issue from time to time an appropriate bulletin containing information on the activities of the United Nations in the field of human rights. Some Eastern European delegations objected to this proposal on financial grounds and abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, which was adopted by 75\* votes to none, with 5 abstentions. The resolution was adopted in Plenary on 19 December by 110\* votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

## (II). *International Conference on Human Rights*

257. In its Resolution 2081 (XX) of 1965, the General Assembly decided to convene an International Conference on Human Rights during 1968 in order to review the progress which had been made in the field of human rights since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to evaluate the effectiveness of the methods used by the United Nations in this field, especially with respect to the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and the practice of apartheid, and to formulate a programme of further measures to be taken subsequent to the celebrations of the International Year for Human Rights. Recommendations concerning the arrangements for the Conference were made by a Preparatory Committee, on which the United Kingdom was represented, and these recommendations were noted by the General Assembly at its Twenty-first and Twenty-second Sessions. The International Conference on Human Rights was held in Tehran, at Iranian invitation, from 22 April to 13 May, 1968. It was attended by representatives of eighty-four states, including the United Kingdom, and by representatives of the specialised agencies and international and other organisations.

258. The Third Committee had before it the Final Act of the Conference, which contained the text of the Proclamation of Tehran adopted on 13 May, 1968; twenty-nine resolutions adopted by the Conference and eighteen draft resolutions tabled there but not considered for lack of time.

Among the resolutions adopted by the Conference were three based on proposals initiated by the United Kingdom delegation dealing with the establishment of a new, additional United Nations programme on racial discrimination, the rights of detained persons, and the human rights aspects of family planning.

259. A draft resolution was introduced in the Third Committee by Sweden and 35 co-sponsors representing all geographical groups. Its purpose was to arrange for the different United Nations organs, including the Secretary-General and the specialised agencies concerned, to take appropriate action on the resolutions and recommendations of the Conference and to ask the Secretary-General to make a progress report to the Twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution, subject to minor amendments, was generally acceptable to all delegations and was adopted unanimously in the Committee. One delegation abstained in the vote when the resolution was adopted in Plenary on 19 December.

260. Following the adoption of this resolution, the Committee proceeded to consider a number of draft resolutions introduced by different delegations who were interested either in securing action by the General Assembly on particular recommendations of the Tehran Conference addressed to it, or in having the General Assembly itself endorse recommendations by the Conference addressed to other bodies.

(a) *Respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories*

261. A draft resolution on this subject was introduced in the Third Committee on 5 December by Afghanistan, with Burundi, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia as co-sponsors. By this the General Assembly, acting upon a request by the Tehran Conference, would decide to establish a Special Committee of Three Member States to investigate Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories. The sponsors of the draft resolution and Arab delegations, who supported it strongly, stressed that its aim was humanitarian. The representative of Israel contested charges against her government and contended that, if the Committee were to investigate the treatment of the population in the occupied territories, it should also investigate the treatment of the Jews in Arab countries. A few delegations supported this. Some delegations, notably the United States and France, expressed the view that since the Security Council were seized of the question of the Middle East as a whole no useful purpose would be served by the adoption of the draft resolution. It was also suggested that this might prejudice the mission of Dr. Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Middle East.

262. The draft resolution was adopted without amendment in the Third Committee on 6 December by 55 votes to 16, with 41\* abstentions. The result in Plenary, where the resolution was considered on 19 December, was 60 votes to 22, with 37\* abstentions.

(b) *Human Rights in Armed Conflicts*

263. The discussion of this question in the Third Committee showed that there was a general belief that human rights should be protected even in time of armed conflict and that basic humanitarian principles should be applied to all persons directly affected by war. Some delegations stated that



the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War did not give adequate protection to civilians who lived in territories which were not actually under military occupation. It was also said that the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 were not sufficiently broad in scope to cover all the modern means of warfare. A draft resolution which reflected these views was introduced by India, with Afghanistan, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Morocco, Norway, the Philippines, Sweden, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Zambia as co-sponsors. This was generally acceptable and subject to minor amendments was adopted. One delegation abstained in the vote in the Third Committee but the resolution was adopted unanimously in Plenary. In it the General Assembly invited the Secretary-General, in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross and other appropriate organisations, to study steps which could be taken to secure the better application of existing humanitarian international Conventions and rules in all armed conflicts, and the need for additional conventions or legal instruments to ensure the better protection of civilians, prisoners and combatants in all armed conflicts and the prohibition and limitation of the use of certain methods of warfare. It also called upon all states which have not yet done so to become parties to the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

(c) *Teaching in Schools of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the structure and activities of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies, with particular reference to Human Rights*

264. This question was originally the subject of a separate item which had been inscribed on the agenda following a proposal by Italy. When it became clear that the Third Committee was unlikely to find time to deal with that item the Italian delegation introduced a draft resolution under the item on the International Year for Human Rights. There was general agreement that children and young people should be instructed in the work of the United Nations, with particular emphasis on human rights, and that suitable training should be given to teaching staff. Some doubts were expressed whether tuition should be given in primary schools but the general view was that this was appropriate since education for many children in developing countries did not extend beyond primary school. Eastern European delegations objected to the fact that the draft resolution was not addressed to "all States" and they and a few other delegations abstained in the vote in the Third Committee and in Plenary. The resolution was adopted by 76\* votes to none, with 8 abstentions in the Committee, and by 105\* votes to none, with 12 abstentions in Plenary. In it the General Assembly, *inter alia*, asked Governments to introduce or encourage the regular study of the United Nations and the specialised agencies and of the principles proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in other declarations on human rights in primary and secondary schools and in the training of teaching staff.

(d) *Measures to achieve rapid and total elimination of all forms of racial discrimination in general and of the policy of apartheid in particular*

265. A draft resolution on this subject was introduced by Upper Volta, with 17 other Afro-Asian delegations and the Ukraine as co-sponsors. By

one provision in this draft resolution the General Assembly would deplore the refusal of the United Kingdom Government to take effective measures to suppress the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure the human rights and fundamental freedoms to the people of "Zimbabwe". Some Latin American and other delegations criticised the implication in this provision that force should be used in Rhodesia and urged that all members of the United Nations should instead join together in making sanctions successful. The United Kingdom representative, Lady Gaitskell, stated the United Kingdom's position on this and other aspects of the draft resolution in a statement on 12 December. (Text at Annex XVIII.) The majority of delegations considered, however, that the United Kingdom should be constantly reminded of its responsibilities and a separate vote on this provision resulted in its being retained by 62 votes to 19,\* with 18 abstentions. Another controversial provision was that by which the General Assembly would call upon all states to sever all relations with South Africa, Portugal and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Insofar as South Africa and Portugal were concerned, this provision was opposed by many Western, Latin American and some other delegations on the grounds that it dealt with a matter which was within the competence of states, that it would do nothing to help the situation in Southern Africa, and that it was at variance with resolutions adopted by the Security Council in which member states had been asked to use their influence with the Government of South Africa. Nevertheless, this provision was also retained in a separate vote in the Third Committee by 55 votes to 29,\* with 16 abstentions, and in Plenary by 64 votes to 28,\* with 21 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted in the Committee by 66 votes to 5, with 29\* abstentions and in Plenary by 83 votes to 5, with 28\* abstentions. In this resolution the General Assembly, in addition to the provisions already referred to, condemned the Governments of South Africa and Portugal for their defiance of the United Nations and world opinion; censured them for their support of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; confirmed the recognition by the Tehran Conference of the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples and patriotic liberation movements in Southern Africa and colonial territories, and its decision to recognise the right of freedom fighters in Southern Africa and in colonial territories to be treated when captured, as prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions of 1949; appealed to the states and organisations dedicated to the ideals of freedom, independence and peace to continue to give political, moral and material assistance to people struggling against all forms of racial discrimination and colonialism; asked the United Nations organs and the specialised agencies concerned to continue to give all appropriate assistance to the patriotic freedom movements in colonial territories and in Southern Africa; and requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with member states, to prepare a programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

(e) *Education of Youth in the respect for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*

266. A draft resolution on this subject was introduced by Cyprus, with eleven co-sponsors. There was general agreement that the enthusiasm, energy and creative ability of youth should be drawn upon in an effort to secure greater respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the draft

resolution, which provided for this, was adopted unanimously both in the Third Committee and in Plenary. In this resolution the General Assembly, *inter alia*, endorsed the appeal by the Tehran Conference to states to employ all means of education so that youth might grow up and develop in a spirit of respect for the human dignity and equal rights of man without discrimination as to race, colour, language, sex or faith; and asked the Commission on Human Rights to study the question of the education of youth all over the world with a view to the development of its personality and the strengthening of its respect for the rights of man and fundamental freedoms.

(f) *Freedom of Information*

267. A draft resolution was introduced by the Philippines, with Costa Rica, the Netherlands, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia as co-sponsors. It was agreed that the General Assembly should take up again the question of freedom of information, which it has not discussed for some years, but opinions differed as to how this could best be done and in particular whether by means of a declaration or a convention. Different interpretations were also given to the meaning of freedom of information. The draft resolution was strongly criticised by a number of Eastern European delegations and they tabled a number of amendments to it. The more important of these were defeated, except for one which recommended to all states and international organisations concerned that freedom of information should be particularly promoted in the case of dissemination of information on the evils of apartheid, racism, nazism, colonialism and racial discrimination. Those delegations, including the United Kingdom, which opposed this provision, argued that they were not in a position to "promote" freedom of information in respect of any matter since they had no control over the information media in their countries. The resolution was adopted in the Third Committee by 64\* votes to 8, with 11 abstentions, and in Plenary by 95\* votes to 8, with 12 abstentions. In this resolution the General Assembly decided, pending completion of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information, to give priority at its Twenty-fourth Session to the consideration and adoption of the draft Declaration on Freedom of Information.

(g) *Legal Aid*

268. Canada introduced a draft resolution on this subject with Costa Rica, India, Jamaica, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines and Upper Volta as co-sponsors. There was wide support for the objective of the resolution which was to facilitate the provision of legal aid to every individual in need of it, regardless of his status or ability to defray the cost. In the case of criminal proceedings, it was agreed that legal aid was essential for the protection of the human rights of the person involved. The resolution was adopted unanimously in the Third Committee and in Plenary. In it the General Assembly recommended to member states to guarantee the progressive development of comprehensive systems of legal aid to those who need it in order to protect their human rights and fundamental freedoms; to devise standards for granting, in appropriate cases, legal or professional assistance; to consider ways and means of defraying the expenses involved in providing such comprehensive legal aid systems; to consider taking all possible steps to simplify legal procedures so as to reduce the burdens on the

financial and other resources of individuals who seek legal redress ; and to encourage co-operation among appropriate bodies making available competent legal assistance to those who need it.

(h) *Human Rights and Scientific and Technological Developments*

269. A draft resolution was introduced by France, with El Salvador, Japan, Mauritania and Singapore as co-sponsors. Representatives of both developed and developing countries pointed out that many of the new developments in the fields of science and technology represented a potential threat to human rights and fundamental freedoms, particularly as regards respect for the privacy of the individual and the protection of the human personality. The use of computers, eaves-dropping devices and broadcasting satellites were amongst the examples given of techniques which could threaten the individual's rights. A number of African countries urged that the General Assembly should seek to preserve the integrity and sovereignty of nations and in this connection mentioned photographic surveillance by satellites. Tunisia proposed an amendment to the draft resolution to meet their concern. Other delegations considered that such a provision would be inappropriate in a resolution dealing with human rights. The United Kingdom and several other delegations voted against the amendment but it was carried. The resolution was adopted unanimously in the Third Committee and in Plenary. In it the General Assembly invited the Secretary-General to undertake a study of the problems, and to prepare a preliminary report, for submission to the Commission on Human Rights, containing a summary of the work already being done in this field by Governments and organisations.

### **Violations of Human Rights**

270. For the second year running the Third Committee was unable to consider this item in detail, though the question of violations of human rights was raised in connection with other items on its agenda, notably the item on the International Year for Human Rights. The Committee confined itself to voting on two draft resolutions recommended to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council. The first of these dealt with measures for combating racial discrimination, and the policies of apartheid and segregation in Southern Africa. While this draft resolution was generally acceptable to most delegations it contained provisions, originally inserted on the initiative of the Ukraine, when the matter was considered in the Commission on Human Rights earlier in the year, by which the General Assembly would condemn the action of those Governments which, in violation of United Nations resolutions, continued to maintain diplomatic, commercial, military, cultural and other relations with South Africa, and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and would call upon those governments to break off such relations. These provisions posed the same difficulties for certain delegations as the similar proposals in the draft resolution on Southern Africa and colonial territories dealt with under the item on the International Year for Human Rights (see paragraph 265). The outcome was the same, the paragraphs in question being retained in separate votes, with the United Kingdom and several other delegations voting against. The resolution was adopted by 61 votes to 2 (South Africa, Brazil), with 21\*

abstentions in the Committee and by 89 votes to 4 (South Africa, Portugal, Brazil and Malawi) with 25† abstentions in Plenary. In addition to the provisions referred to, the General Assembly in this resolution called upon the Government of South Africa to repeal, amend or replace various discriminatory laws, and asked the Secretary-General to establish a United Nations Information Centre in South Africa.

271. The second draft resolution dealt with the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa. This arose from a report presented to the Commission on Human Rights by an *ad hoc* Working Group of five experts. The draft resolution had been adopted unanimously both in the Commission and in the Economic and Social Council and it was acceptable to the great majority in the Third Committee. It was adopted there by 81\* votes to 1 (South Africa), with 1 abstention, and in Plenary by 110\* votes to 2, with 1 abstention. In this resolution the General Assembly, *inter alia*, reaffirmed its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle by the opponents of apartheid to realise their human rights and fundamental freedoms; condemned the torture and inhuman and degrading treatment of detainees and prisoners in South Africa, as described in the report of the *ad hoc* Working Group of Experts; and called upon the Government of South Africa *inter alia* to abolish the 180-Day Law, the Terrorism Act, the Suppression of Communism Act, the Sabotage Act and similar laws, and to release immediately all political prisoners, in particular Mr. Robert Sobukwe, held for their opposition to apartheid.

#### **Elimination of Racial Discrimination**

272. This was another item which the Third Committee had no time to consider properly. It confined itself to consideration of a draft resolution, recommended to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council, dealing with measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance. This draft resolution arose from a proposal by the Ukraine in the Commission on Human Rights. A number of Western delegations, including the United Kingdom, had abstained in the vote on the resolution in the Commission, and later in the Economic and Social Council, mainly because it was proposed that the General Assembly should declare nazism, apartheid and all similar ideologies and practices a "threat to world peace and the security of peoples". It seemed to those delegations that the use of this language was not justified by the facts, particularly bearing in mind the extent of nazism at the present time. In the Third Committee the French delegation succeeded in securing the adoption of an amendment to the effect that the various phenomena mentioned "may jeopardise" international peace and security. A series of amendments by Tunisia designed to extend the scope of the resolution to include measures to be taken against racism and to accord priority to dealing with racism as opposed to nazism were carried with the support, amongst others, of Western delegations, including the United Kingdom. The Eastern European delegations opposed these amendments since they wanted to retain the emphasis on nazism. The resolution was adopted unanimously in the Committee and in Plenary save for a negative vote by South Africa.

273. During the course of the session the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination attracted the necessary number of additional ratifications or accessions (twenty-seven in all were required) to bring the Convention into force. This duly happened on 4 January, 1969. The United Kingdom ratified the Convention on 7 March, 1969.

### Report of the Economic and Social Council

274. The Third Committee considered the different sections of the report of the Economic and Social Council for 1967-68 with which it was concerned under the relevant items on its agenda. On the last day of the session it also considered three draft resolutions. The first of these, introduced by Turkey with fourteen co-sponsors, dealt with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In this draft resolution, which was adopted unanimously in the Third Committee and in Plenary, the General Assembly, *inter alia*, appealed to Governments and others to increase substantially their contributions to UNICEF so that its present goal of an annual income of \$50M could be attained no later than the end of the present United Nations Development Decade; and welcomed an appeal made earlier in the year by the Executive Board of UNICEF for special contributions to meet the emergency needs of mothers and children.

275. The other two resolutions dealt with narcotics. Both were adopted unanimously in the Third Committee and in Plenary. In the first resolution, the draft of which was introduced by Iran with France, Canada and the United States as co-sponsors, the General Assembly asked that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs give urgent attention to the problem of the abuse of psychotropic substances not yet under international control, including the possibility of placing such substances under international control. In the second resolution, the draft of which was introduced by the United States with India, Mauritius, Pakistan, Peru, Venezuela and Yugoslavia as co-sponsors, the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and other competent bodies and organisations, to draw up plans for putting an end to the illegal or uncontrolled production of narcotic raw materials and recommended to Governments that they seek technical assistance in developing alternative economic programmes, such as the substitution of other crops, as a means of preventing the illegal or uncontrolled cultivation of narcotic raw materials.

### Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Third Committee

276. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on reports from the Third Committee.

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by The General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2378	Assistance to Iran in connexion with the earthquake of August 1968 .. ..	23 Oct.	Unanimous		
2391	Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity ..	26 Nov.	58	7*	36
2392	Question of the punishment of war criminals and of persons who have committed crimes against humanity ..	26 Nov.	80*	0	23

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by the General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2393	Capital punishment .. .. .	26 Nov.	94*	0	3
2394	Capital punishment in Southern Africa ..	26 Nov.	89	2	7*
2399	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees .. .. .	6 Dec.		Unanimous	
2432	United Nations Children's Fund ..	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2433	International control of psychotropic substances .. .. .	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2434	Technical assistance in the field of narcotics .. .. .	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2435	Assistance in cases of natural disasters ..	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2436	World social situation .. .. .	19 Dec.	109*	0	2
2437	Creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	19 Dec.	83*	15	16
2438	Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance .. .. .	19 Dec.	111*	1	0
2439	Measures for effectively combating racial discrimination, the policies of apartheid and segregation in Southern Africa ..	19 Dec.	89	4	25*
2440	Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on the treatment of political prisoners in the Republic of South Africa .. .. .	19 Dec.	110*	2	1
2441	International Year for Human Rights ..	19 Dec.	110*	0	9
2442	International Conference on Human Rights .. .. .	19 Dec.	115*	0	1
2443	Respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories .. ..	19 Dec.	60	22	37*
2444	Human rights in armed conflicts ..	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2445	Teaching in schools of the purposes and principles of the Charter and the structure and activities of the U.N. and the specialised agencies, with particular reference to human rights ..	19 Dec.	105*	0	12
2446	Measures to achieve rapid and total elimination of all forms of racial discrimination in general and the policy of apartheid in particular .. .. .	19 Dec.	83	5	28*
2447	Education of youth in the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms .. .. .	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2448	Freedom of information .. .. .	19 Dec.	95*	8	12
2449	Legal aid .. .. .	19 Dec.		Unanimous	
2450	Human rights and scientific and technological developments .. .. .	19 Dec.		Unanimous	

On 6 December, the General Assembly approved without objection the recommendation of the Third Committee that the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development should be further considered at its Twenty-fourth Session, as a matter of high priority, with a view to completing it at that session. On 19 December the General Assembly approved the recommendation of the Third Committee that the items on Housing, Building and Planning, on Town Twinning as a means of international co-operation, on Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, and on the Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights should be postponed to the Twenty-fourth Session. It adopted the Committee's recommendation that the item on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance should be given high priority at that session. Also on 19 December the General Assembly decided that the separate item on the agenda on Freedom of Information had been disposed of by the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 2448 (XXIII) and, similarly, that the item on the need to

impart to the teaching staff of primary and secondary schools a knowledge of the United Nations and its specialised agencies, with particular reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had been disposed of by the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 2445 (XXIII).

## **TRUSTEESHIP AND COLONIAL ITEMS— FOURTH COMMITTEE**

### **Rhodesia**

277. The debate on Rhodesia occupied 18 meetings of the Fourth Committee from 7 October to 31 October 1968. Opening the debate, the United Kingdom representative in the Fourth Committee, Mr. Evan Luard, M.P., pointed out that Security Council Resolution 253 (1968), which imposed comprehensive mandatory sanctions, represented the most important action ever taken by the United Nations under Chapter VII of the Charter. A United Nations Sanctions Committee had recently been set up to help enforce the provisions of the resolution. He reaffirmed the British Government's determination to accept a settlement only in accord with the Six Principles that it had itself laid down. This did not, however, rule out the need for exploitation of the régime's views towards such a settlement and any exchange of views was to be considered on this basis. The British Government remained unalterably opposed to force since the basic problem was political and not military and could be resolved only by political means. The problem of Rhodesia was a test of will for the United Nations and only united action could ensure its satisfactory resolution.

278. Most Afro-Asian and communist speeches condemned the British policy of "no sell-out, no force and no slamming of the door"; the assumption that economic sanctions even though they were now mandatory, would force the Smith régime to change its course was rejected by most speakers. They argued that the increasingly close ties between Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal nullified the effects of the U.N. measures, and that the extension of sanctions to the whole of Southern Africa was indispensable. The talks on board H.M.S. *Fearless* were impugned as an attempt at a compromise which would result in legalising the Smith régime. No settlement would be acceptable if it did not provide for majority rule before independence. Many speakers expressed particular outrage at the hanging of Africans by the Salisbury régime in March 1968. A number of delegations, including the United States and several Latin American countries made plain their view that the use of force was both unrealistic and impractical, and urged the United Kingdom to continue its efforts to reach an honourable settlement.

279. On 23 October the representative of Tanzania, on behalf of the Afro-Asian group, suggested that the Committee should consider, as a matter of urgency, a draft resolution on a specific aspect of the question. A resolution was introduced on the same day by Mauritania, Zambia and India, co-sponsored by 52 other Afro-Asian nations and Yugoslavia. Its operative paragraphs called on the United Kingdom Government not to grant independence to Southern Rhodesia unless it was preceded by the



establishment of a Government based on free elections by universal adult suffrage and majority rule; and called on all states not to recognise any other form of independence granted to Southern Rhodesia.

280. Explaining to the Committee on 25 October his intention to abstain, the United Kingdom representative stated that the resolution sought to take away responsibilities from the British Parliament which had been recognised by the Security Council and by resolutions of the General Assembly; that it pre-judged the outcome of negotiations that were still in progress; that it bound Governments to action in circumstances which could not be foreseen; that it overlooked the action going forward in pursuance of Security Council Resolution 253 (1968) and ignored the fact that the United Kingdom Government insisted that any settlement must be acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole.

281. The resolution was adopted by the Fourth Committee on 25 October by 82 votes to 2, with 16\* abstentions. When presented in the General Assembly on the same day the resolution was adopted by 92 votes to 2, with 17\* abstentions.

282. In the Fourth Committee on 29 October the representatives of Ghana, Iraq, Tanzania and the Ivory Coast on behalf of 46 Afro-Asian nations and Yugoslavia, introduced a comprehensive resolution on Rhodesia. The most important of its sixteen operative paragraphs reaffirmed the responsibility of the United Kingdom as administering power for the continuing deterioration of the situation in Rhodesia; condemned the United Kingdom's failure and refusal to transfer power, based on free elections by universal adult suffrage and on majority rule to the people of "Zimbabwe"; confirmed that the sanctions so far imposed would not put an end to the illegal racist régime unless they were comprehensive, mandatory, supervised by force and complied with by all, including South Africa and Portugal; called on the United Kingdom to use force in order to put an immediate end to the illegal régime and to enter immediately into consultations with the representatives of political parties favouring majority rule; condemned the policies of the Governments of South Africa and Portugal and all other Governments which rendered assistance to the illegal régime; drew the attention of the Security Council to the necessity of extending sanctions under Article 41 of the Charter and imposing sanctions on South Africa and Portugal; condemned the presence of South African forces in Southern Rhodesia and called on the administering power to ensure their immediate expulsion; condemned the detention, imprisonment and assassination of African nationalists in Southern Rhodesia and called on the administering power to ensure their immediate release; called upon the United Kingdom, in view of the armed conflict prevailing in the territory and the inhuman treatment of prisoners, to ensure the application of the Geneva Convention of 1949 on the Treatment of Prisoners of War; urged all states to render all moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of "Zimbabwe".

283. Explaining the United Kingdom delegation's intention to vote against the resolution, Mr. Luard said on 30 October that, if only for the sake of the U.N. organisation itself, a halt must be called to the progression of ever more militant and violent resolutions which bore little relationship

to the world in which we lived. The United Kingdom Government had frequently made plain that it was against the use of force in solving the Rhodesian problem and that it would not at the present time contemplate an economic war with South Africa.

284. On 30 October the resolution was adopted in the Fourth Committee by 89 votes to 9\*, with 15 abstentions. It was adopted by the General Assembly on 7 November by 86 votes to 9\*, with 19 abstentions.

### **Equatorial Guinea**

285. Since the Twenty-second Session, a United Nations Mission had visited Spanish Equatorial Guinea in order to supervise the referendum and the elections which were to precede the independence of the territory. On 11 October, the evening of independence, the Fourth Committee agreed to present to the General Assembly a consensus expressing appreciation of the Mission's report and of the Spanish Government's co-operation. A number of African, Asian and Latin American delegations congratulated Spain for her co-operation with the mission. Some hoped that other administering powers would draw the appropriate conclusions from the success of the mission. The consensus was adopted by the General Assembly later on 11 October.

### **The Portuguese Territories**

286. The question of the Portuguese territories was discussed at 15 meetings of the Fourth Committee between 25 October and 20 November. Mr. Sharfudine Mahommed Khan and Mr. Miguel Mruupa, referred to respectively as the representative and Deputy Secretary for External Affairs for the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), were heard as petitioners by the Committee. At the request of Mr. Khan, two films were shown to the Committee: a Yugoslav production portraying the work of FRELIMO, particularly in the area under its control, and a production by Granada Television describing the military activities of PAIGC (Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné "portuguesa" e das Ilhas de Cabo Verde) in Portuguese Guinea. In their statements, the petitioners regretted that they had been unable to bring with them examples of captured NATO weapons, but they hoped to do so next year. They stressed that in their view the Cabora Bassa hydro-electric scheme in Mozambique would result in the eviction of large numbers of indigenous inhabitants and would delay the achievement of independence. They condemned both the participation of foreign firms in the scheme and the system of contract labour under which a reported 200,000 Mozambique labourers employed in South Africa had half their wages withheld and paid directly to the Portuguese Government.

287. Communist and Afro-Asian speakers condemned the Portuguese Government's policy of spending over 40 per cent of Portugal's annual budget on military expenditure and for its treatment of the indigenous population. It was said that only the military and economic assistance that Portugal received from her allies, particularly those in NATO, enabled her to afford such policies. Many speakers referred to the increasingly close

co-operation, especially in military fields, of Portugal in her Southern African territories with Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Certain speakers made specific appeals to the new Government in Portugal to re-examine its policies in Africa and to adopt a more liberal approach.

288. The representative of Portugal said that, despite border infiltrations, the territories were stable and orderly, and the Government was making great efforts to develop economic and social life in a spirit of multi-racialism. Portugal provided all her defence needs from her own resources and no NATO weapons were used by her in Africa. She wished to have good relations with all African nations, particularly her neighbours. Since Portuguese African policy was dictated by the organic and historical reality of Portuguese life and not by any particular Government or individual, there would be no change in its fundamentals.

289. On 15 November the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and India introduced a draft resolution which was sponsored by 52 Afro-Asian States. A revised version of this resolution, omitting draft paragraphs which contained language suggestive of Chapter VII action by the Security Council and which approved the report of the Committee of Twenty-four on the Portuguese territories, was put to the vote on 20 November and adopted by 96 votes to 3, with 13\* abstentions. The most significant of the operative paragraphs called on the Portuguese Government to apply the principle of self-determination without delay; drew the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation in the territories which had also aggravated the explosive situation in southern Africa; appealed to all states to grant assistance to the peoples of the territories; renewed its appeal to members of NATO to withhold assistance to Portugal; condemned the collaboration of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia with Portugal; condemned the violations by the Government of Portugal of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States; appealed to all states to prevent the recruitment and training of mercenaries; deplored the arbitrary evictions of the African population and the settlement of foreign immigrants in the territories; deplored the activities of foreign financial interests; and called for the application in the territories of the 1949 Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War.

290. Explaining the United Kingdom's decision to abstain on the resolution Mr. Luard welcomed the fact that it was more moderate than those of previous years, particularly as the emergence of a new Government in Portugal gave a chance for a reappraisal of Portuguese colonial policies. The United Kingdom delegation shared the view of the majority on these policies and would have liked to be able to support the resolution, but the misconceived references to the role of NATO, to the impact of foreign economic interests and to matters reserved for the Security Council left them with no option but to abstain.

291. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November by 85 votes to 3, with 15\* abstentions.

#### **The General Debate**

292. In previous Sessions each colonial item on the agenda was discussed separately. At the Twenty-third Session a different pattern was adopted and,

apart from the questions of Rhodesia, Equatorial Guinea and the Portuguese territories, and the hearing of petitioners from South West Africa, all remaining items allocated to the Fourth Committee were remitted for discussion in a general debate, which occupied twelve meetings from 18 November to 4 December. After completion of the general debate, draft resolutions on specific matters were introduced separately.

293. As a result, there were references to most items on the agenda both during the general debate and when later individual draft resolutions were introduced. A summary of the discussions is given below under the headings of the various items. Certain themes, however, arose during the general debate which cannot be linked directly with any specific item on the Committee's agenda. Foremost among these was the general question of decolonisation.

294. In a statement on 25 November (full text at Annex XIX) the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Luard said that the process of decolonisation was now approaching its end. Almost all the remaining United Kingdom territories were small. Many had limited resources and were remote from the main lines of communication. They had difficult problems which demanded special attention. It was satisfactory that the Committee of 24 had decided to undertake a special study of the problems of smaller territories, essentially directed to questions of self-determination and the eventual status appropriate to them. The United Kingdom Government would be glad to co-operate with this study if it were approached constructively. Mr. Luard then dealt with constitutional progress in British dependent territories in 1967 and 1968. He expected progress to continue in 1969 towards the goals proclaimed in the Charter: to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions.

295. A number of speakers from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean recognised that there were difficulties in decolonising the remaining territories but argued that their peoples should be allowed to exercise the right of self-determination. Some speakers referred to alternatives to independence, such as association. Most speakers laid emphasis on what they regarded as a need for United Nations visiting missions to go to the remaining territories. Some laid weight on the need for the freely-expressed wishes of the peoples to be paramount. There was criticism of the powers retained by colonial governors, even in territories where there were elected local governments. Certain speakers, notably the representatives of communist countries, claimed that military activities by administering powers in dependent territories impeded self-determination, that these were being imposed on an increasing scale and that they were distorting local economies.

296. Replying at the end of the general debate, Mr. Luard refuted allegations which had been made about British military bases in Fiji, St. Helena, Ascension, the Indian Ocean area and the Bahamas. In the few territories where there were British forces, they were not there against the will of the people. As for the powers of British colonial governors, it was a misconception to suppose that these were arbitrary or extensive. In normal circumstances, as a reading of colonial constitutions would show, the powers of governors were carefully circumscribed.

**Information transmitted under Article 73(e) of the Charter, and Offers of Study and Training Facilities for Inhabitants of Non-self-governing Territories.**

297. On 10 December a draft resolution was introduced by Sierra Leone, with eventual co-sponsorship by 23 other Afro-Asian states and Yugoslavia, which regretted that some member states had not transmitted information on their territories as called for by General Assembly Resolution 2351 (XXII), and urged them to do so. One paragraph of the draft resolution strongly regretted what it described as the persistent refusal of the United Kingdom Government to transmit such information on Southern Rhodesia, and the United Kingdom Government's decision to cease transmitting information on the Associated States in the Eastern Caribbean. Speaking before the vote on 13 December, the United Kingdom Representative, Mr. Luard, criticised the singling out of the United Kingdom in the draft. He said that the United Kingdom had always paid the greatest attention to Article 73, and its adherence to the Charter in this matter was not open to question. It was a mis-statement to claim that the United Kingdom Government refused to transmit information on Southern Rhodesia: the situation there physically limited the ability of the United Kingdom Government to transmit the necessary information. The Associated States had now attained a full measure of self-government and Article 73(e) therefore no longer applied.

298. The reference to the Associated States retained in the draft resolution, was approved in a separate vote, by 56 votes to 18\*, with 23 abstentions. The whole of that paragraph, with its reference to Southern Rhodesia, was also retained in a separate vote by 64 votes to 10\*, with 25 abstentions. Another paragraph, which approved the Chapter of the report of the Special Committee of 24 on the question, was adopted by 73 votes to 6\*, with 14 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then adopted by 81 votes to 3, with 16\* abstentions. A number of speakers expressed disagreement with the reference to the Associated States. On 18 December, the resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by 87 votes to 4, with 16\* abstentions.

299. The Fourth Committee and General Assembly also approved unanimously on the same day a resolution introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia with 22 African and Asian co-sponsors, requesting member states to co-operate in providing scholarships to inhabitants of colonial territories.

### **Fiji**

300. During the general debate a number of African, Asian and Caribbean representatives called for the communities in Fiji to weld themselves into a nation. They urged the United Kingdom to assist this process and to permit a United Nations mission to visit the territory. The Indian representative said that it was of paramount importance to foster inter-racial co-operation and confidence, through mutual understanding and goodwill. His delegation had reason to think that the principal parties concerned were engaged in a search for mutually acceptable constitutional arrangements for the further political evolution of Fiji in the direction of independence.

301. On 12 December, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee said that, having regard to the statements made during the general debate that local consultations were taking place, it had been suggested by a number of

delegations that further consideration of the question should be postponed to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. The Committee decided to recommend this course, and the General Assembly endorsed this recommendation on 18 December.

### **Oman**

302. At its Twenty-second Session the General Assembly adopted a resolution which called upon the United Kingdom to cease repressive action in Oman, withdraw British troops, and eliminate British domination in any form; it appealed to all member states to render assistance to the people of the territory in their "struggle to achieve freedom and independence"; it requested the Committee of 24 to consider the establishment of a sub-Committee to further its examination of the situation in Oman; and requested the Secretary-General to take appropriate measures for the implementation of the resolution.

303. At the beginning of the Twenty-third Session, the United Kingdom, following the practice of earlier years, reserved its position when the Oman item was inscribed on the Assembly's agenda, and again when the item was allocated to the Fourth Committee, arguing that, as this was not a colonial question, that Committee had no competence.

304. The general debate on the Oman item began in the Fourth Committee on 18 November, when the Rapporteur introduced the chapter of the Committee of 24 report relating to Oman. On 25 November the Fourth Committee decided to hear the Oman petitioners, represented by Amir Sulaiman bin Himyar and Muhammad Amin Abdullah. The United Kingdom delegation, having entered a reservation on the right of these petitioners to be heard, withdrew from all participation in the subsequent debate and voting. On 6 December the Chairman informed the Committee that the main petitioner had submitted a written statement in lieu of appearing before the Committee. The Committee then decided to circulate this written statement as a Committee document.

305. On 9 December the representatives of Syria and Mauritania, eventually with 24 co-sponsors, introduced a draft resolution which reaffirmed the General Assembly on 18 December by 66 votes to 18, with 26 abstentions. its resolution on Oman passed at the Twenty-second Session and "other relevant resolutions"; called upon the United Kingdom to implement these; and requested the Committee of 24 to follow developments in the territory and to report to the General Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session.

306. Debate on the resolution was minimal. On 12 December it was adopted in the Fourth Committee by 58 votes to 17, with 18 abstentions. The United Kingdom delegation was absent. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December by 66 votes to 18, with 26 abstentions. The United Kingdom delegation did not participate in the vote.

### **Foreign Economic Interests**

307. During the general debate, many speakers from Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia argued that the aim of investment in colonial territories by foreign economic interests was to achieve maximum profits at the expense

of the indigenous people, and that the administering powers co-operated with these interests and resisted the desire of the peoples of dependent territories to obtain independence. The speakers laid particular, though not exclusive, emphasis on the activities of foreign economic interests in southern Africa. A few speakers, however, said that foreign economic interests should not be condemned indiscriminately since most dependent territories were poor and economic assistance was a primary concern for them. The United Kingdom representative, Mr. Luard, said that it was the United Kingdom Government's policy to ensure that locally elected governments in British dependent territories exercised the freedom to choose the type of economic relationship they preferred.

308. A draft resolution was introduced by the representatives of Algeria and Sierra Leone and ultimately co-sponsored by 24 other countries from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. As eventually amended, this draft approved the report of the Committee of 24, on which many statements in the debate had been based; affirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of dependent territories to own and dispose of the natural resources of their territories; declared that administering powers who deprived them of these rights or subordinated them to foreign interests, violated their obligations under Chapters XI and XII of the Charter; condemned the exploitation of colonial territories and peoples and those foreign economic interests which were designed to perpetuate colonial rule; deplored policies of administering powers aimed at encouraging a systematic inflow of foreign immigrants to colonial territories; and requested that these practices should stop.

309. The United Kingdom representative, Mr. Luard, speaking before the vote on 13 December, said that the United Kingdom could certainly not accept the thesis that all economic investment was harmful to the inhabitants of dependent territories. Newly independent countries all sought foreign investment and it was unrealistic to argue that the situation was markedly different before independence. Nor was it true that such investment delayed the granting of independence: independence had generally come first to those countries where investment had been the highest. The draft could be taken as a condemnation of all economic activity in colonial territories, but in fact to allow outside investment was in no way inconsistent with Chapters XI and XII of the Charter.

310. A number of speakers, particularly from Latin American countries, expressed reservations on the paragraph approving the report of the Committee of 24. This paragraph was adopted in a separate vote by 70 votes to 7\*, with 29 abstentions. The paragraph declaring that the actions of administering powers violated their obligations under the Charter was adopted by 81 votes to 4\*, with 18 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 17\* abstentions. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December, by 87 votes to 2, with 19\* abstentions.

#### **Implementation of Resolution 1514 (XV) by the Specialised Agencies and International Institutions and Report of the Economic and Social Council**

311. During the general debate a number of speakers, particularly from Eastern Europe, called for the specialised agencies to do more to help the people of dependent territories, and especially national liberation movements.

They argued that the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund were continuing to grant loans to South Africa and Portugal in disregard of a previous General Assembly resolution.

312. On 9 December a draft resolution was introduced by the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Congo and of Tunisia with 25 other co-sponsors. This appealed again to the specialised agencies and international institutions to help in the implementation of General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV), and recommended that they should assist the peoples struggling for their liberation from colonial rule, and in particular should work out concrete programmes of assistance to the peoples of colonial territories in southern Africa, in co-operation with the Organisation of African Unity and through it with the national liberation movements. The draft resolution also appealed to the agencies and in particular to the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund to withhold assistance from Portugal and South Africa. On 10 December the Soviet representative introduced a new paragraph which recommended that the International Bank should withdraw the loans and credits it had granted to the governments of Portugal and South Africa.

313. On 13 December the Soviet amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 31\*, with 35 abstentions. A preambular paragraph which noted with regret that some of the specialised agencies had not so far implemented General Assembly Resolution 2311 (XXII), was adopted by 65 votes to 3, with 32\* abstentions. The paragraph recommending concrete programmes of assistance in co-operation with the national liberation movements was adopted by 77 votes to 6\*, with 16 abstentions. The paragraph calling on the agencies to withhold assistance from Portugal and South Africa was adopted by 67 votes to 7\*, with 27 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was then passed by 79 votes to 5\*, with 19 abstentions.

314. In Plenary on 18 December, the paragraph incorporating the Soviet amendment was adopted by 36 votes to 31\*, with 43 abstentions. The preambular paragraph regretting that some of the agencies had not implemented General Assembly Resolution 2311 (XXII) was adopted by 58 votes to 4, with 14\* abstentions. The paragraph appealing to the agencies to withhold aid from Portugal and South Africa was adopted by 58 votes to 10\*, with 42 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 82 votes to 7\*, with 25 abstentions.

### **Report of the Trusteeship Council**

315. In the course of the general debate, the Australian representative reviewed the administration of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. He said that the Australian Government had welcomed the United Nations Mission in early 1968 and was studying its recommendations thoroughly. The year had seen important political advances, particularly the elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage, the establishment of the Administrator's Executive Council, and the expansion of Local Government Councils. A five-year development programme had been announced. As the Governor-General of Australia had made clear, in opening the House of Assembly in the territory, the Australian Government took the view that



it was the destiny of Papua and New Guinea to become a self-governing country, developed for independence, if and when it was clearly demonstrated by the majority of the indigenous population that this was what they wanted.

316. On 13 December two draft resolutions were introduced in the Fourth Committee on the question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. The first introduced by the Liberian representative was in more moderate terms than General Assembly Resolution 2348 (XXII). The other, introduced by the Sudanese representative with 26 co-sponsors from African and Arab countries, regretted the fact that the Administering Power had not implemented resolutions relating to the territory, and called upon it to fix an early date for self-determination and independence and to hold free elections under United Nations supervision. In explanation of vote on 16 December Mr. Luard drew attention to progress in the territory and said that there could be no doubt that the Administering Authority intended to prepare Papua and New Guinea for independence at the right moment. The United Kingdom delegation would vote for the Liberian draft resolution and against the second draft resolution. Both resolutions were adopted by the Fourth Committee, the draft sponsored by 27 countries was adopted by 65 votes to 14\*, with 17 abstentions, and the Liberian draft by 41\* votes to 37, with 17 abstentions. When the two resolutions were considered in the General Assembly on 18 December, the resolution sponsored by 27 countries was adopted by 72 votes to 19\*, with 24 abstentions. The Liberian resolution received 61\* votes to 37, with 17 abstentions: it thus failed to secure the two-thirds majority necessary for adoption.

### **Territories not considered separately**

#### *1. Ifni and Spanish Sahara*

317. In the course of the general debate the representative of Spain recalled his Foreign Minister's statement in the General Assembly to the effect that Ifni was not a country, but an enclave within Morocco. He said that a Spanish delegation would be going to Rabat in the near future to conclude the discussions on Ifni, which were far advanced. This visit was expected to lead to the signature of a Treaty transferring Ifni to Moroccan sovereignty. As regards Spanish Sahara, his government has already asserted its desire to respect and maintain the right of the people of the territory to self-determination as soon as they so desired. Spain would provide all means, in collaboration with the United Nations, to enable them to exercise that right. The representatives of Morocco and Mauritania stated their claims to Spanish Sahara. Some of the speakers in the general debate noted the apparent progress in negotiations over Ifni and expressed the hope that there would be similar progress with regard to Spanish Sahara.

318. On 16 December a draft resolution in terms close to those of General Assembly Resolution 2354 (XXII) was introduced by the representative of Ghana with 16 co-sponsors. The resolution was adopted on the same day by 105\* votes to none, with 3 abstentions. It was adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December by 114\* votes to none with 3 abstentions.

#### *2. Gibraltar*

319. Before the general debate opened, a draft resolution sponsored by Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Honduras and Syria was circulated to

the Committee. This regretted that the United Kingdom had failed to comply with General Assembly Resolution 2353 (XXII); declared that a continuation of the colonial situation in Gibraltar was incompatible with the Charter and the resolution on decolonisation; requested the United Kingdom to terminate the colonial situation in Gibraltar no later than 1 October, 1969; and called on the United Kingdom Government to begin without delay the negotiations with the Spanish Government provided for in Resolution 2353 (XXII).

320. There were extensive references to Gibraltar during the general debate. Most speakers on the subject were from Latin America and Arab countries. They called for the implementation of Resolution 2353 and the restoration of Spanish territorial integrity by the return of Gibraltar to Spain. Some referred to the Spanish offer of safeguards for the inhabitants. A small number of speakers called for negotiations between the United Kingdom and Spain without indicating their view of what the outcome should be. The Spanish representative said that the United Kingdom was seeking to confuse opinion by claiming that it desired only to protect the interests of the Gibraltarians. The promise of a new constitution was a manoeuvre. All member states should call on the United Kingdom to negotiate with Spain and thus safeguard the interests of the people of the territory. The great powers had a duty to convince the United Kingdom that a United Nations solution constituted the best way to end the colonial situation. Spain could not allow the matter to drag on. If the United Kingdom continued to refuse to listen to reason, the colony would become uninhabitable: the fortress would gradually lose its flesh and be reduced to bare rock.

321. The United Kingdom representative, Mr. Luard, on 29 November replied (text at Annex XX) that the United Kingdom Government had made clear its readiness to hold talks with Spain, but without pre-conditions. Spain had insisted that the talks be on the basis of General Assembly Resolution 2353 (XXII), which meant a hand-over to Spain. The United Kingdom Government were prepared to decolonise Gibraltar. It was Spain's insistence on her option under the treaty of Utrecht which was responsible for the lack of progress towards decolonisation. Mr. Luard asked whether the Government of Spain would be ready to release the United Kingdom Government from that provision of the treaty, so that it could become possible for the British Government to decolonise Gibraltar in the normal way—by granting independence to it. The people of Gibraltar were descended from people who had lived there for over 200 years. In that time a specifically Gibraltarian way of life had grown up. The Gibraltarians believed that that way of life was more likely to be guaranteed under a relationship with the British Government than under a relationship with the Spanish Government. It was for the Spanish Government to convince the people of Gibraltar that it could and would assure their rights as effectively as Britain. The United Kingdom's position was fully based on the Charter. The Government of Spain would not attain their objective by securing majorities in the Committee or the General Assembly.

322. On 4 December the draft resolution which had been previously circulated, was introduced by the representatives of Honduras and Syria. Eventually this resolution had 24 sponsors, mostly Latin American and Arab.

All those speaking to the resolution, except for the United Kingdom, supported its terms. Speaking on 16 December, Mr. Luard said that the draft resolution was unacceptable. It was regrettable that a course had not been followed which could lead to a compromise solution. The United Kingdom Government was prepared to negotiate, but the interests and wishes of the people of Gibraltar had to be taken into account. In all other cases, the United Nations had accepted that the wishes of the people of dependent territories were the paramount consideration. The adoption of the draft resolution would do nothing whatever to bring progress on the issue or to provide any kind of constructive influence. It could have no influence on the British Government. The draft resolution was adopted on 16 December by 66 votes to 18\*, with 31 abstentions. The representatives of Jamaica, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Australia, Malaysia and Barbados explained their votes against the resolution.

323. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December by 67 votes to 18\*, with 34 abstentions. In explaining the United Kingdom's vote, Lord Caradon said that his Government believed in the principles stated in Chapter XI of the Charter. That is what they had endeavoured to fulfil in their dependent territories, and they saw no cause to exclude the people of Gibraltar from the protection of the Charter. Spanish policy directed against the people of Gibraltar had been misconceived and had militated against any positive progress. He looked forward to the day when an effort would be made by the Spanish Government to establish relations, not of intimidation but of conciliation. The United Kingdom Government regretted that the endeavours of other delegations to bring about co-operation had achieved no change of course on the part of the Spanish Government. They were convinced that conciliation was the only road which could lead to peace and friendship. The proposition that the people should be handed over against their will was so far removed from possibility as to be incredible. It was deplorable that a proposition should have been supported which could not be put into effect, which could only bar the way to practical progress and which had brought wide discredit to the United Nations. The United Kingdom Government would warmly welcome a new endeavour to search for common ground and for a solution. The resolution marked the dead-end of one road. Lord Caradon trusted that it would not be too long before the parties started out on another. The text of Lord Caradon's statement is at Annex XXI.

### 3. *Territory of the Afars and Issas (French Somaliland)*

324. The Fourth Committee recommended to the General Assembly that consideration of the question of French Somaliland should be postponed until the Twenty-fourth Session. The General Assembly approved this recommendation on 18 December.

### 4. *Other territories not considered separately*

325. On 16 December a draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone, co-sponsored by twelve African and Asian countries and Yugoslavia, on the question of American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat,

New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands. This reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples in those territories to self-determination and independence ; called on the administering powers to implement the relevant Assembly resolutions without delay ; declared that any attempt to disrupt the national unity and territorial integrity of colonial territories and the establishment of military bases and installations there was incompatible with the Charter and the declaration on decolonisation ; urged the administering powers to allow United Nations visiting groups to visit the territories ; decided that the United Nations should help the peoples of these territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status ; and requested the Committee of 24 to continue to pay special attention to them.

326. In a separate vote taken the same day, the paragraph referring to territorial integrity and military bases and installations was adopted by 48 votes to 13\*, with 23 abstentions. A number of speakers expressed their reservations about references to military bases in dependent territories. Mr. Luard said that this paragraph was unacceptable to the United Kingdom because military bases and installations were in no way contrary to the Charter or the declaration on decolonisation and indeed were often welcome to the people of the territories concerned. He objected to the inclusion of the Associated States of the Eastern Caribbean in the resolution, since they had attained a full measure of self-government. The resolution as a whole was adopted by the Committee by 74 votes to 1, with 16\* abstentions.

327. In the General Assembly on 18 December the paragraph on military bases was retained by 66 votes to 16\*, with 29 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 22\* abstentions.

#### **United Nations Training and Educational Programme for Southern Africa**

328. On 13 December a draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark, with 19 co-sponsors, appealing to all states, organisations and individuals to make generous contributions to the United Nations Training and Educational Programme. In 1967 the General Assembly had decided to replace three separate programmes for South West Africa, Portuguese territories and South Africans by a single programme and also to include Southern Rhodesia within its scope. The draft also requested the Secretary-General to establish an Advisory Committee, and decided that, pending the receipt of adequate voluntary contributions, \$100,000 would be provided out of the regular United Nations budget.

329. The United Kingdom representative, Mr. Luard, said that the United Kingdom had given consistent support for the education of southern Africans. It had provided £41,600 for the Programme, which equalled about a quarter of the total money that had been pledged. It had previously contributed to the programme for South Africans. Under a separate Commonwealth scheme a hundred awards had been given to Rhodesian Africans.

330. On 16 December the resolution was adopted in the Fourth Committee by 89\* votes to 1, with 1 abstention. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December by 115\* votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

### Resolutions adopted on the Reports of the Fourth Committee

331. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on Reports from the Fourth Committee.

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by the General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
Con-					
sensus	Equatorial Guinea .. .. .	11 Oct.	—	—	—
2379	Question of Southern Rhodesia .. .. .	25 Oct.	92	2	17*
2383	Question of Southern Rhodesia .. .. .	7 Nov.	86	9*	19
2395	Question of Territories under Portuguese Administration .. .. .	29 Nov.	85	3	15*
2422	Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73.e of the Charter of the United Nations .. .. .	18 Dec.	87	4	16*
2423	Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories .. .. .	18 Dec.	Without objection		
2424	Oman .. .. .	18 Dec.	66	18	26
2425	“Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, <i>apartheid</i> and racial discrimination in southern Africa” .. .. .	18 Dec.	87	2	19*
2426	Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the Specialised Agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations .. .. .	18 Dec.	82	7*	25
2427	Question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea .. .. .	18 Dec.	72	19*	24
2428	Question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara .. .. .	18 Dec.	114*	0	3
2429	Question of Gibraltar .. .. .	18 Dec.	67	18*	34
2430	Question of American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Antuilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the U.S. Virgin Islands .. .. .	18 Dec.	89	22	22*
2431	U.N. Training and Educational Programme .. .. .	18 Dec.	115*	2	1

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ITEMS— THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

#### Introduction

332. In the general debate on the budget there was widespread appreciation of the Secretary-General's response to the wishes expressed at the Twenty-second Session that there should be a closer relationship between programme

and budget processing. In particular the creation of a small internal review group drawn from the Office of the Controller and of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs was acknowledged by many members to be a welcome development. The need to reinforce the machinery for establishing priorities was emphasised, however, and a suggestion by the Secretary-General that the Secretariat might in future play a more active role in the review of programmes evoked considerable interest. In making this suggestion the Secretary-General had in mind that it would be necessary to make some changes in present methods before General Assembly Resolution 2370 (XXII) could be implemented. That resolution calls, *inter alia*, for the establishment each year of a planning figure for the next year but one, and is due to be implemented for the first time in 1969.

333. Despite the improvements made or contemplated in the budget-building processes, there was disquiet, particularly among the major contributors, about the growth of the budget. Moreover, because of the inclusion of provisional items in the original estimates and the late presentation of other proposals, it was not possible to assess the true extent of the increase until the closing stages of the Assembly. Meantime the Committee had rejected or postponed consideration of several recommendations designed to improve financial control. In these circumstances the United Kingdom felt bound to register its dissatisfaction on the occasion of the second reading of the budget estimates. The text of the statement then made by the United Kingdom representative is at Annex XXII.

#### **Supplementary Estimates for 1968**

334. At the Twenty-second Session the amount appropriated for 1968 was \$140,430,950 gross (\$116,795,950 net). The Secretary-General proposed that a further \$1,626,800 gross (\$1,311,800 net) should be appropriated to meet increases in estimated expenditure which had arisen during the course of the year. On the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) which pointed to the fact that supplementary provisions made in recent years had not been fully utilised, the Fifth Committee reduced the gross amount requested by \$270,000. Adjustments were also made to the revenue estimates and the revised provision for 1968 approved by the Fifth Committee and endorsed by the General Assembly was \$141,787,750 gross (\$117,807,750 net).

335. During the course of the debate on the supplementary estimates, the United Kingdom representative drew attention to unsatisfactory features of the procedures relating to the provision for payment and authorisation of fees to members of an *ad hoc* working group appointed by the Commission on Human Rights. Steps have since been taken to formulate more precisely the conditions under which fees may be paid for services rendered to the United Nations.

#### **Estimates for 1969**

336. In his initial budget estimates the Secretary-General requested appropriations of \$140,520,210 gross (\$115,460,970 net). The ACABQ recommended substantial reductions in the expenditure estimates which would have reduced the estimates to \$138,316,950 gross (\$113,257,710 net). It was

apparent from the outset, however, that the final estimates would be much in excess of these figures because there were numerous items for which no provision (or only *pro memoria* provision) had been made pending decisions by the General Assembly. After these provisions had been added and account taken of revised estimates submitted during the course of the Session, the estimates finally approved by the General Assembly amounted to \$154,915,250 gross (\$127,695,010) net. The increase over the estimates originally approved for 1968 was therefore of the order of 10 per cent. The percentage increase would have been still higher but for the fact that the cost of non-recurring items (e.g. major conferences) included in the 1968 budget exceeded that of those for which provision is required in the 1969 budget.

337. Increased salary scales and allowances for both professional and general service staff were the largest single factor contributing to the increase. The approval of new posts also involved a considerable increase, although, because of delays in recruitment, the full weight of this will not be felt until 1970. The provision of premises for the expanding staff, the higher cost of maintaining and servicing existing premises, the extension of staff training programmes, and the decision to make Russian and Spanish working languages of the General Assembly and the Security Council also added appreciably to the costs. These and other features of the budget debates are described in more detail in the succeeding paragraphs.

#### **Unforeseen and Extraordinary Expenditure**

338. Each year the General Assembly passes a resolution giving the Secretary-General authority, subject to certain limits and conditions, to meet expenses which were not foreseen when the budget was approved. At the Twenty-second Session, the ACABQ, in consultation with the Secretary-General, was asked to re-define unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure and to consider whether the rules governing transfers and supplementary estimates needed revision. Although the recommendations of the ACABQ were consistent with parallel recommendations made by the Committee of Seven on the Reorganisation of the Secretariat, the Fifth Committee failed to take this opportunity to strengthen its financial procedures. Instead, a Tanzanian proposal that further consideration of the matter should be deferred until the Twenty-fourth Session was carried by 30 votes to 19\* with 23 abstentions.

#### **Revenue-producing Activities**

339. There was widespread support for a Brazilian suggestion that more might be done to increase the Organisation's income. The Fifth Committee therefore requested the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive study for presentation at the Twenty-fourth Session. The study will explore the short and long term practical possibilities of increasing the income from present revenue-producing activities and of introducing new such activities.

#### **Implementation of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of experts to examine the finances of the United Nations and the specialised agencies**

340. The recommendation that an Inspectorate should be established has been implemented. All the Inspectors have been appointed and they have

submitted several reports ; these have yet to be evaluated. As regards the drive to implement the other recommendations, this has now become essentially an exercise in noting and encouraging further progress. The ACABQ has been asked to pay particular attention to the implementation of the recommendations when preparing its annual reports on administrative and budgetary co-ordination, and the Secretary-General has been requested to submit another comprehensive progress report in two years time.

### **Report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Secretariat**

341. This Committee of Seven, which included a representative of the United Kingdom, began its work in April, 1968. It presented its report to the Secretary-General in the autumn, who made it available to the Fifth Committee later in the Session. The Committee of Seven has interpreted its terms of reference very broadly and its report touches on many of the matters which were under discussion in the Fifth Committee. Lack of time, however, prevented more than a perfunctory consideration of the report during the Session and, in consequence, the Fifth Committee was disinclined to lend its weight immediately to many of the recommendations. Some of the more important recommendations are, however, mentioned at the appropriate points below.

### **Staff Numbers**

342. In his budget estimates for 1969 the Secretary General proposed that the establishment of the United Nations, including the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) should be increased by nearly 500 professional and general service posts. The ACABQ recommended a reduction of about 25 per cent in the number of new posts, and suggested that the Secretary-General should undertake a desk by desk survey of the deployment and utilisation of existing personnel. The Committee of Seven endorsed that suggestion, and there was general agreement in the Fifth Committee that a survey was desirable although opinions varied on the method by which it should be carried out and in particular on the desirability of employing outside consultants. Various proposals for limiting the increases pending the outcome of the survey were considered, but none of them commanded majority support. Eventually, therefore, the Committee approved the recommendation of the ACABQ on the understanding that the Secretary-General will:—

- (a) in the process of filling the new posts authorised for 1969, give due regard to any preliminary results of the survey which may become available ; and
- (b) have given due consideration to any available results of the manpower survey when he presents his budget estimates for 1970 to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly.

### **Salary Scales**

343. Based on the recommendations of the International Civil Service Advisory Board (ICSAB), the Secretary-General proposed an interim salary increase of 5 per cent for the professional staff to be effective from 1 January,



1969. A number of delegations questioned the need for this increase and the USSR introduced a resolution seeking to postpone the introduction of the new scales until the General Assembly had adopted new principles for establishing the salaries of international civil servants. The resolution was rejected by 7 votes to 41\* with 26 abstentions, and the salary increases were then approved by 60\* votes to 8 with 11 abstentions. A resolution was subsequently introduced by Pakistan with eleven co-sponsors, asking ICSAB to indicate in its next report to the Secretary-General what progress had been made in its review of the principles underlying the international salary scales and requesting the Secretary-General to circulate the report as a document of the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. The resolution was adopted unanimously. Differences of opinion about the need to appoint an *ad hoc* committee of experts nominated by member states to examine the recommendations of the Board were left unresolved. Provision was also made in the budget estimates for a 5 per cent salary increase effective 1 January, 1969 for the general service staff. Several delegates questioned the adequacy of the salaries of the lower paid staff, particularly those of the United Nations guides and security staff.

#### United Nations accommodation

344. Because of the growth of the Secretariat in recent years, there is now an acute shortage of office space. This was reflected in proposals for renting accommodation in New York and for building projects in New York, Geneva and Santiago. The specific proposals before the Committee and the action taken are described below. The discussions revealed that there was considerable disquiet among member states about the financial control and management of United Nations building projects. The need for longer term and more comprehensive planning of United Nations office and conference space was also emphasised and reflected in a resolution.

##### *New York*

345. The Fifth Committee approved an appropriation of \$250,000 for the preparation of detailed architectural and engineering plans for a new building on an area south-west of the headquarters buildings. Preliminary studies undertaken by governmental, municipal and corporation institutions at no cost to the United Nations had confirmed the feasibility of the project, but the further survey was needed before the cost of the building could be estimated reliably. The Secretary-General informed the Committee, however, that the total expenditures might be of the order of \$50 million, but expected that only a portion of this would be a charge on the regular budget. Pending more permanent arrangements being made, the Committee authorised the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the rental of outside premises in New York at a cost not exceeding \$550,000 in 1969.

##### *Geneva*

346. In 1966 the General Assembly had authorised extensions to the Palais des Nations. The architects subsequently proposed drastic changes in the plans, affecting the dimensions, seating capacity and ancillary facilities of the new conference rooms and a very considerable expansion of the new office accommodation. The Fifth Committee approved the new plans at

an estimated cost to the United Nations of \$22 million against the original estimate of \$15 million. The project will be financed in the first instance by a loan from the Swiss Government, and in order to reduce the impact on the United Nations budget, the period for repayment of the loan has been extended by two years.

### *Santiago*

347. The Secretary-General informed the Fifth Committee that the new building recently completed in Santiago to house the Economic Commission for Latin America had been found to have quite serious functional disadvantages. In addition the staff had already outgrown the accommodation. The possibility of a combined operation designed to improve, adapt and extend the existing building was considered, but rejected. Instead, on the advice of the ACABQ, the Committee approved plans for the improvement of the building at a cost, provisionally estimated, of \$1,328,500 and of which not more than \$659,000 would be borne on the budget for 1969. The Committee also authorised the Secretary-General to proceed with the preparation of detailed plans and cost estimates for the construction of a satellite building for consideration at the Twenty-fourth Session.

### **United Nations Bond Issue**

348. The controversy about the method of financing the amortisation and interest charges on the United Nations bonds, of which about \$130 million remain outstanding, was revived by a draft resolution introduced by the representative of Brazil and co-sponsored by Argentine, India and Nigeria. The resolution proposed that the ACABQ should study the question in the light of the debate held during the Twenty-first, Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions, and report to the Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session. The United Kingdom representative opposed this resolution from the outset on the grounds that no amount of study could alter the terms of the resolution under which the bonds were issued and which, in effect, constituted the prospectus for the issue. Moreover, the initiation of a study would imply that the United Nations was prepared to contemplate a unilateral change in the terms of the contract between it and the bondholders. Although a number of other delegations expressed like views, the resolution was adopted in the Fifth Committee by a roll call vote of 29 to 28,\* with 26 abstentions. In Plenary, the United Kingdom representative moved that the matter should be regarded as an important question for the purpose of Article 18 (2) of the Charter, since it was a budgetary question involving the credit of the Organisation. This motion was carried by 52\* votes to 29, with 38 abstentions, and the resolution itself was then rejected by 34 votes to 51,\* with 33 abstentions. The decision taken in the Fifth Committee was thus reversed.

### **Part V of the Budget**

349. This part of the budget makes provision for technical assistance. Since the main technical assistance effort of the United Nations is financed by voluntary contributions, the amount borne on the regular budget has been established at \$6.4 million since 1962. The Industrial Development Board had, however, approved an increase in that part of the provision relating to industrial development, the effect of which was to increase the total

requirement under Part V to \$6.9 million. This action underlined the difficulty inherent in the arrangement whereby semi-autonomous units are financed through the regular budget. It also exposed the divergence of view between the developed and developing countries in regard to the means of financing technical assistance. The increased provision for industrial development was, however, approved in the Fifth Committee by 57 votes to 15,\* with 10 abstentions.

### Personnel Questions

350. The report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Secretariat gave further impetus to the move to secure a better geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat. The Fifth Committee passed a resolution calling upon the Secretary-General to renew his efforts to that end. The Secretary-General was also urged to take the necessary steps to enable countries which have not filled their minimum quota of posts to do so during 1969 and 1970.

351. The Committee also returned to the question of improving the linguistic balance of the Secretariat. The proposal to pay language bonuses which had been incorporated in a resolution passed at the Twenty-second Session was not pursued. Instead, a resolution introduced by Tunisia with thirty-seven co-sponsors, provided different incentives for the professional staff. First, promotion from one grade to another would be conditional upon adequate and confirmed knowledge of a second working language. Second, such knowledge would permit accelerated incremental progression within each grade. In response to suggestions that these provisions were unduly rigid and might encroach on the discretion of the Secretary-General, the sponsors agreed that the draft resolution should be amended to permit the promotion of staff members who do not have the required language qualifications if the Secretary-General deems it necessary for the proper functioning of the Secretariat. With this amendment the resolution, which also provided for an intensification of the language training programme, was adopted in the Fifth Committee by 100\* votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

352. The representative of the USSR proposed that Russian should be included among the working languages of all the principal organs of the United Nations. He later accepted a suggestion by the representative of the UAR that the proposal be limited to making Russian a working language of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Those supporting the proposal pointed to the importance of Russian as a means of communication, particularly in science and diplomacy. Others, including the United Kingdom, pointed to the cost of increasing the number of working languages; they questioned whether it was in the interest of efficiency and economy to adopt Russian as a working language. After an amendment introduced by the representative of China who wished to add Chinese as well as Russian to the working languages of the General Assembly had been defeated, a draft resolution embodying the modified proposal of the USSR was adopted in the Fifth Committee by 55 votes to 22,\* with 28 abstentions.

353. In Plenary, the representative of New Zealand moved that the matter should be regarded as an important question for the purpose of Article 18 (2) of the Charter. This motion failed by 36\* votes to 53 with

33 abstentions. A proposal to add Spanish to the recommendation relating to the Security Council was then approved by 96 votes to 6 with 22\* abstentions and the amended resolution as a whole was adopted by 81 to 17,\* with 24 abstentions. Subsequently, on 24 January, 1969, the Security Council resolved to include Russian and Spanish among its working languages. Henceforth, therefore, English, French, Russian and Spanish will all be working languages of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

### **Regulation of Conferences and Documentation**

354. The Committee on Conferences sought clarification of its mandate from the General Assembly. Experience had shown the need to define more precisely its relationship with other United Nations bodies, with particular reference to the authorisation of changes in the approved calendar of conferences. The Committee suggested that such changes should in future be subject to its concurrence. A resolution embodying this suggestion and other proposals designed to strengthen the authority of the Committee on Conferences was presented to the Fifth Committee, but its provisions were eroded by a number of amendments which were proposed by the representative of Pakistan and were adopted during the course of the debates. On the other hand, a further amendment which was proposed by the ACABQ and which was designed to ensure early implementation of that part of the report of the Committee of Seven relating to conferences and documentation was also passed in the Fifth Committee. But second thoughts prevailed in Plenary when twenty-six developing countries moved that the amendment be struck out. That motion was carried by 86 votes to 9,\* with 24 abstentions. Despite these setbacks, attempts to contain the volume of conferences and documentation are continuing and some progress is being made. A number of bodies have agreed to dispense with summary records and others are considering whether they can follow suit. The possibility of holding certain conferences at two-yearly intervals instead of annually is also being further explored.

### **United Nations Scale of Assessments**

355. The Fifth Committee had before it a report of the Committee on Contributions which had reviewed its basic procedures in the light of the reservations expressed by a number of delegations at the Twenty-second Session. In its report, the Committee on Contributions explained more fully how it gave effect to the various directives of the General Assembly, but concluded that the scale which it had recommended and which was now in force gave effect fairly to those directives and the terms of reference within which the Committee works. Whilst some delegations expressed disappointment that the Committee had not felt able to adopt specific suggestions made at the previous session, the main discussion centred on whether the Committee's terms of reference were still appropriate. The doubts felt on this score were reflected in a draft resolution introduced by the representative of Mexico with ten co-sponsors. This asked the Committee on Contributions to keep its terms of reference and the criteria which it uses under review and, taking account of the views expressed by delegations, to submit a further

report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. The resolution was adopted by the Fifth Committee by 78 votes to none, with 15\* abstentions. The United Kingdom abstention reflected doubts both about the need for the further review and its nature.

356. At the suggestion of the United Kingdom representative, it was agreed that a report should be prepared showing the overall contributions made by each member state to the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialised agencies and to all other programmes and trust funds of the United Nations family of organisations whether financed by assessed or voluntary contributions. The Fifth Committee also asked the Secretary-General to prepare a concise statement of the changes which have occurred in the past ten years in the economies of member states, with particular emphasis on changes in the national *per capita* income figures of the developing and the highly industrialised member states.

### **Enlargement of the Committee on Contributions**

357. On 1 November, the representatives of nine African countries and of Pakistan, Southern Yemen, Spain, and Trinidad and Tobago requested the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda for the discussion of a proposal that the membership of the Committee on Contributions should be increased from ten to twelve to accommodate nationals of African member states. When the General Committee considered this request the United Kingdom representative, Sir Leslie Glass, while not questioning the importance of the subject nor opposing inscription of the item, pointed out that the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly required that, if items were inscribed when the Session was already in progress, they should be of an urgent as well as important nature. He suggested that the item in question hardly met the requirement of urgency. The item was nevertheless inscribed and the Fifth Committee adopted unanimously a resolution enlarging the Committee. Two Africans were subsequently elected to membership.

### **Conclusion**

358. Although the proceedings of the Fifth Committee gave rise to twenty-seven resolutions, the Twenty-third Session was not a very rewarding one. The early debates lacked lustre and the closing stages of the session were dominated by the language question. When introducing his budget estimates to the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General devoted a large part of his statement to the deteriorating financial situation, but no solution to that problem was in sight. There is an increasing tendency for members to question the advice tendered to the Fifth Committee by the several expert committees appointed by the General Assembly. Insofar as this reflects an increasing interest in administrative and budgetary matters, this is a healthy development. But some of the more intricate and technical questions which fall within the purview of the Fifth Committee do not lend themselves readily to discussion in a forum of one hundred and twenty-six and it would be unfortunate if the authority of the expert committees were to be undermined by ill-informed debate

## Resolutions Adopted on Reports of the Fifth Committee

359. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on Reports from the Fifth Committee.

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by The General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2380	Financial reports and accounts for the financial year ended 31 December 1967 and reports of the Board of Auditors	1 Nov.	Without objection		
2381	Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of the Committee on Contributions .. .. .	1 Nov. A 21 Dec. B C	Without objection Without objection Without objection		
2390	Enlargement of the Committee on Contributions: amendment to Rule 159 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly .. .. .	25 Nov.	Unanimous		
2468	Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1968 .. .. .	21 Dec. A B	108*	0	14
2469	Appointments to fill vacancies in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions ..	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2470	Appointment to fill a vacancy in the membership of the Board of Auditors	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2471	Appointments to fill vacancies in the United Nations Administrative Tribunal .. .. .	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2472	Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations .. .. .	21 Dec. A B	109	0	11*
2473	Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialised agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency ..	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2474	Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialised agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency ..	21 Dec. A B	110*	10	0
2475	Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies	21 Dec. A B	Unanimous Unanimous		
2476	Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board .. .. .	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2477	United Nations International School ..	21 Dec.	Unanimous		
2478	Pattern of Conferences .. .. .	21 Dec.	Unanimous		
2479	The question of including Russian among the working languages of the United Nations .. .. .	21 Dec.	81	17*	24
2480	Composition of the Secretariat .. ..	21 Dec. A B	118*	0	2
2481	Amendments to the Staff Regulations of the United Nations .. .. .	21 Dec.	Unanimous		
2482	Budget for the financial year 1969 ..	21 Dec. A B C	101*	1	13
2483	Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the financial year 1969 .. .. .	21 Dec.	107*	11	1
2484	Working Capital Fund for the financial year 1969 .. .. .	21 Dec.	107*	0	12

Resolution No.	Title	Date of adoption by The General Assembly	Votes in the General Assembly		
			For	Against	Abstained
2485	Salary Scales for the professional and higher categories .. .. .	21 Dec.	103*	8	3
2486	Methods of establishing the salaries of international civil servants .. .. .	21 Dec.	Unanimous		
2487	Proposed new construction and major alterations to existing premises at United Nations Headquarters in New York .. .. .	21 Dec.	102*	11	6
2488	Plans for the extension of conference facilities at the Palais des Nations, Geneva .. .. .	21 Dec.	Unanimous		
2489	Expenses to be incurred by the United Nations in respect of individuals or groups of experts appointed by organs or subsidiary organs for the performance of special <i>ad hoc</i> tasks .. .. .	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2490	Amounts of honoraria paid to the President and other members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal .. .. .	21 Dec.	Without objection		
2491	Rates of subsistence allowance payable to eligible members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations .. .. .	21 Dec.	107*	0	10

### LEGAL ITEMS—THE SIXTH COMMITTEE

#### Report of the International Law Commission on its Twentieth Session

360. The Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its Twentieth Session, which was held from 27 May to 2 August, 1968, in Geneva, was the first item for discussion in the Sixth Committee.

361. The Report concerned primarily two subjects: (a) Relations between States and International Organisations, on which draft Articles were prepared; and (b) Succession of States and Governments, in which the Commission considered Succession in respect of matters other than Treaties, on the basis of a Report prepared by its Special Rapporteur, Mr. Mohammed Bedjaoui, and Succession in respect of Treaties, on the basis of a Report from its Special Rapporteur, Sir Humphrey Waldock. The Commission also briefly discussed the topic of the Most-Favoured-Nation Clause, for which it had appointed Mr. Endre Ustor as Special Rapporteur. But, in addition to the work on specific topics already discussed, the Commission reviewed its programme and methods of work, as the Session under discussion marked the twentieth year since its creation.

362. In the debate in the Sixth Committee, the Succession of States and Governments attracted comments from most speakers. A number of delegations suggested that the cases of succession which arise as a result of decolonisation should receive special and independent attention by the Commission, whereas other speakers, including the United Kingdom representative, considered that the topic should be viewed as a whole and that such cases should be considered only together with other examples.

363. The debate in the Sixth Committee opened with a statement by the Chairman of the International Law Commission reviewing the work done during its first twenty years of service.

364. The work on the second topic, Relations between International Organisations and States, is in an early stage and has only dealt with the question of the status, privileges and immunities of permanent missions by which states are represented before international organisations. Many delegations were therefore content to welcome the progress which had so far been made and to reserve their comments until a later stage in the development of the work. For the same reason most delegations did not comment in substance on the topic of the Most-Favoured-Nation Clause, though a number of speakers supported the view (expressed by the Commission's Special Rapporteur and accepted by it) that the discussion of this topic should not be narrowly restricted to questions of the role of the clause in the domain of international trade but should rather explore the major applications of the clause.

365. The speakers in the Sixth Committee generally welcomed the proposed review by the Commission of its long-term programme. Most delegations, however, did not support the suggestion by the Commission that the term of service of each member should be lengthened from five to six or seven years. A number of delegations supported the proposal that the Secretariat should employ an outside consultant in preparing a basic document for the assistance of the Commission in the review; others preferred that this work should be done by the Commission itself or the existing members of the Secretariat. The Legal Counsel of the United Nations, in his concluding remarks, made clear that in his view this matter lay within his discretion.

366. On 14 October, Australia and 20 other states, including the United Kingdom, submitted a draft resolution. A number of minor changes and revisions were made. By the draft resolution, as put to the vote in the Committee, the General Assembly congratulated the Commission on the work accomplished during the past twenty years; noted with approval the proposed programme and organisation of work, including the preparation of a new survey of the whole field of international law; recommended that the Commission should continue work on Succession of States and Governments and Relations between States and International Organisations and the Most-Favoured-Nation Clause, and begin substantive work on State Responsibility at its next Session; and expressed the hope that further seminars would be organised with the participation of an increasing number of nationals of developing countries. This resolution was adopted on 15 October by the Sixth Committee unanimously.

367. On 4 November a number of statements were made in the Sixth Committee in celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the first election of members of the International Law Commission.

368. On 11 December the General Assembly adopted the resolution unanimously.

### **Convention on Special Missions**

369. The principal Item before the Sixth Committee at its Twenty-third Session was the Convention on Special Missions, i.e., Missions representing a State which are sent temporarily and for a specific purpose to another State, e.g., to enter into negotiations.



370. The International Law Commission, at its Nineteenth Session, in 1967, concluded its work on draft Articles on Special Missions. These Articles proposed a régime defining the status, privileges and immunities of Special Missions. The General Assembly, in Resolution 2273 (XXII) of 1967, had decided that further work to embody these draft Articles into an international convention should not be done by a Conference of Plenipotentiaries but by the General Assembly at the Twenty-third Session.

371. When the debate opened on this subject, a Drafting Committee of fifteen states, including the United Kingdom, was established, and other procedural arrangements made. In addition, it was decided to invite Switzerland to participate in the work of the Sixth Committee on this subject, in view of the special position which that country has in the activity of international diplomacy.

372. The draft Articles proposed by the International Law Commission followed, with relatively few divergencies, the principles embodied in the Convention on Diplomatic Relations drawn up by the Vienna Conference on Diplomatic Relations in 1961. A number of delegations, including in particular the United Kingdom, France and other West European delegations, expressed the view, in connection with many Articles, that the scale of privileges and immunities set out in the draft Articles of the International Law Commission was set at too high a level. These delegations considered that, because of the temporary and frequently technical character of Special Missions, it was possible to reduce the scale of privileges and immunities below that foreseen by the International Law Commission without depriving Special Missions of the facilities necessary for carrying out the tasks with which they are charged. On the other hand, a large number of delegations, especially from African and Asian countries, considered that Special Missions were sent particularly by the new states, who were neither by size nor financial strength able to set up the network of permanent diplomatic missions which was enjoyed by the old established states. The bulk of their diplomatic activity was conducted through Special Missions rather than permanent diplomatic missions and required the same scale of privileges and immunities. The Communist delegations were also of the opinion that the scale of privileges proposed by the International Law Commission was entirely appropriate, having regard to the representative character of Special Missions. This difference of approach led to the tabling by West European delegations of a number of amendments proposing the elimination of Articles or the reduction of the level of privileges and immunities granted, but the general result of the debate was to show that the majority in the Sixth Committee supported the existing Articles.

373. The Sixth Committee decided to leave on one side Article 1 of the Convention, which contains definitions of the terms used in it, including the definition of a Special Mission as a mission of a representative and temporary character sent by one state to another state to deal with that state on specific questions or to perform in relation to the latter state a specific task.

374. Part I of the draft Articles, which contained general provisions relating to Special Missions, such as their appointment, composition, nationality, authority to act, precedence, and seat, while a number of

amendments were made, gave rise to relatively little controversy. A provision proposed by the International Law Commission which would have provided that "a state may send a special mission to a state or receive one from a state which it does not recognise" was deleted. The United Kingdom, which proposed this deletion, argued, with the support of a number of other delegations, that it was inappropriate to touch upon controversial questions of international law, such as the doctrines of recognition, in the drafting of a practical Convention concerning state intercourse.

375. When the Committee turned to Part II, which contained the facilities, privileges and immunities to be enjoyed by Special Missions, the difference of approach outlined above became immediately apparent. The United Kingdom proposed a revision of Article 21 which would have envisaged that Part II of the Convention, as proposed by the International Law Commission, would apply only to the members of Special Missions led by the Head of State, the Head of Government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and other Ministers of the Government of comparable rank, and to any other Mission where a special agreement to apply these privileges might be entered into. As a corollary, the proposal of the United Kingdom introduced a new Part III which would accord to Missions other than those just mentioned a lower scale of privileges. This scale was based substantially on the privileges and immunities granted to representatives of member states attending meetings of Specialised Agencies by the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 November, 1947, together with the application of a number of Articles which were appropriate for all Special Missions.

376. The French delegation adopted a somewhat different approach. They proposed a provision whereby the Head of State, Head of Government and other Ministers of comparable rank would be accorded the privileges of a diplomatic agent in accordance with the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The other members of a Special Mission would be accorded a lower scale of privileges, which was embodied in a series of amendments proposed by France to the subsequent Articles of the International Law Commission. Almost all Western European delegations were able to support either the United Kingdom or the French suggestions, or both.

377. The proposal of the United Kingdom was criticised as involving an alteration to the whole structure of the International Law Commission draft, though it preserved the precise drafting. The French proposal was resisted because it at least impliedly involved a substantial reduction of the privileges and immunities elsewhere in the draft. After a full debate on these matters it became clear that the majority in the Committee did not support the scheme proposed by the United Kingdom. Accordingly, before the matter was brought to a vote, the United Kingdom indicated that they did not insist that their amendment be put to a vote, while making clear that they continued to believe in the merits of their proposal, and reserved the right to revert to it at a later stage in debate. The French amendments (except for a less important one relating to the Head of State) were rejected by a series of votes.

378. The Committee then considered Article 22 onwards. A French amendment to Article 24, making clear that the exemption of the premises of a Special Mission from taxation need only be granted to the extent compatible with the nature and duration of the functions to be performed by the Special Mission, was approved by 32\* votes to 25, with 25 abstentions. An amendment to Article 25, presented by Australia and the United Kingdom jointly, which would have required the Special Mission to use the premises of the permanent diplomatic mission of the country concerned to the extent that this was possible, was however defeated by 17\* votes to 47, with 22 abstentions.

379. On Article 28 a United Kingdom proposal that the Special Mission should use the communications facilities of the permanent diplomatic mission of the state concerned, insofar as public correspondence facilities were inappropriate, was withdrawn in favour of an amendment proposed by Ghana covering much the same ground; this latter was adopted by 54\* votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

380. The next principal point of conflict in the Committee arose when Article 29, personal inviolability of members of the Special Mission, and Article 31, immunity from jurisdiction of the members, came to be debated. The French delegation presented amendments to both these Articles which would in effect have given to the members of a Special Mission the treatment accorded to consular agents. The delegation of the United Kingdom, though recalling that it had favoured a higher range of privileges for missions of ministerial rank, as was indicated above, supported the proposals of the French delegation, since a further Article of the current draft Articles permitted special agreements which could have provided for a higher level of privileges in appropriate cases. There was in addition a Chilean amendment which would have provided that immunity from civil jurisdiction should extend only to acts done by members of a Special Mission in the course of their official duties as such. The amendments proposed by France, however, were supported almost exclusively by Western European delegations and were ultimately defeated, as to Article 29, by 16\* votes to 52, with 20 abstentions, and as to Article 31, by 18\* votes to 47, with 22 abstentions. Even the Chilean amendment was defeated by 28\* votes to 45, with 17 abstentions. At this point the Committee interrupted its work on this subject, having considered and adopted Articles 2-29 and 31 of the draft Convention.

381. The Committee also decided to propose in its Report that, at the Twenty-fourth Session, Articles adopted during this Session should only be reconsidered if the Committee by a vote of two-thirds so desired, that the Drafting Committee should continue in being, and that Switzerland should be invited again to participate in the work of the Committee on this subject.

382. On 5 and 6 December the Sixth Committee reverted to this subject to consider the Report of the Drafting Committee on the articles referred to it by the Sixth Committee namely, Articles 2-29 and 31. The texts proposed by the Drafting Committee were adopted by the Sixth Committee subject to minor changes to Articles 6 and 9.

383. On 6 December, the Sixth Committee adopted unanimously a draft resolution to carry over to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly the work on the draft Convention. In the General Assembly on 18 December, the draft resolution was adopted unanimously, together with the procedural decisions and recommendations for the next Session referred to above.

### **Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression**

384. The Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression, which met in Geneva from 4 June to 6 July 1968, was the subject of a brief discussion in the Sixth Committee. The Report of the Special Committee represented a new study within the United Nations of the question of defining aggression; earlier Special Committees on this subject had been established by the General Assembly and had met in 1953 and 1956, but no work had since then been done on the substance of this subject.

385. The Report set out the arguments for and against the definition of aggression, considered the manner of definition and examined various acts which might be regarded as falling within that term. In addition, the Report included the text of draft definitions proposed by a number of African, Asian and Latin American states, together with some amendments proposed to them. The Special Committee adopted, by 18 to none, with 8\* abstentions, a Soviet-sponsored draft resolution which recommended that, because it was unable to finish its work by preparing a definition, the Special Committee should meet again before the end of 1968. A Canadian compromise proposal, that the Committee should resume either before the end of 1968 or early in 1969, was then withdrawn.

386. Almost all speakers in the Sixth Committee considered that the work done in the Special Committee had been constructive and valuable and that the atmosphere prevailing in the Special Committee had been workmanlike and serious.

387. Many speakers continued to stress how valuable it would be if a definition of aggression were adopted within the United Nations. The concept was a significant one in the Charter, being used in Article 1(1) as well as Article 39, and a clear expression of it would be of use to the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations. Most speakers considered that the appropriate way to embody such a definition would be by a declaration or resolution by the General Assembly. These speakers did not favour either a general definition which would endeavour to express in general terms the concept of aggression, nor one which proceeded by an enumeration of all the possible acts of aggression. They preferred what was called a "mixed" definition, i.e. an expression of the central concept in general terms, followed by a list of acts which constituted aggression but without any attempt to make this list exhaustive.

388. A number of delegations, however, including the United Kingdom, considered that the attempt to define aggression had in it inherent dangers. It was very important that an attempt should not lead to a definition which

was inadequate. An incomplete definition, so far from deterring an aggressor, would rather offer him openings for evasion. Similarly, a definition must not hamper the Security Council in the exercise of its responsibility under Article 39 of the Charter fully to appraise the circumstances of all alleged cases of aggression. Any attempt to make a definition binding on the Security Council would be an unauthorised attempt to amend the Charter. The San Francisco Conference had expressly declined to include a definition of aggression in the Charter in order to leave this power of determination to the Security Council. These delegations doubted the value of an attempt to define aggression and indicated the requirements which, in their view, any such definition must meet.

389. There was some discussion also of the scope of any definition which the Special Committee might prepare. Many speakers considered that it should concentrate on aggression by armed forces, and in particular the direct forms of attack by invasion, bombardment or blockade which had formed the most frequent and most flagrant cases of aggression in the past. They considered that what they called "economic aggression" or "ideological aggression" should be dealt with at a later stage in the work. Other delegations, including the United Kingdom, considered that, in accordance with the Charter, the essence of aggression was the existence of an armed attack and that other forms of state conduct, while they might constitute intervention or some other form of international wrong, could not be regarded as constituting aggression. Similarly, some of these delegations considered that it would be quite wrong to concentrate on the clear and evident cases of direct armed attack and that in the modern world indirect forms of state attack, such as by subversion or terrorism, should also form the subject of any discussion of the question of defining aggression.

390. The United Kingdom, as well as a number of other delegations, had occasion during the debate to refer to the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union on 21 August, 1968. It was suggested that this invasion showed how little a definition deterred an aggressor, since the Soviet Union had been one of the first to press for a definition of aggression and indeed had proposed a number of definitions itself. It was said that the Soviet action completely contradicted the definitions which the Soviet Union had itself proposed and had embodied in an international treaty of 1933, to which the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia were parties. It was said that, if the Soviet Union wished to justify its action, this would require an amendment to all definitions of aggression which had ever been advanced. In reply the Soviet Union suggested that these statements had been demanded by the United States from its allies; the action of the Soviet Union and its allies in Czechoslovakia was entirely a matter between the Eastern European states of the Communist system and was not the concern of any other state.

391. Both the question of Czechoslovakia and some technical aspects of the question of defining aggression were touched on in the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Darwin, on 20 November, 1968, a full text of which is at Annex XXIII.

392. In addition, there were brief references to the Arab/Israel conflict in the Middle East, the fighting in Vietnam and other specific international incidents.

393. On 22 November, Algeria and 26 African, Asian and Latin American delegations presented a draft resolution by which, as revised, the General Assembly decided that the Spécial Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression should continue its work in accordance with General Assembly Resolution 2330 (XXII) as soon as possible in 1969.

394. On 26 November this resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee by 74 votes to none, with 16\* abstentions. The General Assembly adopted it on 18 December by 71 votes to none, with 16\* abstentions.

#### **Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on its First Session**

395. The next item to be discussed by the Sixth Committee was the Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its First Session, held from 29 January to 26 February, 1968, in New York. The Report of the Commission, of which the United Kingdom is a member, set out decisions on its work taken at its First Session. Thus the close relationship which, in accordance with General Assembly Resolution 2205 (XXI), the Commission should have with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Commission also recognised the value of co-operation with organisations active in the field both within the United Nations and outside it. The Commission identified three topics which it should study as a matter of priority, namely, the international sale of goods, international payments and international commercial arbitration. It decided that it would be useful to establish a register of organisations active in the field of international trade law and a register of texts giving important international instruments on a number of topics, including those selected as priority topics as mentioned above. A proposal was also made that the Commission should study international shipping legislation, and the Secretary-General foresaw the possibility of drawing up a paper on this subject.

396. After the end of the Commission's session, its Chairman attended the Second Session of UNCTAD to convey the desire of the Commission to establish close collaboration with UNCTAD both to avoid duplication and to inform UNCTAD of the work of the Commission.

397. The discussion in the Sixth Committee of the Report of the Commission showed general satisfaction with the work done during its First Session. The desire was expressed by a number of delegations, more particularly from the developing countries, that the Commission should actively pursue work in the field for the benefit of developing countries and they argued in favour of a close relationship between the Commission and UNCTAD.

398. There was general satisfaction with the programme of work foreseen by the Commission, but a large number of delegations wanted the Commission to add to its existing priorities the topic of international shipping legislation. A number of delegations, including the United Kingdom, doubted whether it was appropriate to add this topic, since it would increase the burden of a programme which was already substantial and might be premature

while work was proceeding on this subject both in the Shipping Committee of the Trade and Development Board and also in the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organisation.

399. The Committee also discussed the proposal to establish a register of texts and organisations. The Committee had before it certain further proposals as to the content of the register, together with the related financial implications proposed by the Secretariat. There was general agreement to proceed with the register of organisations. Many delegations, including the United Kingdom, as well as delegations from African, Asian and Latin American countries, favoured the immediate putting in hand of work on the register of texts also. But others, including delegations from Eastern Europe and some Western countries, considered that the expense was too great and should be reduced either by reconsideration in the Commission of the manner of presentation of the register of texts or by other economies.

400. In discussion of training and assistance in the field of international trade law, a number of delegations, including those from developing countries, sought opportunities for training of experts in this field. Others, including the United Kingdom, pointed out that a Report of the Secretary-General on this matter was awaited and that the needs of international trade law were being considered also in the separate item on the UN Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, which was to be discussed subsequently in the Sixth Committee.

401. On 12 December, Argentina and twelve co-sponsors, including the United Kingdom, submitted a draft resolution by which, as subsequently revised, the General Assembly took note of the Report of UNCITRAL and of its programme of work; authorised the Secretary-General to establish the Register of Organisations; approved in principle the proposal to establish a Register of International Instruments and requested that UNCITRAL should consider further the precise nature and scope of such Register; authorised the Secretary-General to establish the Register of Instruments in accordance with further directives to be given by UNCITRAL; and recommended that UNCITRAL should continue its work on its chosen priority topics, consider the inclusion of international shipping legislation among its priority topics, consider opportunities for training and assistance, keep its programme of work under constant review, consider ways and means to improve co-ordination among organisations active in this field and consider when appropriate the possibility of issuing a year book.

402. On 14 December this resolution was put to a vote. Operative paragraph 4, which concerned the Register of International Instruments, was adopted by 70\* votes to 1, with 8 abstentions. Operative paragraph 5, which authorised the Secretary-General to proceed with the Register in accordance with directives from UNCITRAL, was adopted by 64\* votes to 4, with 16 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then adopted by 77\* votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

403. On 18 December the General Assembly adopted the resolution by 86\* votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

**Consideration of the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations**

404. The Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, whose mandate was renewed by General Assembly Resolution 2327 (XXII) of 1967, met in New York from 9 to 30 September, 1968, to consider certain of the Charter principles set forth in General Assembly Resolution 1815 (XVII).

It gave most of its time to the principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. After extensive discussions, the Drafting Committee of the Special Committee submitted a Report which registered agreement on statements concerning a number of important aspects of the subject, but which indicated that no agreement was reached on certain other aspects. After further debate, the Special Committee adopted that Report. The Special Committee also considered, though more briefly, the Principle of Equal Rights and Self-determination of Peoples; the Drafting Committee reported that it had been unable to study the subject in depth for lack of time, but that further consideration of this principle should be carried on in parallel with further consideration of the principle on the Prohibition of the Threat or Use of Force. This Report was also adopted. The Special Committee did not have time to consider the third item on its agenda, which related to the principle concerning the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

405. In the Sixth Committee discussion of the Report of the Special Committee, many delegations welcomed the progress made, in particular over the formulation of a number of important aspects of the Principle on the Prohibition of the Threat or Use of Force, though regret was also expressed that it had not proved possible to complete the formulation of any principle. Many representatives expressed satisfaction that agreement was reached on a statement of the general prohibition of the use of force. On the consequences and corollaries of the prohibition of the threat or use of force, on which the Special Committee had reported a varying measure of agreement, different aspects were emphasised; for example, some delegations stressed the illegality of acts of reprisal and doubted how far, in connection with the threat or use of force, international lines of demarcation should be assimilated to international frontiers. There was no agreement as to how widely a duty to refrain from propaganda for wars of aggression should be expressed, having regard to constitutional rights of freedom of speech. A number of delegations also drew attention to certain aspects of the use of force in connection with colonial situations.

406. The United Kingdom representative stressed the relevance of the use of force by the organisation of armed bands or volunteer or irregular forces or other forms of violent involvement in civil strife, which was particularly dangerous and prevalent. He insisted that the formulations on the use of force should fully accord with the Charter in any definition of the term



“force” and that the discussion should concern the use of force in international relations. He stressed the need to cover also the lawful uses of force, for example, under the inherent right of self-defence.

407. A number of delegations commented also in the Principle of Equal Rights and Self-Determination of Peoples, though the Special Committee had devoted less time to this principle. Some considered this principle entirely general in effect, whereas others considered it primarily of importance in connection with the position of colonial peoples and the need to put an end to colonial situations.

408. There was little comment on the agenda item on the Principle concerning the Duty not to Intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, since the Special Committee did not deal with it. A number of delegations reaffirmed their respective positions on the question how far General Assembly Resolution 2131 (XX), the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, should or should not be regarded as representing a formulation in legal terms of this principle.

409. In the course of their statements a number of Western European delegations, including the United Kingdom, referred to the setback in the work of the Special Committee caused by the Soviet action in Czechoslovakia shortly before its meeting.

410. There was general agreement that the Special Committee should resume its work and complete the formulation of the seven Principles as far as possible. It was recalled that the Special Committee had earlier completed formulations on four of the Principles concerned; the three under consideration in September 1968, were the only outstanding Principles. A number of delegations considered that improvements should be made to formulations already agreed; some wanted to expand and broaden the formulation on the Principle of the Duty of States to settle their Disputes by peaceful means, while others thought the formulation on the Sovereign Equality of States should be improved by additional wording relating to the permanent sovereignty of states over natural resources. But, equally, a large number of delegations stressed that it was undesirable to re-open earlier formulations and that the aim should now be to complete the work on the outstanding Principles.

411. As in previous years, a number of delegations stressed that the practice of the Special Committee in seeking to adopt formulations by consensus might lead to obstruction and frustration, whereas others, including the United Kingdom, emphasised that this represented the only way in which texts having a firm basis in international law could be established.

412. On 14 December, Afghanistan and 49 (subsequently 51) other delegations, including the United Kingdom, submitted a draft resolution. This took note of the Report of the Special Committee, requesting it to continue and complete its work, to endeavour to resolve all relevant questions relating to the formulation of the seven Principles, in order to complete, as far as possible, its work, and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its Twenty-fourth Session.

413. On 17 December the Committee adopted the draft resolution by acclamation. The Chairman of the Sixth Committee first stated that, without prejudice to the positions of delegations, it was agreed that the Special Committee should endeavour to complete the two Principles of Non-Use of Force and Self-Determination before addressing itself to the other Principles.

414. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on 20 December.

#### **United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law**

415. The Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, of which the United Kingdom is a member, submitted a Report and recommendations for discussion.

416. In the Sixth Committee there was general satisfaction at the year's activities under the programme. In particular the increasing participation of UNESCO and UNITAR was welcomed.

417. On 13 December, Afghanistan, Ecuador, Ghana, Hungary and Tanzania, subsequently joined as co-sponsors by Cyprus, India, Pakistan, Panama and Philippines, put forward a draft resolution based closely on the unanimous recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The Sixth Committee unanimously adopted this resolution, by which the General Assembly endorsed the Report of the Secretary-General and the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee and made provision for the future conduct of the programme.

418. On 20 December the General Assembly unanimously adopted this resolution.

419. On the recommendation of the Sixth Committee, the General Assembly, without objection, confirmed the appointment for a further period of three years of the existing members of the Advisory Committee, including the United Kingdom, except that Afghanistan was replaced by Iraq.

#### **Resolutions adopted on Reports of the Sixth Committee**

420. The following resolutions were adopted by the Twenty-third Session of the General Assembly on reports from the Sixth Committee.

<i>Resolution No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption by the General Assembly</i>	<i>Votes in the General Assembly</i>		
			<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>	<i>Abstained</i>
2400	Report of the International Law Commission .. .. .	11 Dec.	Unanimous		
2419	Draft Convention on Special Missions .. .. .	18 Dec.	Unanimous		
2420	Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression .. .. .	18 Dec.	71	0	16*
2421	Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law .. .. .	18 Dec.	86*	0	2
2463	Consideration of principles of International law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations .. .. .	20 Dec.	Unanimous		
2464	United Nations Programme for Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law .. .. .	20 Dec.	Unanimous		

## ANNEX I

**STATEMENT BY LORD CARADON IN THE PLENARY OF THE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 3 DECEMBER 1968****The Problems of Human Environment**

We are now on the last lap of this session of the Assembly—a session which started in deep gloom for reasons we are still painfully aware ; it has only slowly made headway through much frustration.

Some superficial observers seem to think that the gloom and the frustration are due to shortcoming or failure in the United Nations Organisation. We are familiar with that popular delusion. We delegates know—and it is well that it should be often repeated and emphasised to the outside world—that there is nothing wrong with the United Nations, except the members.

It is not the Organisation which has failed: it is the nation members who have not yet sufficiently grasped the truth that we are all members one of another. Our economic and political salvation will come not by everyone grabbing for himself and the devil take the hindmost. Our salvation will come from international understanding and international co-operation. That is the overriding self-interest of us all. That is the obvious truth from which we can all draw comfort and confidence for the future.

So we particularly welcome the fact that we can turn from our anxious search for common ground on which to escape from deadlocks in the Far East and the Near East and Africa—wherever we look—and turn for a while to consider a question of world-wide importance in which there need be no deadlock unless we ourselves invent one.

We turn to consider a question which is certainly urgent and undoubtedly international, a subject in which we all have a vital interest and in which we can all play a part and on which there is no cause for us to disagree.

When we look back on the Twenty-third session of the Assembly in future years we may remember it not for continued stalemate between East and West and North and South but for a new initiative in which we came together from the four corners of the world to support an international initiative of incalculable consequence.

I trust that we shall agree to act in full agreement just as we did last year when at the call and inspiration of Malta we passed unanimously an historic resolution—the resolution directed to ensure that the untold riches of the deep sea shall be devoted to the needs of all mankind.

Again we have cause for gratitude to Sweden. It is not for me to praise the contribution which the Nordic countries in general and Sweden in particular make to the work of the United Nations. They give us a lead in every field. Their voluntary contributions put larger nations to shame. They give us men of ability and integrity and courage whenever we need them. They are constantly engaged on the search, which should occupy us all—the search for means to make our Organisation more effective. And now by introducing this resolution they have again done lasting service to the United Nations, by forcing us to concentrate our attention on a purpose as fundamental as it is far reaching.

Furthermore in the remarkable speech which we heard this morning the Swedish Ambassador has raised the level of our deliberations by the range and the clarity of his wide review.

We delegates are a motley collection of diplomats and politicians and civil servants and lawyers engaged and absorbed in the new and unfamiliar processes of parliamentary diplomacy.

We are all apprentices in the new profession, cadets in the new service. We live in a confusion of pressures and interests and prejudices and conflicts. We can seldom look beyond the next session, often not beyond the next resolution. In our own countries few of us can look beyond the next election—if we are lucky enough to come from a country which has such things. But now Sweden has made us look ahead and think in terms not of immediate tactical self-interest but of long-term universal advantage. All of us should be grateful for the imagination and inspiration of the Swedish initiative.

Just as it would be impudent for me to praise the Swedish delegation, so it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to speak to the substance of the great issues on which the searchlight of international enquiry is now to be directed. I am not a scientist. But already I begin to comprehend something of the value of the Swedish resolution, in heightening the general awareness of the problem to use the phrase of the Swedish Ambassador.

Even I am now being required to think about some of the terrifying problems of the future of the universe. Already I am strengthened in my conviction that science is much too serious and much too dangerous to be left to the scientists.

We see already the first fruit of the Swedish resolution. Diplomats, politicians, civil servants and lawyers as we are, we must raise our sights from our daily preoccupations, we must peer into the future, we must contemplate disasters almost beyond comprehension, we must think of vast possibilities which may decide the future happiness and the future survival of mankind.

I will say this for the scientists. They have not failed to give us warnings. They are perhaps apt to discover and release a danger before they think how we can control it. They let the genie out of the bottle before they start to think of how we can put him back. But their warnings are now coming loud and clear. They are sufficiently alarming.

I take one aspect of the warnings alone, as an example of the horrors which the scientists now threaten.

Take the threat of urbanisation, to which the Swedish Ambassador referred this morning when he spoke of the price to be paid for unplanned precipitate urbanisation. It involves the threat of the abandonment of the countryside, the loss of fresh air, the neglect of physical exertion, the submergence of the individual into a crowded and stunted mass, the expectation that before long all mankind will be packed tight into cities which exude a poisonous waste and belch out pollution. To anyone like myself brought up in the countryside this is a horrible prospect.

A leading scientist was telling us only the other day that nearly 40 per cent of the world's population is already living in urban conditions and that on present trends it will take only sixteen years for half the world's population to be living in cities, and only fifty-five years for it to reach 100 per cent.

Within the lifetime of a child born today, on present trends of population increase, fifteen thousand million people will be fed and housed in cities—nearly five times as many now. The whole human species will be living in cities each of a million-and-over inhabitants, with the biggest city having one thousand three hundred million inhabitants. Those are the staggering predictions of Professor Kingsley Davis, recently quoted by my friend Lord Ritchie-Calder.

But that is not all. I was reading the other day that in the United States a baby is born every twelve seconds and a car every five seconds. The two together set up a new demand for living space and road space which eats away two acres of countryside every minute. In my own country I am told that urban expansion will swallow up one sixth of Britain's farmland between now and the end of the century.

But even that is not all. We are told by the same leading authority that urban growth in under-developed regions is now going ahead far faster than in any developed regions. Between 1920 and the end of the century the urban population of the developed countries is expected to quadruple: the urban population in under-developed countries will multiply twenty times, so that nearly twice as many people will be town dwellers in poor regions as in the rich.

The rich are now discovering the enormous overheads of city dwelling and the vast investment and maintenance involved in keeping the great cities functioning, but there is no prospect, no prospect whatever, that the poor regions will be able to invest even a fraction of what will be needed to prevent the development of tropical slums on an appalling scale.

Nor is the communist world free from these dangers. I quote a recent statement by a distinguished communist scientist when he said: "Scientific study of all the interrelationships in nature and the consequences of our interference clearly lag behind the changes. Large amounts of harmful wastes of industry and transport are being dumped into the air and water, including cancer-inducing substances. Will the safe limit be passed everywhere, as has already happened in a number of places?" And he went on to say: "The salvation of our environment requires that we overcome our divisions and the pressure of temporary, local interests. Otherwise, the Soviet Union will poison the United States with its wastes and vice versa. At present that is a hyperbole. But with a ten per cent annual increase of wastes, the increases over 100 years will be 20,000 times".

Not only are the dangers almost beyond our imagination, they are also clearly international. They are the concern of the communist as much as the capitalist. They are the concern of the poor as much as the rich. They are the concern of everyone irrespective of their country or their wealth or their origin or their race.

I have made a personal comment, and I have fully admitted my own ignorance. That is not to say that my Government will not have a very positive contribution to make when the preparations are made for the 1972 conference and when the conference takes place. In the whole range of technical and scientific problems involved my Government will have a contribution to make based on our own experience and our own practical

progress. We claim to be in the forefront of such progress and we shall not be prepared to be second to anyone in the part we now play.

Now let me say a few words about our responsibilities here in this Assembly.

Firstly, we should pass the resolution, and I greatly hope that, imitating the decision we took on the sea bed last year, this resolution will be passed unanimously.

Secondly, I would emphasise that in setting in motion this new initiative we are not seeking to delay or prejudice any of the enterprises in this vast field which are already going forward. In particular we took note of the important conference on the biosphere held in Paris last September. The recommendations of that conference envisage a leading role for UNESCO in future research, and the recommendations of that conference must be given the fullest weight here. Our purpose is not to duplicate but to stimulate. We wish not to discourage all the work now proceeding in the complicated range of scientific research, but rather to give all such effort a new and balanced stimulus.

The second comment I make is that for a conference of the kind envisaged for 1972 the preparation will be all-important, indeed as important as the conference itself. I must admit that when I first studied the resolution before us it seemed to me that inadequate thought had been given to the need for continuous and expanding preparation leading up to the conference itself. It is well, no doubt, that the Secretary-General should be asked to report to the meeting of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva next summer. But that report can scarcely be more than a preliminary review. We must ensure that thereafter the work of preparation, so wide in its range and so complicated in its ramifications, goes forward with increasing momentum.

The third comment I would make on the resolution is about the conference itself. It should not be a mere gathering of experts or a long drawn out exposition of technical detail. It should not be composed only of those who carry out scientific research. It should be a concentrated conference of those who take decisions. It must invite the attention of the world to the interlocking problems. It must indicate where enquiry and research have so far been inadequate. It must do no less than awaken the conscience of the world to the obligation to make our planet not only habitable but also congenial and even beautiful to future generations.

I am glad to say that on all these questions concerning the purpose and scope and preparation and duration of the conference we were reassured and encouraged by the clarification given to us this morning by Ambassador Astrom.

So far we have been rough and careless and greedy in our exploitation of nature for our own needs. Now if nature is not to get her own back on man we shall have to be more gentle and more persuasive and more understanding with her.

I am impressed by the argument that in the past century or so the world has developed a new kind of social concern. We have factory acts, laws about violence and cruelty, provision for the old and the sick and the poor.

Slowly and haltingly we have been trying to check the neglect and exploitation of man by man.

The next great step in civilisation—and it is a step which we cannot delay—will be to make effective provision for the welfare of the planet itself.

It is with considerations as far reaching and indeed as hopeful as these that we should now join in expressing our overwhelming approval for the resolution put before us, and our readiness to join in the preparations for the 1972 conference and our determination to make that conference an effective call to mankind to be a master and not a prisoner in his own planet.

## ANNEX II

### STATEMENT BY MR. I. F. PORTER IN THE PLENARY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 20 DECEMBER 1968

#### Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

My délegation heard with great interest the speech on the 15th of November by the distinguished Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency presenting the annual report of the Agency to this Assembly. The report, taken in conjunction with earlier reports, shows that the Agency has concerned itself actively with all aspects of peaceful nuclear co-operation. The Agency now has nearly 100 members making it an invaluable world-wide forum for co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

My own country was a founder member of the Agency and has supported its work from the beginning. The United Kingdom has made voluntary contributions totalling about \$1.5 million to the operational budget that finances the technical assistance programme of the Agency since its inception in 1958. This cumulative contribution is second only to that of the United States. The United Kingdom has provided the Agency with over 150 experts to carry out and assist in technical assistance projects and continues to put forward as many candidates as possible for these posts. We provide, in the form of IAEA fellowships, facilities for scientists from other countries to come to Britain to share our experience of the peaceful applications of nuclear energy. Since the scheme was started in 1958 we have accepted 500 fellows for training in the United Kingdom and we continue to offer 60 fellowships a year. In addition we have since 1963 offered five fellowships each year for training at the Bradwell and Berkeley nuclear power stations in the United Kingdom. British scientists have played a full part in the panels, study groups, symposia and conferences on different aspects of atomic energy which make the Agency a valuable clearing house for information on the latest developments in this rapidly growing field.

The report draws attention to the importance for the future of the Agency of the conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which was commended by this Assembly by an overwhelming majority on the 12th of

June this year. Under Article III of the Treaty parties which are non-nuclear weapon states undertake to accept safeguards as set forth in an agreement to be negotiated and concluded with the Agency in accordance with the Statute of the Agency and its safeguards system. In developing this provision the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee were following the good example of the countries of Latin America, who had shown their confidence in the Agency by asking it to safeguard the peaceful nuclear activities of parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, a task it is already carrying out in Mexico. Mexico is to be congratulated on showing the way in this matter. In this connexion I should like to reaffirm the offer made by my own Government during the negotiations on the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Mr. Mulley said in the House of Commons on the 4th of December last year, and I quote :

“To assist these negotiations Her Majesty’s Government have decided that at such time as international safeguards are put into effect in the non-nuclear weapon states in implementation of the provisions of a Treaty they will be prepared to offer an opportunity for the application of similar safeguards in the United Kingdom subject to exclusions for national security reasons only.”

A similar offer has been by the United States. The Agency’s safeguards will therefore be applied to a large proportion of the world’s peaceful nuclear activities. In order to facilitate the development of the necessary techniques we have already submitted to IAEA safeguards two nuclear reactors at Bradwell, the largest power station under safeguards anywhere in the world. It is in our view important that the Agency should be in a position as soon as possible to negotiate the safeguards agreements required under the Treaty. The experience of safeguards which it has accumulated over the years will be invaluable in carrying out this task on which so much of the effectiveness and the credibility of the Treaty depends.

In addition Articles IV and V of the Treaty are likely to bring new or increased tasks to the Agency. The provisions of Article IV of the Treaty will give an important fillip to co-operation in development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, particularly in the developing areas of the world. This increased interest was demonstrated by the debate in the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States held in Geneva last September. Here again the Agency has already prepared itself for the tasks ahead by the valuable and comprehensive study it undertook in 1966 on what more it could do to orient its programme towards the needs of the developing countries.

My delegation welcome and will support resolution A/L.552/Rev.2 sponsored by Canada, Iran and Poland, which draws attention to two decisions of the Agency at its recent General Conference to prepare itself for the future opened up by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. My Government has full confidence in the Agency and its ability to carry out the important and increasing tasks that will fall to it when the Treaty comes into force. We look forward to hearing at the next session of the General Assembly a report on the progress that the Agency has been able to make in carrying out these tasks. Meanwhile our representatives will play a full part in the further detailed discussion of these issues in the appropriate organs of the Agency in Vienna.



**STATEMENT BY LORD CARADON IN THE PLENARY OF THE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 16 DECEMBER, 1968**

**Colonialism**

I hesitate to reply to the speech to which we have just listened, coming though it does from an expert in modern colonialism, partly because the points which he raises have already been adequately answered in the Fourth Committee ; but also because I expect that the speeches to which we are about to listen from the Soviet Union and the Ukraine will bear a marked resemblance to the speech to which we have just listened. It may therefore be preferable to listen to them all before we consider whether they justify a reply.

I remember that the first speech I made in this General Assembly seven years ago was in the colonial debate. Since then I have regularly spoken in the annual debates on this subject—and in that seven years another fifty million people in countries formerly administered by mine have attained independence. While the debates have been continuing colonialism has been ending.

In coming to speak yet again on this subject I feel like an actor repeatedly recalled by an enthusiastic audience—when the performance is in fact over.

I have had frequent occasion to remind this Assembly that in less than a quarter of a century my country has assisted and participated in an advance to independence by a quarter of the population of the world. All the eight hundred and fifty million people of the Commonwealth now live in independent sovereign countries, all except less than 1 per cent. What is more, in nearly all the countries previously under British administration the advance to independence was on the basis of full adult suffrage, free parliaments and independent courts. That is a success which cannot be denied or belittled. We claim that our greatest achievement was the conversion of an empire into a free commonwealth. Now the work is almost done.

When Swaziland was admitted to the United Nations during this session of the Assembly we were able to claim that the last of the seventeen territories in Africa administered by my country had attained independence—the last, that is, except Rhodesia.

I do not for a moment wish to suggest that the problem of Rhodesia is not of outstanding importance. On the contrary, I believe that it is one of the most important questions which the United Nations have ever had to consider. But I have suggested before and I put it to you again that the problem of Rhodesia is not a normal colonial problem. It is far more important. It is a racial and political problem. It is part of the whole problem of white supremacy in southern Africa.

In Rhodesia it is not a matter of a metropolitan power retaining domination over a colonial territory. The problem is very different. It is not that the administering power has failed to accept its obligation to free the people: the administering power has been prevented from doing so. It is a matter

of a comparatively small white population in the territory refusing to allow the much greater African population to take a full share in the government of their own country.

The white minority has so far defied and frustrated the intentions of the administering power, and of the United Nations as well.

As I say, this is part of the whole problem of white supremacy in southern Africa. It is part of a world-wide racial problem of the utmost importance. I am the last person to question the importance of the Rhodesian issue or to question the need to deal decisively with it. But to suggest that it is merely a colonial problem would be to misunderstand and misjudge it altogether.

We are not here today to consider how the racial questions of the world should be tackled. Nor are we here to deal with the racial and political problems of southern Africa. We shall have other opportunities to do so in this Assembly and in the Security Council. What we are here to do is to consider the question of the remaining colonial territories. If we agree that Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories in Africa are part of a different and much larger problem, and if we agree that Hong Kong is a special case, we may take it that the remaining colonial territories number about thirty. They have a population of three and a half million. That is the extent of the remaining problem.

My country has a special concern in this. For amongst these thirty territories eighteen are under British administration. These eighteen territories have a total population of one and one-third million—with an average population of seventy-five thousand, ranging from nearly half a million in Fiji to under one hundred in Pitcairn Island.

It is the future of these thirty territories to which I have referred which principally raises the question of micro-states, to which the Secretary-General has several times invited our attention in his annual reports.

Nearly all these territories are not only small in size and in population but also limited in resources. Many of them are isolated and remote islands.

What is their future? What are their peculiar problems? How can they participate in the international community? How can they derive the benefits of international assistance and at the same time make their contribution to the international family of peoples and countries?

Which of these small countries if any should join the United Nations? That is one important question recently much discussed. Some of them may wish to be independent without applying for membership of the United Nations, such as Western Samoa and Nauru—Nauru incidentally having followed its independence by applying for and being welcomed to special membership of the Commonwealth.

But the question of membership or association with the United Nations and its agencies is only one aspect of the problem. By their nature most of these small communities have unusual needs and face unusual difficulties. They each have characteristics and aspirations which are peculiar to themselves. It is wrong to attempt to generalise about them. Still worse is to try to force them into a standard single mould. They constitute a quite separate problem—or rather a whole series of separate problems.

They have the right to expect more from the United Nations than a mere repetition of old dogmatic slogans and the revival of stale resolutions. They need understanding of their peculiar problems and needs, they may well need exceptional assistance, we must not be so lacking in imagination and sympathy to tell them that there is nothing for them except to walk the plank of isolated independence, to sink in a sea of troubles beyond their strength to overcome.

With all their differences and peculiarities they have one need in common. There is one test which we can apply, one principle which we need not doubt. That is the principle laid down in the Charter that the interests of the inhabitants are paramount. The Charter spells out the aims clearly enough "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of development".

These are the directions of the Charter. These are the purposes we must all keep uppermost in our minds as we tackle this remaining problem—the problem of the remaining small territories. This is the "sacred trust", to use the Charter language, with which we are charged—that the interests of these peoples should be paramount and that their aspirations should prevail.

It is well therefore that the United Nations Institute for Training and Research should have begun a study of the subject of the micro-states. It is well too that the Committee of Twenty-Four should have accepted the need to direct special attention to this problem of the future of the smaller territories. It is the Committee's chief remaining concern, its last task.

When the Charter was drawn up at San Francisco the work of decolonisation had still to be undertaken. In less than a quarter of a century the purpose has been accomplished. My country is proud to have taken a leading part in that achievement.

What now remains to be done is by comparison of mere numbers trivial. The remaining task might be regarded as inconsiderable in terms of wealth and power. I would not, however, call these territories vestiges, as the previous speaker did. We recognise that the age of colonialism is over and done with. We welcome that. Now we have an obligation to see that the peoples of the remaining territories are protected and assisted with understanding and fairness and generosity.

It is a task to which the international community can certainly contribute, and if we are to finish the work as it should be finished we must be guided now as we have been guided in the past by the principle that the interests and wishes of the peoples concerned must be paramount.

## ANNEX IV

### STATEMENT BY MR. D. H. T. HILDYARD IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 17 DECEMBER 1968

#### Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

My delegation welcomes the Report of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space published last week and circulated as document A/7285. I should like also to repeat our appreciation of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee which was circulated earlier in the year as document A/AC. 105/45 and was considered by the eleventh session of the Main Committee in October.

Since the First Committee discussed Outer Space and all its aspects last year, there have been great new achievements in the exploration of Outer Space and we stand on the brink of others even more spectacular and far-reaching in their implications. We have seen the very successful and efficient circumnavigation of the moon by the Soviet spacecrafts Zond 5 in October and Zond 6 last month. I am glad that British scientists were associated in these experiments through the observations made at the time at Jodrell Bank. There was also the successful manned flight by a Soviet astronaut in November. In the same month there took place the great feat of the United States three-man space flight "Apollo 7". We now all await the next and greatest venture, "Apollo 8", due to start a few days from now, and we wish every success to all concerned in it.

Coming back to earth, so to speak, 1968 has seen useful progress at the Vienna Conference on Outer Space, in publicising the practical applications of space activities for the benefit of all, particularly the less developed countries. My delegation believes that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should meet in due course to consider in detail the various proposals made as a result of the Vienna Conference and report back on them to the Main Committee, after consultations with other interested United Nations Agencies.

It is only appropriate that in this debate delegations should both define their attitudes to the projects and proposals under consideration by the Committee and give at least an outline of the activities of their own country. I should like to say a few words about the recent British activities in our domestic space programme, and on various collaborative space programmes in which the United Kingdom has participated actively. The United Kingdom started its own Sounding Rocket programme in 1957 and since then over 160 Skylark rockets have been launched from Woomera in collaboration with the Australian authorities. More recently, a few of these rockets have been fitted with sun-pointing stabilised heads, and there is under development a much more sophisticated star-pointing stabilisation unit for future Skylark launchings. The extensive use of the unstabilised Skylarks has produced much scientific information, and the sun-pointing stabilised Skylark will make possible work of similar potential.

On the basis of these years of experience in the use of Sounding Rockets, the United Kingdom has been able to participate usefully in collaborative programmes with several countries. One recent successful programme was with NASA and Pakistan, when the United Kingdom provided the payload for Nike Apache rockets launched from the Sonmiani range in Pakistan. Preparations are under way for a programme to be carried out jointly with Sweden and the United States from the European Space Research Organisation's range at Kiruna in northern Sweden. Plans are being made and equipment being provisioned for further collaborative programmes using small rockets and probably involving launchings from the ranges at Thumba in India and Sonmiani in Pakistan.

In the field of regional co-operation, the United Kingdom is a founder member of the European Space Research Organisation and has participated fully in all that Organisation's programmes. United Kingdom experiments have been included in all the satellites so far planned and in just over half of the seventy or so rockets launched to date. The Organisation's second satellite was successfully launched on 3 October, 1968; United Kingdom scientists contributed four out of the eight experiments on board. Further United Kingdom experiments will be included in the payloads of the succeeding European Space Research Organisation's planned satellites, including the TD-I experimental satellite project.

I should like to refer to the hope expressed by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his Annual Report, that joint practical ventures bringing the benefits of space exploration to all nations should be encouraged. The Thumba Equatorial Sounding Rocket Launching Station in India is such a joint practical venture, and is already engaged in useful work. The Sounding Rocket Station at Mar del Plata in Argentina is mentioned by the Secretary-General as another possible joint venture if, as my delegation sincerely hopes, its eligibility for United Nations sponsorship is endorsed by the group of scientists who are to visit the station during 1969. We welcome the reference to this important Argentinian project in operative paragraph 8 of part B of the draft resolution before us today. My country remains keen to offer a scientist to be included in that group when the time comes.

I now turn to matters in the field of wider international co-operation in the exploration of Outer Space. The most important event of 1968 in this field was the opening for signature earlier this year of an Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, and the Return of Objects launched into Outer Space. Since that date, some 70 countries have signed the Agreement. My own country joined the Soviet Union and the United States of America in ratifying the Agreement on 3 December, on which day it entered into force. We hope that those states which have not yet acceded to or ratified the Agreement will do so as soon as possible. By contrast, however, progress on another major instrument stemming from the Outer Space Treaty has been disappointingly slow, that is the draft Convention on Liability for Damage arising from Space Objects. A number of drafts were before the Legal Sub-Committee, including the recent, in our view constructive, draft tabled by the Indian delegation. Several contentious issues remain to be resolved, however, before we can reach agreement on this subject which is an

essential step towards developing a legal régime for outer space. My delegation would like to stress the need for speedy progress here, and we hope that before the next meeting of the Legal Sub-Committee which in our view should take place early in 1969, Governments will give serious consideration as to how some headway can be made on the six major points of difference which remain to be settled.

On the substance of the matters still to be settled in the Liability Convention, my delegation hopes that Governments will reconsider their positions on the law applicable to measure of damage and unresolved aspects of joint liability, concerning which we submitted proposals in the light of the course of the debate. We do not believe that there can be any widespread support for the argument that the law of the launching state should govern the measure of compensation paid in another country, especially when the launching state may in some cases be at fault. We are glad to note that some progress has been made on the important questions of the relationship between international organisations and the Convention, and it was encouraging to hear, at the main committee's meeting in October, that the Soviet Union may now be in a position to accept the provision in the Indian draft on this point. We hope that it will soon be possible to reach agreement to include nuclear damage in the Convention. But it is still more essential to have adequate procedures to determine the compensation due. My delegation believes that it is useless, in this very practical question, to have rules, however good, if there is no effective way of ascertaining the sum due under them in the unhappy event that damage occurs.

The problem of Definition of Outer Space was referred by the lawyers to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee last autumn, but the scientists were unable to agree upon any scientific or technical criteria upon which a definition for a lower limit for outer space could be based. The difficulties of formulating such a definition are clearly very great. In the light of the very rapid pace of space technology, my delegation does not believe it practical at this stage to define a lower limit for outer space, or indeed desirable to attempt to do so. In a few years it may be possible to determine with some certainty the lowest point in a satellite's orbit. We talk now in terms of 50 miles above the surface of the earth, but technically it is not inconceivable that satellites will orbit the earth at a lower level. We believe that further studies should continue of the scientific and technical background.

We have somewhat similar reservations about being too specific at this stage in making recommendations on the Utilisation of Outer Space.

On the question of Direct Broadcasting by Satellites, we support the decision reached by the Main Committee in October on the proposals then put forward by the distinguished representatives of Sweden and Canada. This decision is recorded in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution "B" before us today. My delegation favours the establishment of a Working Group to study and report to the Main Committee on the technical feasibility of communications by direct broadcasting from satellites, on the current and foreseeable developments in the field, and on the implications which are likely to be important and far-reaching. In our view it would be desirable for the Working Group to meet early next year. We also believe that the Working Group should study the technical and scientific aspects of the

problem first, in close association with the International Telecommunications Union and other Specialised Agencies as appropriate. On the basis of such studies, the Working Group could then consider other aspects of the question for transmission to the Main Committee in time for it to report to the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. The United Kingdom wishes to make a full contribution to the studies made by the Working Group, and would like to participate at specialist level in all aspects of its work.

In his remarks to the Main Committee at a meeting last week to discuss informally texts of draft resolutions, the distinguished delegate of Sweden recalled in most timely fashion the doctrine to which we have all subscribed, that communication by means of satellites should be available to all nations on a global and non-discriminatory basis. Concern in some quarters at the prospect of possibly competing international communications systems has been so marked of late that my delegation is happy to see a specific reminder of our obligations under General Assembly Resolution 1721D (XVI) included in the draft resolution before us today, of which the United Kingdom is a co-sponsor. We also welcome the letter to the Secretary-General from the distinguished representative of the United States, which has been circulated in this Committee as document A/C. 1/979 of 12 December. This contains a most useful and timely clarification of the United States position on arrangements for attendance at the forthcoming Conference on definitive arrangements for INTELSAT. In conclusion I should like to express the confidence of my delegation that it will be possible to reach agreement in February next year on definitive arrangements which will reflect the greater use of INTELSAT made by many of the smaller countries who are or would like to become members.

## ANNEX V

### STATEMENT BY THE RT. HON. FRED MULLEY, M.P., IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 18 NOVEMBER 1968

#### Disarmament

I should like, Mr. Chairman, first to congratulate you on your election to the Chair and to say that under your guidance I am sure the Committee will conduct its business with great efficiency and, I very much hope, make a positive contribution to our work to secure further measures of arms control and disarmament.

I share your disappointment, Mr. Chairman, at the slow start to these debates and, despite the enthusiasm with which we embrace resolutions in general terms often with far-reaching implications, at the reluctance of delegates to take the floor and contribute to our deliberations.

We must be realistic and recognise that the impetus that I thought we had attained in this Committee last June has not been maintained. In his excellent speech last week the distinguished delegate of Canada reminded us of the words of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his statement to the

General Assembly on the 2nd of October, when he said: "My Government is well aware of the blow recent events have dealt to international confidence. But progress in nuclear arms control, to which great-power co-operation is particularly essential, is not a narrow interest of any one power or group of powers, great or small; it is an urgent and over-riding interest of the human race in sheer survival". That is also the position of my Government and we stand ready to take part in meaningful negotiations towards the conclusion of agreements in any field of arms control or disarmament. We have, as those delegates will know who have read the proceedings of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee, gone further and made constructive and detailed proposals to assist progress in both the nuclear and non-nuclear fields. I will refer to these proposals in a moment.

We welcomed the Non-Proliferation Treaty not only because of the advance it represents in itself towards international security and the further utilisation of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, but also because of the commitment it contains in Article VI to achieve further measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date. We all know that we shall not make significant progress in other matters until the Non-Proliferation Treaty is completed and brought into force. I suggested, therefore, that this must remain our priority task and that we must seek to recreate the international sense of urgency we had developed to this end earlier in the year.

My Secretary of State, Mr. Michael Stewart, in addressing the General Assembly on the 14th of October said:—

"The signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was an important step forward. But it is a step that will rapidly lose its value if it is not followed by further measures in the Disarmament field.

"Our aim is General and Complete Disarmament. We know by experience that if we are to get there we have got to seize hold one after another of the steps to Disarmament that can practically be taken now."

I suggest that this approach is the answer to the distinguished delegate of Yugoslavia who, in his interesting speech, posed the question: "What stands in the way of progress?" We can only make progress if we identify those steps which can practically be taken now. Then we must do real work to turn the general language of resolutions, often drafted to conceal rather than to reveal the difficulties, into the precise formulation of binding treaties and conventions with the provision of adequate safeguards to assure the participants that their security is not put at risk by their adherence to the Treaty. I thought the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia was unduly hard on the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee. No member of that Committee, I am sure, would argue that it was perfect and my colleagues there will confirm that it is not my view and agree that there is room for improvement in our methods of work. But it seems to me that one cannot hope to make progress in the necessary detailed work in a body much bigger than the ENDC. I firmly believe that if we can get the Non-Proliferation Treaty completed we can make substantial progress in Geneva and that we should be allowed to do so.



I assure the distinguished delegate that progress is not held up in any way because of lack of facilities for discussion. It seems to me the ENDC on the one hand and this Committee on the other provide ample opportunities. The basic fact is that progress towards nuclear disarmament can only be made if there is agreement between the nuclear powers, although I readily concede the right and proper concern of non-nuclear-weapon states to exercise all their powers of persuasion to achieve such agreement.

For these reasons his suggestion of setting up another special United Nations body to continue the work of the Non-Nuclear Conference does not seem to me to be a good idea. We shall not assist our slow and painful progress towards ending the proliferation of nuclear weapons by the proliferation of Committees and bodies concerned with this subject matter and I cannot see how such a body could avoid duplicating work already undertaken by bodies in which nuclear as well as non-nuclear countries are playing their part. For example, as I made clear in the ENDC in July, in my view the International Atomic Energy Agency—which is a United Nations body reporting directly to the General Assembly—has clearly a major role to play in implementing Articles III, IV and V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Nor could I agree to reopen the question of Security Assurances given by the Soviet Union, the United States and ourselves in conjunction with that Treaty and welcomed so recently by the Security Council.

My Government followed with great interest the proceedings of the recent Non-Nuclear Conference although it did not seem right that we should, as a nuclear power without voting rights, seek to participate in the discussions. We have studied with care its resolutions on which I should like to reserve the right of my Government to intervene later.

I turn now to consider some of the possible future measures of disarmament before us and some of the practical steps we might take now. Inevitably time requires me to be selective and I shall seek only to indicate priorities and not to attempt an exhaustive survey.

In my view the most hopeful recent development has been the agreement, announced in July, between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to enter into bilateral discussions on the limitation and the reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles. My Government warmly welcomed this decision and hopes that it will be possible for these negotiations to begin at an early date and that they will be conducted with maximum intensity in order to reach positive results in the shortest possible time. These bilateral negotiations are fundamental to the progress we all want to make towards real nuclear disarmament and their successful outcome is of vital concern to us all. The conduct of such negotiations will also be a clear testimony of the desire of the two major nuclear powers to carry out their obligations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It was felt in the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee that highest priority should be given to nuclear disarmament and to measures to end the nuclear arms race and I feel that this is a view which will be shared by this Committee. In this connection I would give particular priority to the prohibition of underground testing.

Attempts to get a Comprehensive Test Ban have a long history and I would pay tribute to the efforts of Sweden and the work of her distinguished Minister Mrs. Myrdal and congratulate the International Institute for Peace and Conflict Research in Stockholm on its achievement in co-ordinating the work and producing an agreed international report on the present state of the art of seismic test ban verification. The important developments in seismology in recent years are an encouraging factor in our search for a solution to the problems which have so far prevented the conclusion of a Treaty.

My Government favour the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty at the earliest possible moment and as soon as terms that are generally acceptable can be agreed. In our view the real danger of vertical nuclear proliferation lies in the development of more sophisticated weapons systems which a comprehensive test ban treaty would prevent. Quantitative control will achieve little if the weapons that are permitted become more and more costly and sophisticated and increasingly devastating in their power of destruction.

To assist in the production of an agreed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty I made two proposals at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee and these are set out in the Working Paper I presented at Geneva and which is before the Committee at page 65 of the Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

The first is a suggestion of a procedure which would provide an ultimate right of on-site inspection but which is specifically designed to circumscribe this right in such a way as to ensure that it would not be exercised irresponsibly or improperly. As scientific knowledge and the means of detection and identification develop, the need for and the probability of on-site inspection should diminish. No country adhering to the treaty would be submitting to any certain or automatic on-site inspection. But the possibility that inspection might take place would play a very large part in establishing confidence in the effectiveness of the treaty.

The second proposal is that if there cannot be an early fully effective ban—which I would much prefer—consideration should be given to a phased operation. This would mean starting with an agreed annual quota of underground explosions, reducing over a fixed period of time to zero. Such quotas would put an increasingly powerful brake on the development of new nuclear weapon systems and would finally bring this dangerous process to a complete halt.

I hope the ENDC will give further consideration to these proposals when it reconvenes.

At the earliest opportunity after the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, I proposed on the 16th of July in Geneva that the Secretary-General should be asked to prepare a report on the nature and possible effects of chemical weapons and on the implications of their use and that priority in the non-nuclear field should be accorded to an instrument to ban the production and possession of agents of biological warfare. These proposals were further elaborated in a Working Paper, presented at Geneva, and contained at page 61 of the Report of the ENDC.

My task in presenting the case for these proposals today is much easier than it was last July since the arguments have been marshalled with greater cogency than I could do by the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report in paragraphs 30 to 32. I quote:

“The question of chemical and biological weapons has been overshadowed by the question of nuclear weapons, which have a destructive power several orders of magnitude greater than that of chemical and biological weapons. Nevertheless, these too are weapons of mass destruction regarded with universal horror. In some respects they may be even more dangerous than nuclear weapons because they do not require the enormous expenditure of financial and scientific resources that are required for nuclear weapons.”

And later on he says:

“During the twenty-three years of the existence of the United Nations, there has never been a thorough discussion in any United Nations organ of the problems posed by chemical and biological weapons, nor has there been a detailed study of them.”

The Committee will recall resolution 2162 B of the XXI Session which called for the full implementation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. Let me at once make clear, as I did at Geneva and in the Working Paper, to which I referred, that my purpose is to supplement and not supersede that Protocol. My Government attach great importance to it and have no reason to weaken it in any way. On the contrary we would like to see all States who have not already acceded to it taking this step. Rather less than half the members of this Committee have in fact ratified the Protocol.

However, more is needed, and it was in the spirit and within the letter of Resolution 2162 B that I made my proposals, since the resolution says in its preamble:

“Noting that the ENDC has the task of seeking an agreement on the cessation of the development and production of chemical and bacteriological weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and on the elimination of all such weapons from national arsenals, as called for in the draft proposals on general and complete disarmament now before the Committee.”

I should also say a word about terminology since the Committee may have noted that I speak of chemical and biological weapons. “Chemical” seems to me a more modern and comprehensive term than “Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases” and similarly “Biological”, although I am advised “microbiological” would be more accurate, is to be preferred to “Bacteriological”. Indeed a strict interpretation of “bacteriological” would exclude all diseases caused by, for instance, the viruses and the rickettsiae. Thus, the study would not include the use of smallpox or typhus for military purposes. I feel sure the Committee will wish our consideration of these matters and measures to eliminate these horrible means of warfare to be as comprehensive as possible.

I advocated a study of chemical means since it seemed to my Government that an international consensus of scientific opinion was a necessary preliminary to the solution of some of the difficult questions. I urged an immediate consideration within the ENDC of measures to ban biological means of warfare because these are universally and completely regarded with horror and to this extent the task of framing a convention is easier, although as my Working Paper indicates the difficulties in the field of verification are formidable.

However, the ENDC decided to ask for a study on both aspects. Conscious of the great value, in our work and for public opinion, of the previous report on nuclear weapons, I accepted this recommendation on the clear understanding that it was made as an earnest of the ENDC's desire to proceed with urgency on my proposal on microbiological warfare and not with the object of procrastination.

I hope therefore that this Committee and the General Assembly will unanimously endorse the recommendation for a study which should be on as wide a basis as possible and which should, in the words of the Secretary-General, "explore and weigh the dangers of chemical and biological weapons". At the same time, and without waiting for the completion of the report, I hope the ENDC will give further consideration to the arms control aspects of these problems and particularly the difficulties of verification.

The Secretary-General has pointed out that the first draft resolution on preventing the spread of nuclear weapons was introduced as long ago as 1958. He goes on at paragraph 21 of his Introduction to say:

"Owing to the fact that for a number of years the efforts towards disarmament have been concentrated on the issue of non-proliferation, less attention has been given to other important aspects of the disarmament question. Therefore, it will be desirable for the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and the General Assembly to review the situation and take up, with firmness of purpose, those questions which are more urgent and more amenable to early agreement."

This seems to us to be good advice, and my Government will do all in its power to carry it out.

## ANNEX VI

### STATEMENT BY MR. I. F. PORTER IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 6 DECEMBER, 1968

#### Disarmament

I have asked for the floor to comment briefly on four of the draft resolutions before us: draft resolutions L.449, L.450 and L.451 on the Non-Nuclear Conference, and draft resolution L.448 on General and Complete Disarmament.

I should like first to say something about draft resolutions L.449, L.450 and L.451 on the Non-Nuclear Conference. We have also just received draft resolution L.452.

My Government welcome the general approach of the draft resolution L.450 submitted by Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan and the Netherlands, and just introduced by the distinguished representative of Finland. Although we have reservations about some parts of it, we nevertheless support its broad objective and appreciate the spirit in which it is being put forward.

The Non-Nuclear Conference referred proposals on the civil uses of nuclear energy, including peaceful explosions, and on further measures of disarmament, to certain competent international bodies. Draft resolution L.450 provides for the reports of those bodies to be forwarded to the Secretary-General so that we can consider implementation at the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly. In the view of my delegation, this is the right procedure; it will give us the opportunity at our next session to examine progress made and to decide on the basis of reports by competent experts what further action may be necessary.

My delegation will vote for draft resolution L.450.

I should like to assure the distinguished delegate of Cyprus that the problems raised by draft resolution L.449 are of great concern to us all. However, this resolution would give the Disarmament Commission tasks far beyond its mandate or purpose and we hope that it will not therefore be pressed to a vote.

Draft resolution L.451 is, in the view of my delegation, defective in several respects. I should like to mention just three of our reasons for thinking so.

First, whereas draft resolution L.450 recommends that the Secretary-General place the question of implementation of the results of the Non-Nuclear Conference, including convening of a meeting of the UN Disarmament Commission, on the agenda of the Twenty-fourth Session, draft resolution L.451 requests the Secretary-General to consult member states to ascertain their preference on the alternatives of convening a meeting of the Disarmament Commission either not later than July next year or after the the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly and before April, 1970. We strongly oppose the timing suggested in draft resolution L.451. In our view it is too early now to fix a date or even alternative dates for a meeting of the Disarmament Commission. This can only be done in the light of the reports received from the competent bodies, which are unlikely to be available for our consideration much before the Twenty-fourth Session of the General Assembly.

My second reason concerns the mandate given to the Disarmament Commission in draft resolution L.451. In the view of my delegation cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is more appropriately dealt with by the IAEA, which, unlike the Disarmament Commission, was created for that purpose. To give this additional function to the Disarmament Commission would in our view be to interpolate an unnecessary intermediary between the Agency and the General Assembly.

Finally, in paragraph 4 of the first part of the draft resolution there is a request for, and I quote: "prompt attention and full co-operation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Atomic Energy Agency as regards ways and means for the implementation of the programmes and measures contemplated in Resolution J". This paragraph seems to assume that the two organisations referred to have accepted as a matter of course the programmes and measures contemplated in Resolution J, whereas, as Resolution J in fact recognises, the organisations themselves must take that decision.

These are three of the reasons why we cannot accept draft resolution L.451.

In conclusion I should like to introduce briefly an amendment to draft resolution L.448/Rev.1 on General and Complete Disarmament. We propose the addition of a new fourth preambular paragraph, which would read:—

*"Noting with satisfaction the agreement of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States of America to enter into bilateral discussions on the limitation and the reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defence against ballistic missiles."*

We feel that the resolution would not be complete without a reference to this agreement. These talks could be an important step towards the halting of the nuclear arms race and therefore towards our ultimate aim of General and Complete Disarmament.

I hope that the co-sponsors of the resolution can accept the amendment and that it will have the Committee's approval.

## ANNEX VII

### STATEMENT BY MR. I. F. PORTER IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

17 December 1968

#### Non-Nuclear Conference

I should like to make the following explanations of vote on resolutions A/C.1/L.459/Rev. 1, L.460 and L.458 on the Non-Nuclear Conference.

This delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution L.459/Rev.1, introduced by the distinguished representative of Mexico.

My Government welcome the initiative by the countries of Latin America in making their continent the first inhabited nuclear-free zone in the world and we hope that all signatories of the Treaty will follow the example of the six who have allowed it to enter into force in their own territories and that all states in the region will soon become Parties to the Treaty.

We have expressed our support in a practical form by signing the two Additional Protocols to the Treaty. We hope that other countries will follow our example and that in particular those nuclear-weapon states who have not yet done so will sign Additional Protocol II.

My delegation will reluctantly vote against draft resolution L.460.

We share with its sponsors the desire to initiate as soon as possible the preparatory work necessary to determine the principles and international procedures to be adopted in order that benefits under Article V of the Non-Proliferation Treaty can be made available. This work is however already in hand. The Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States, in its Resolution H, recommended that the International Atomic Energy Agency initiate studies of the possible functions of the Agency in relation to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Prompt action was taken on this recommendation by the General Conference of the IAEA on which all member states of the Agency, and thus the great majority of member states of the United Nations, are represented. The General Conference requested its Director-General and Board of Governors to study the question and to report to the next General Conference. This decision was taken more than two months ago and we do not see the need now to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to conduct a similar study. If, as we hope, resolution L.458 is adopted, we shall in any case be due to consider the progress made on this subject at the next session of this Assembly.

In any case, we could not support a resolution on peaceful explosions which contained no reference to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, from which the current interest in this subject mainly stems. The preamble recalls statements made in this Committee during the Resumed Twenty-second Session of the General Assembly by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union but fails to add that these statements were made in the context of Article V of the Treaty.

Since the United Kingdom welcomes the general approach of resolution L.458 and supports its broad objectives, we shall vote in its favour.

However, on paragraph 1 of the resolution I must say that while we support the substance in general of the Declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States, we cannot subscribe to some of its wording. Our vote in favour of the resolution as a whole should not therefore be taken to mean that we endorse this Declaration in every detail.

On paragraph 7, my Government, while voting for the resolution, do not of course consider themselves committed in advance to supporting a meeting of the Disarmament Commission in 1970. The decision on this question should, in our view, be taken by the General Assembly in the light of the circumstances at the time.

## ANNEX VIII

### STATEMENT BY SIR LESLIE GLASS IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 11 DECEMBER 1968

#### Korea

Why does the United Nations exist? What is fundamental to the whole concept of the Organisation? The answer is peace—the preventing of fighting and war and the settlement of disputes. This is just what we are talking about here today. No one could or should say that we should not talk about this.

The growing tension in Korea carries the seeds of serious danger for international peace and security. The violence in the area which increased so dramatically last year was followed in January of this year by an attack on the residence of the President of the Republic of Korea in Seoul and continuing violence in the ensuing months. Such incidents could quickly lead to a grave situation.

Moreover, just now, when the United Nations is considering the Korean question, the North Koreans chose this moment to intensify their attacks which reached new levels in October and November. If they think that thereby they can intimidate the United Nations, they are mistaken. Their behaviour only shows more convincingly than ever that at no time has there been greater need for the presence of the United Nations Command Forces in Korea. Yet there are those who come here and call once again for the United Nations to leave Korea.

It is now eighteen years since the United Nations Forces first went to Korea. At this time, when new dangers threaten, perhaps I may be permitted to recall to the Committee the circumstances which led to the despatch of United Nations Forces to Korea.

The United Nations Forces in Korea had their origin in a Security Council resolution of 27 June 1950. The resolution found that there had been an armed attack upon the Republic of Korea forces from North Korea which constituted a breach of the peace. It recommended that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as might be necessary to repel the armed attack and restore international peace and security in the area.

Fifty-one member states of the United Nations expressed their support for the stand taken by the Security Council; only five dissented. I repeat, out of the whole United Nations membership only five dissented. Sixteen Governments contributed forces and many others supplied other assistance.

It hardly needs to be said that the few who opposed the United Nations going to the assistance of the Republic of Korea when it was under attack from North Korea, today continue to take a leading part in calling for the United Nations to abandon its responsibilities in Korea.

I should like too to recall to the Committee this passage from the report of the United Nations Commission on Korea covering the period from 15 December 1949 to 4 September 1950:—

“The invasion of the territory of the Republic of Korea by the armed forces of the North Korean authorities, which began on 25 June 1950, was an act of aggression initiated without warning and without provocation, in execution of a carefully prepared plan.



“This plan of aggression, it is now clear, was an essential part of the policy of the North Korean authorities, the object of which was to secure control over the whole of Korea. If control could not be gained by peaceful means, it would be achieved by overthrowing the Republic of Korea, either by undermining it from within or, should that prove ineffective, by resorting to direct aggression. As the methods used for undermining the Republic from within proved unsuccessful, the North Korean authorities launched an invasion of the territory of the Republic of Korea.”

This report has an all too familiar ring. Today we read in the reports of UNCURK and of the United Nations Command of intrusion and infiltration and sabotage, and even attempted political assassination, carried out by North Korea. A further example of North Korean aggressiveness was their seizure in January of the United States ship “Pueblò” and their continued detention of the ship and its crew. The British Foreign Secretary expressed the sense of outrage felt in the United Kingdom at the time of this action. The British Representative in the Security Council urged on the Council the grave dangers of the situation, both in the light of the report of the seizure of the ship and also of the most disquieting evidence of the increase in violations of the Korean Armistice Agreement. But his call for the need for respect for the Agreement to be reaffirmed by the Council went unheeded and violations continue.

Ever since the United Nations was compelled to take action to oppose and, at great cost, to halt the North Korean assault upon the Republic of Korea, the North Korean authorities have lost no opportunity of attacking the United Nations. By perverting and rewriting history they have sought to destroy the standing and prestige of the United Nations and to have the world believe that the United Nations acted illegally in Korea.

The Korean War was an instance of the United Nations acting collectively to foil aggression. We reject utterly North Korean accusations that it was North Korea that was the victim of aggression at the hands of the United Nations.

We reject too the demand of the North Koreans and their friends that the United Nations should leave Korea and cease to concern itself with the Korean situation. Let us pause for a moment and think seriously about what would happen if United Nations troops were not present to watch the military demarcation line. Few in this Committee would, I believe, dare to predict what the future would then hold for Korea; indeed what could be the consequences for the peace of Asia and the world. We learnt all too well in 1950 what the North Koreans mean by “peaceful reunification”. No one can wish that experience to be repeated.

I would urge all members of the United Nations who have joined us since 1950 to study with the greatest care the sad history of events of that year. Are we to believe that the mere removal of the presence of the United Nations is to bring lasting peace and security? If so, this surely suggests a curious attitude towards the United Nations. Is this an extension of the doctrine which has been propounded to us that there are areas of the world—spheres of influence—in which it is better that the United Nations should not interfere? That there are areas of the world in which the use of force is to be regarded as a normal means of regulating disputes? Could it be that the proposal for the United Nations to withdraw from Korea is in fact an invitation to the United Nations to leave the Korean question

to be settled, as an attempt was made in 1950 to settle it, that is by force? In spite of all their talk of peaceful reunification, there is much to suggest that that is indeed the course of events favoured by that minority in this Committee which calls for United Nations withdrawal from Korea.

I repeat, the United Nations' first responsibility is to maintain peace in Korea. So long as the United Nations' presence is necessary for that purpose it must remain. My delegation is vehemently opposed to the proposal for its withdrawal.

Indeed, such is the situation, that we believe that the United Nations should keep itself more immediately informed of what is happening in Korea. For that reason, the resolution before the Committee, which my delegation has co-sponsored, calls for regular reports from the United Nations Commission. We should not fall victim to the delusion that United Nations peace-keeping in Korea is an affair of annual debate.

But simply to hold the present position is not enough. What we have to do is to progress to a final settlement. The lines of that settlement have been set out in many resolutions of the General Assembly.

Our purpose—the purpose of the United Nations—is to bring about, by peaceful means, the establishment of a unified independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the restoration of international peace and security in the area. That is surely a purpose we can all support. It is right and proper that the United Nations should concern itself with that task, just as it should make its first concern the maintenance of peace in Korea.

This is the more so since the Government of the Republic of Korea has sought the assistance of the United Nations; has unhesitatingly recognised the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the question of the unification of Korea; and has undertaken to give its unsparing co-operation to United Nations efforts for the earliest achievement of unification, in accordance with the principles reaffirmed in the General Assembly's many resolutions.

The obstacle to progress is the obstinate refusal of the North Korean authorities to vary in any way their attitude of rejection of the United Nations. On this there has been no change. Amid all the verbiage of their statements the message remains the same. Thus in their memorandum of 18 July, I quote, "If the United Nations really wants to act in accordance with the principles of the Charter, it must take its hands off the Korean question"; and then again on 25 July: "The question of Korea's unification must be settled in any case by the Korean people themselves in an independent way and the United Nations or any other outside forces must not meddle in it."

To accept and condone such rejection of the United Nations would be dangerous for all of us. To reward such rejection with concessions would be worse still.

We most strongly and sincerely urge that those friends of North Korea who have influence with the North Korean authorities should do all in their power to persuade the North Koreans to reconsider their position. Surely after eighteen years this is not too soon.

My delegation can see no reason why, if the North Koreans would meet with the United Nations in a spirit of co-operation, progress could not be made. That is what we should all wish to see. I cannot believe that any member of this Committee would be unready to support a United Nations effort to bring final peace to Korea if the North Koreans would make that possible.

If there are those who will not at any price have the United Nations concern itself with Korea, I think we should be wise to examine their motives with extreme care before accepting their advice.

We for our part will continue to give to the United Nations in its efforts to bring about a settlement in Korea the same support which we have consistently given in the past. My delegation has accordingly sponsored the draft resolution in document L.453 and urges other delegations in the Committee to vote for that resolution.

## ANNEX IX

### STATEMENT BY MR. D. H. T. HILDYARD IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1 NOVEMBER 1968

#### The Sea Bed

As this is the first time that my delegation has spoken not on a point of order, may I offer you very briefly—in accordance I hope with the spirit if not the letter of your request—our congratulations on your election as Chairman of this important Committee and to join in the tributes which have been paid to you both as a person of outstanding qualities and as the representative of your great country. I should like also to offer congratulations and to associate my delegation with the tributes which have been paid to our distinguished Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. With such a bureau we can have confidence that our deliberations will be presided over with skill and impartiality and, as well as due seriousness and dedication, a sense of humour.

I would like first to comment shortly on the results achieved during the past year and in particular the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to study the peaceful uses of the sea bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. We are entering an immense new world which presents a great challenge to us all. Everything related to the sea remains of deep interest and concern to my country. As a distinguished Commonwealth colleague reminded me recently, the British are reared on Shakespeare, cricket and the sea. Perhaps I should also add John Masfield in view of the poetic and apt reference by the distinguished Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to "Sea Fever". In any event my country has tried to play a full part in all the *Ad Hoc* Committee's studies.

I believe that in the last ten months good progress has been made. We have identified and clarified the extent of the main problems and we have found a wide measure of common ground on which we can build in

the future. For this my delegation would like to pay tribute especially to Ambassador Amerasinghe of Ceylon, the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and to Ambassador Benites of Ecuador and Mr. Denorme of Belgium, the Chairmen of the two Working Groups, together with their respective bureaux. We are indeed indebted to them for the imagination as well as the dedication of their efforts. We are also most grateful to the Secretariat for the very excellent documentation and guidance with which they have unfailingly provided us.

As the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee shows, a great deal more work clearly remains to be done. In this great venture we must proceed carefully and slowly if we are to build on solid foundations. We want to avoid, if we can possibly do so, hurried and ill-considered decisions which would create uncertainty and confusion and work against the orderly development in the future of the exploitation of the resources of the sea bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction in the interests of mankind as a whole. Scientific and technical progress is increasingly rapid but it is clear that the complications and cost of the exploitation of deep sea resources will be very great for a considerable time to come. We can still proceed in a considered and orderly fashion without feeling that technical developments are running ahead of us and that we must adjust as best we can to harsh and imminent economic realities. This is certainly due in great part to the timely initiative of the distinguished Representative and the Government of Malta for which we shall always remain indebted to them.

In this connexion I would like to say that any arrangements which we may discuss will, in the view of my delegation, only be effective to the extent that they are agreed. My delegation therefore have consistently attached the greatest importance to endeavouring to ensure that at every stage of the deliberation of this subject by the United Nations we should proceed only on the basis of general agreement. We believe that the progress so far justifies our confidence in this procedure and that it should continue to be followed in any Standing Committee.

My delegation shares the view that the next step is to build on the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and that as there is clearly so much work to be done we should now establish a Standing Committee. My delegation was happy to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.425 introduced by the distinguished Chairman of the Technical and Economic Sub Committee so ably and in such a spirit of conciliation. We believe that this resolution identifies well the problems and the common ground which have so far emerged, but we also would be happy to see amendments from any quarter which would enlarge the area of agreement without changing the basic direction. We would also be glad to support a draft resolution on the lines of that suggested by the United States proposing an International Decade of Ocean Exploration which we believe could give a great fillip both to our understanding of the problems involved and to the development which we all wish to see. In practice a decade of ocean exploration would be concerned with the investigation not only of the ocean floor and its subsoil, but also of the waters of the oceans themselves, and would therefore include questions outside the scope of the item which we are at present discussing here. It is for this reason that it is envisaged

that the co-ordination of such a decade in so far as it is not handled on a national basis should be allotted to the Inter-government Oceanographic Commission.

All maritime states must be concerned over the possibility of pollution of the seas arising from activities on the sea bed which are, or may become, possible as a result of developing modern technology. My country, and our neighbour France, have cause to remember the sudden and very disagreeable increase in the oil resources of our coasts which resulted last year from the sinking of a large tanker on the south-western coast of England. The Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation is actively at work on the question of pollution from ships. My delegation are very glad that the delegation of Iceland have proposed that the whole question of marine pollution from activities on the sea bed should be examined from the outset. We would be ready to support a draft resolution on the general lines of that proposed by the delegation of Iceland and included in Annex III of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report.

With the help of the organisations mentioned in paragraph 4 of the 50 power draft resolution we should have the infra-structure we need. As previous speakers have pointed out, however, there has been wide support for the idea that following the precedent in regard to outer space, the General Assembly should adopt a set of guide-lines or principles to point more clearly the direction for our future work. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee presents two sets of such principles in addition to those which various delegations have themselves put forward. It did not prove possible in the time available to reach general agreement on any single set of principles. My delegation was closely associated with the formulation of the second and shorter set described in paragraph 88 of the report. As the distinguished Representative of Ceylon and others have commented, the two sets have much in common. My delegation believes, however, that we would be well advised not to go into too many details at this stage before the full implications may be entirely understood. We therefore favour concentration on a clear and relatively simple outline such as the shorter set offers. These principles are in any case far-reaching. I would like to comment briefly on these principles which, I think, are valuable in helping all concerned to define their attitudes more clearly.

The first states that there is an area of the sea bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof underlying the high seas which lies beyond the limit of national jurisdiction. This is a basic concept which underlies both the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.425 and the whole future work of the proposed Standing Committee. Nobody has disputed this view.

The second states that taking into account relevant dispositions of international law, there should be agreed a precise boundary for this area. There are, as we know, differences of view as to where such a boundary should lie and as to when and in what manner some further international agreement on any boundary should be sought. This is certainly a question which will require much further study and discussion before general agreement can be reached. I believe that an important factor may be the timing. We may be able to make progress on delimitation after we have made more progress on other aspects of our work and have clarified and agreed further the arrangements which we would like to see.

The third principle states that there should be agreed as soon as practicable an international régime governing the exploitation of the resources of this area. My delegation strongly holds the view that there should be such an international régime. Nevertheless we believe that this whole question needs much further study before it will be possible to decide the precise nature of this régime. Nor can we say how any régime we establish now will develop and evolve or what form it is likely to take in the more distant future. There will certainly be a number of differences of view both on substance and semantics. We shall have to go into the whole question very carefully in a spirit of mutual understanding.

The fourth principle says that "no state may claim or exercise sovereign rights over any part of this area, and no part of it is subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by use or occupation, or by any other means". I believe that this principle is now widely accepted. Indeed one may say that it was the idea enshrined in this principle which more than anything else inspired the members of the United Nations to make the sea bed a major item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

\* The fifth principle states that the exploration and use of this area shall be carried on for the benefit and in the interests of all mankind, taking into account the special needs of the developing countries. This principle also has underlain much of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and is reflected in the draft resolution. Much study and effort will be needed to translate it into effective action, but it is clearly a basic objective.

The sixth principle states that this area shall be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. As the report shows, discussion of this question so far has centred round how further consideration and definition of the principle should be conducted. It remains the view of my delegation that such a reservation could not limit the inherent rights of states to secure their own defence in accordance with the Charter and international law. The consideration of any specific arms control measures which might accompany the reservation of the sea bed for peaceful purposes is a matter which should be viewed as closely related to other fields of arms control. My Government strongly advocates international agreement on arms control measures whenever these will genuinely contribute to international peace and security. My Government have constantly worked for such agreements. A year ago my delegation advocated in this Committee that the specific arms control aspects of United Nations consideration of the sea bed should, after preliminary discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, be considered in detail in the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee. We are glad to see that the ENDC has taken up this subject, and as its report indicates, agreed that this new subject would be a fruitful area for future work. Indeed the disarmament items which this Committee is due to discuss at a later stage of its work are framed to provide, both in the report of the ENDC and in the memorandum of the Soviet Government, an opportunity for further discussion of this important question.

The seventh and last principle states that activities in this area shall be conducted in accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. Activities in this area shall not infringe upon the

freedom of the high seas. This principle is meant to supplement earlier principles and to confirm that it is not intended to cast doubt upon established principles such as the freedom of the high seas.

My Delegation shares the hope expressed by the distinguished Representative of Ceylon that it may prove possible to agree on some set of principles which we believe could act as guidelines against which we can all judge the possibilities or proposals which we discuss. We hope that any agreed principles which may emerge will be closely allied to the basic seven to which I have referred. If such agreement does not prove possible, however, we hope that these tentative principles may prove valuable as a catalyst for the opinions and attitudes of all those participating in our work.

Mr. Chairman, the sea bed and deep ocean floor confront us with a great and fascinating challenge. Scientific and technical progress offers greater possibilities every day. In our handling of most of the other subjects with which we deal we are caught in the web of complications spun by the past. The sea bed is a challenge to our own vision and foresight for it is we ourselves and not a long series of past generations who will be responsible for the shape of things to come.

## ANNEX X

### STATEMENT BY SIR LESLIE GLASS IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 15 NOVEMBER 1968

#### Apartheid

Apartheid is a hateful political and social system. We are agreed here on that; and it would be the heartfelt wish of my delegation that we could all have voted together affirmatively in a single massive expression of the overwhelming view of this Committee and of the United Nations.

Unhappily year after year that is not possible. And the only people who can draw comfort from this are the supporters of apartheid.

The reason for this is that the draft resolutions which are regularly put to this Committee are so framed as to make it impossible for some delegations to support them, however deeply they share the feelings of the Committee on the issue of apartheid.

In numerous statements in previous debates my delegation has explained its difficulties with these resolutions. Today we have been faced with another of the same kind.

Almost every paragraph of the resolution in document A/SPC/L. 160, even those with the spirit of which my delegation is in full agreement, is so presented as to give difficulty to us in supporting it. Tendentious language is used again and again. Those of us who think United Nations resolutions should be taken seriously must in all honesty object to language which may later be interpreted by some of our members to contain implications which very many of us could not agree with. Some members of course have no particular scruples about the exact meaning of words in relation to what they themselves are prepared to do. We have certainly heard in the course

of our proceedings some stirring speeches on human rights and on the principles of liberty and self-determination from representatives of countries whose own devotion to these principles is, on recent evidence in East Europe, to say the least of it highly selective.

I shall not attempt to deal in detail with my delegation's objections to the resolution in document A/SPC/L. 160 Rev. 1. I wish to confine myself in this statement to making certain main points in the light of which my delegation has been unable to support this draft resolution. They have all been made before. Our strongest objections relate to preambular paragraphs 4 and 7 and to operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

First, however abhorrent the situation in South Africa, it is not in our view such as to justify invoking the provisions of Chapter 7 of the Charter: this is in any case a matter for the judgment of the Security Council.

Secondly I wish to repeat again the position of the United Kingdom on the question of sanctions against South Africa. We have always made it clear that we cannot and will not now contemplate an economic war with South Africa. Those were the words of the British Foreign Secretary speaking in the General Debate at the XXIIInd General Assembly Session on 26 September last year. That is still our position.

My third point on the resolution in document A/SPC/L. 160 Rev 1 is simply that it cannot and will not be implemented. It will therefore do no good to the people of South Africa and can only call in question the realism of our debates. On this I would again like to quote from the British Foreign Secretary's statement to which I have already referred. He said this:—

“To call for action in solving the problems of Southern Africa without at the same time recognising the limitations on the scope of that action is to invite at best frustration and at worst a betrayal of the trust placed in us.”

If we in this Committee are to make a contribution to progress towards the end which we all seek, we must first be ready to examine together in a spirit of co-operation and not recrimination steps upon which we can agree. Intensification of methods which have brought no results, and will bring no results because we are not united upon them, will not help. New studies, new reports, new Committees will add nothing if the policy which governs them is mistaken. We believe that that is the case with the resolution in document A/SPC/L. 160 Rev. 1. If, Mr. Chairman, carried away by understandable emotion, we pass in our Committees and Assembly unrealistic and impractical resolutions which we all know have no chance of being carried out, we are debasing the currency of our resolutions to a mere act of demonstration, like the waving of placards, and we are positively acting to reduce their real influence in the world.

I have referred to our main objections. There are many other aspects of this resolution which are not acceptable to my delegation. I will not seek to list them, but with particular regard to operative paragraph 8 I must restate the reservations on the legal implications of sub-paragraph (c), which were expressed by the British delegation when this question arose at the recent Human Rights Conference in Tehran.



Having said all this, I would again emphasise my delegation's strong wish to associate itself with those parts of the resolution which condemn the evil and inhuman practice of apartheid, and our regret that the sponsors of the resolution have so loaded it with demands for controversial and unrealistic action that we should have had to enter such serious reservations.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to end on a more constructive note. My Government welcomes and supports the work of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and also that of the United Nations Education and Training Programme, and we have contributed to both. I am very glad to be able to inform the Committee that my Government proposes, subject to the approval of the United Kingdom Parliament, to make an additional contribution of £41,600 to the Education and Training Programme. Under these schemes practical and effective assistance, if of a limited kind, is being given. We wish to see that assistance receiving the widest possible support. We have before us today a resolution improving and clarifying the terms of reference of the Trust Fund, and my delegation has voted for that resolution.

## ANNEX XI

### **STATEMENT BY Mr. D. H. T. HILDYARD IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 18 DECEMBER 1968**

#### **Peacekeeping**

As you rightly keep reminding us, time is short. I do not think that this is any moment for further discussion of the principles or philosophy of Peacekeeping Operations, which could not but be protracted. I would merely like to say that my delegation cannot share in certain important aspects the views expressed yesterday by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union on these principles. These are issues which must one day be resolved if United Nations peacekeeping is to be put on an assured and agreed basis. But we are not going to resolve them by debate now in this Committee. We all appear to accept that as long as agreement cannot be reached on principles, we must take what practical steps we can. I think that it is appropriate that speakers should define their attitudes to the steps at present **under consideration**.

We have now before us the progress reports of the Committee of 33, and are considering in particular the work which has been done by the Working Group on the first model: the study of United Nations military observers established or authorised by the Security Council for observation purposes pursuant to Security Council resolutions. My delegation hopes to see first the completion of the material on this first model requested from the Secretary-General by the Working Group, which we would hope to see circulated thereafter to all members of the Committee of 33 and indeed of this Committee. The Working Group would then proceed as quickly as possible to formulate conclusions and recommendations which would lead to more effective handling in the future of the problems which arise in United Nations Observer Operations.

At the same time we consider that the Working Group should ask the Secretary-General for material on a further model, which we believe should be the operations of United Nations Peacekeeping forces. Conclusions and recommendations should then be formulated on these also, with a view to enabling the United Nations to improve its capacity to react quickly and efficiently to any call for the use of forces to help preserve peace. In all this work the Committee will have the benefit of the many important contributions made by certain member Governments. These contributions include the study by my own Government submitted on 29 May, 1968.

In the course of these studies and discussions we should all have in the forefront of our minds the question of financing. I should like to lay particular emphasis on this issue about which a number of distinguished representatives have spoken with such force and concern. Whatever facets of peacekeeping operations we may be considering, whether they are of major importance or relatively small and limited but possibly marking the way to some constructive advance, financing lies at the very basis.

The Secretary-General has pointed out in his "Introduction to the Annual Report on the Work of the Organisation" that "the financial situation in connexion with the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus has continued to deteriorate and that the deficit for this operation now stands at a figure of approximately \$13,586,000". He goes on to point out that in his periodic reports he has repeatedly underlined how unsatisfactory are the financial arrangements for the Force.

In addition, there are outstanding debts for the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations.

We all know the great difficulties involved. But the United Nations' debts are not just going to disappear. They must somehow be liquidated. I would like to join with previous speakers in urging those who regard United Nations peacekeeping as important, indeed vital, and who have not yet come forward with a contribution, to consider seriously whether they could not do so now. It is a melancholy fact that three years after the Secretary-General appealed for the support of member states in this matter the contributions of ten million dollars made by my Government still represents nearly half the total so far raised.

But liquidation of past debts is only a beginning. What we have also to do is to put the financing of future peacekeeping on a solid basis. The Secretary-General should not be expected to have to appeal endlessly to member states for the money required to pay for peacekeeping operations authorised by the United Nations. We cannot remind ourselves too often that we will only get the United Nations that we pay for; and that means the United Nations which each individual member state is willing to pay for. If one member may default with impunity, so may others.

Against the background of these hopes and aspirations, the results achieved so far by the Committee of 33 are clearly very far from impressive. They are indeed hardly micro, let alone mini. Many of us had hoped for something better after so many years. Nevertheless there has been at least some advance and some evidence of a new spirit to make progress. In the light of the endless sterile arguments of the past, perhaps we have now a small candle or a diminutive and fragile plant which needs tending very carefully.

I need not stress again the very deep interest which my country has always had in all aspects of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations as among the most important activities of our Organisation. Our interest and concern have been amply proved by the part the United Kingdom has played in these operations, the contributions which we have made, and perhaps most strikingly by our financial contributions. We are prepared to make a constructive contribution to the studies of the Working Group and the Committee of 33. If all the members of these bodies are prepared to join in a constructive approach, building on the very small achievement this year, 1969 could be a year in which we really have something to show.

In conclusion I should like to express the admiration and gratitude of my delegation for the dedication, patience and skill of the Chairman of the Committee of 33, Ambassador Cuevas Cancino. If the Working Group has made a very small advance, much of the credit must go to him. I would also like to pay tribute to the members of the bureau for their efforts and their perseverance in this, one of the most difficult, delicate and frustrating problems of our Organisation.

## ANNEX XII

### STATEMENT BY LORD CARADON IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 18 NOVEMBER 1968

#### United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees

It is usual to start our annual debate on this subject with expressions of gratitude to Dr. Michelmore and the devoted staff of the United Nations Agency which he heads. I am particularly glad to start that way today.

We are sometimes asked what practical work the United Nations Organisation does. There are often people eager and anxious to belittle every international effort, every United Nations endeavour. We all know how many failures and how many delays and how many disagreements dog our slow advance towards international understanding and international cooperation. We know our shortcomings only too well. But today we consider a United Nations Agency whose invaluable work cannot be disputed.

No one can doubt that the Agency dealing with the Palestine refugees is necessary. No one can doubt that without it there would have been appalling suffering on a vast scale. A million people would have been condemned. It was an essential enterprise in compassion. It was much more than that. It was not only a matter of saving lives. It was a matter of giving innocent sufferers some hope. It was a matter of caring for the sick. It was a matter—this being as important as anything—of giving education and training to young people striving to free themselves from despair.

It was an honourable international enterprise. It has been well done. We admire all those who have given their anxiety and their effort to this fine cause.

We have expressed our gratitude to them in the past. We have double reason to thank them now. For, still facing many familiar difficulties, they were suddenly confronted last year during and after the June conflict with a new emergency and new demands. Those demands called for more than persistent devotion and efficient administration. They called for speedy improvisation, ready resourcefulness and capacity for courageous and responsible decision. Governments, including my own, provided additional contributions to meet the crisis. So did many other United Nations Agencies and private organisations—all contributing to a concerted effort which showed the extent of the concern aroused throughout the world.

Accordingly we have special reason this year to tell those who have laboured so hard and so well to meet this new crisis that we are proud of their achievement and we are grateful for their example—a fine achievement and a fine example in international endeavour.

As we thank Dr. Michelmore for the report he has given us, we also express our gratitude to the Secretary-General who has taken the exceptional action of putting before us a message of particular importance. It is on that message and in response to that challenge that I wish to speak today.

It is a good parliamentary custom to declare any personal interest in a subject under debate. I wish to declare my own personal interest. I had the great privilege of living for more than a decade on one side or the other of the Jordan—more than seven years in the villages and towns of the West and more than three years in the villages and towns of the East. I would claim that very few know them better than I do. I have consequently a personal interest in the people. Their suffering is to me more than a matter of statistics. The injustice which they have endured, most of them for so long, and their hardships, which are now so much greater, seem to me very real and very near. I hope that all of us have sufficient imagination to realise that there is no more terrible sentence than the sentence of leaving home and land to set out on an exile as harsh as it is apparently hopeless.

I propose to speak shortly later in this debate about the finances and future mandate of the Agency. Today I wish to speak of the immediate problem which must take top priority in our concern.

It is not my purpose to speak today of the main refugee problem which has existed for twenty years. On that the United Nations has often pronounced in the past since the time of General Assembly Resolution 194(III) passed in December 1948. The solution of that vast human problem is for urgent consideration as part of the just and lasting settlement which was the object of Security Council Resolution 242 of last November.

When he spoke in the General Assembly on the 8th of October the Foreign Foreign Minister of Israel referred to this and made certain proposals for dealing with the long term problem as part of a plan for permanent peace.

The proposals he made were these: “A conference of Middle Eastern States should be convened, together with the Governments contributing to refugee relief and the specialised agencies of the United Nations, in order to chart a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem in the framework of a lasting peace and the integration of refugees into productive life. This conference can be called in advance of peace negotiations.

“Under the peace settlement, joint refugee integration and rehabilitation commissions should be established by the signatories in order to approve agreed projects for refugee integration in the Middle East, with regional and international aid.”

Those are important proposals, but it is not my intention to discuss them now. They and other proposals will be for consideration in the course of consultations directed to the solution of the long-term problem in the search for an overall political settlement.

Today I wish to address our attention not to long-term purposes but to one immediate aim.

What is to be done to rescue more than a quarter of a million men, women and children who crossed over the Jordan from their homes and camps during and after the fighting of June last year and now exist in extreme hardship, many of them on the hills of Eastern Jordan? Nothing is more urgent than that. The severity of the winter will greatly intensify their misery. Many of them have homes, stone houses, to go back to on the other side of the Jordan Valley. They could go home tomorrow.

The Security Council in its Resolution 237 of June last year and the General Assembly in its Resolution 2252 of July last year called for their return to be facilitated. It is a remarkable fact that both these resolutions were passed unanimously.

Dr. Michelmore rightly invited special attention to the desperate plight of these people in his report.

Foreign Minister Eban in his speech to the Assembly on the 8 of October spoke of the need for an interim measure for the forth-coming winter. He spoke of the need to intensify and accelerate action not only to unite families but also to deal with hardship. I like the sound of those words, “intensify” and “accelerate”. He said that he had particularly in mind those who crossed to the East Bank during the June 1967 fighting.

He spoke of hardship cases, and we cannot doubt the extent of the hardship. The great majority of those who left their homes are enduring hardship now. The hardship will become much greater as this year ends and next year begins. I do not believe it is necessary to appeal for the widest and most humane and most urgent interpretation of the proposals which the Israel Government has made.

As the Secretary-General said to us last Monday: “It cannot be questioned that the plight of many of the refugees could best be relieved immediately by their return to their homes and to the camps which they formerly occupied.” And he went on: “I think it is necessary to state that if the camps on the West Bank could again serve the original purpose, and if the displaced persons could return to their former homes, a long step could have been taken towards reducing the hardships faced by a large number of the refugees and displaced persons in Jordan.”

My own Government has, consistently pressed for action to deal with this immediate problem, the problem of those who crossed the Jordan during and after the June war. We have emphasised this immediate need on every possible occasion.

More than a year ago my Foreign Secretary at that time spoke in the Assembly greatly regretting that there had not been more progress in the return of innocent people to their homes.

This is what my Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart, said to the Assembly when he spoke here last month: "In the work which will be necessary I believe much emphasis must be laid on the problem of the refugees. I am glad to note that the Israel Government intends to introduce new measures to hasten the return to their homes of those who fled during the fighting last year. I very much hope these new measures will lead to the speedy return, before the rigours of the winter, of all those who wish to go back".

Mr. Stewart concluded by saying that if we had the conviction that there was going to be a real beginning in solving the refugee problem, "that would transform the atmosphere and we should be in sight of that real, just and lasting peace that all in the Middle East so urgently need. But there must be no more delay."

No more delay in action to transform the atmosphere, a speedy return home. Those are the aims which could be met at once.

Perhaps I may also be permitted to recall what I said in the Security Council on the 10 of June last year while the fighting was still going on. I said then: "If my voice can be heard, if the voices we speak here can be heard so far away, I would greatly hope that the people of the hills of Samaria will stay where they are. I believe that they will suffer much more if they leave."

Would that our voices had been heard then. Much suffering would indeed have been averted.

Now my suggestion is this.

We cannot hope to solve the whole refugee problem here and now. The urgency and importance of that main task cannot be over-estimated, but the immediate purpose should be to separate out the problem of the "newly displaced persons" as they are called in the official jargon, those who left their homes or UNRWA camps during and after last year's fighting, those who have homes or camps to go back to. Let them be dealt with first.

And if anyone should say that this humanitarian act will increase dangers of violence, I would reply that the dangers of violence are not more from people living in their homes than they are from people living through the winter in the hardships and humiliation of exile.

Let me add a plea for urgency. I have myself seen men, women and children die of exposure in the snows of a Jordan winter. There is no time to lose, and no time for bureaucratic delays on either side. The passport for immediate return should be evidence that those coming back from the East have homes to go to and the wish to go back.

What a transformation in the atmosphere there would be if a generous, a magnanimous gesture could now be made.

And after all, when you come to think of it, it is not asking a lot that people should be allowed to go home. Surely this is an elementary human right.

So I advocate that we should not allow ourselves to be confused by disputes over the exact numbers involved or by all the complications and difficulties of wider issues. Let a start be made by allowing the new refugees to go home.

There is one other parallel action which could be taken at once. That is to allow the existing refugee camps near Jericho and elsewhere on the West Bank to be occupied again. Dr. Michelmore in his report says "In relation to UNRWA, its capacity to help is reduced by the fact that some of its best camps, schools, clinics and other facilities stand idle in Jericho and other camps on the West Bank are partly empty while the former inhabitants eke out a bare subsistence in tented camps and other temporary accommodation in east Jordan . . . the incongruity of having to improvise and expend limited resources, while decent permanent camps and facilities lie idle on the West Bank, is striking".

"Incongruity" indeed. I can think of other words. It is wasteful. It is surely indefensible.

Moreover these partly empty camps—there are, I believe, nearly fifty thousand vacancies in the Jericho camps alone—could surely be used to give temporary shelter to those now in tented camps in the hills who were previously living permanently west of the Jordan, as staging camps in the first place and then once more to house those refugees long registered with UNRWA who joined the general exodus in the June war.

Allow me for a minute or two to reflect on the whole situation we face in the Near East.

Nearly a year ago we passed unanimously a resolution in the Security Council. The principles and purposes on which we then agreed are accepted by all. We know the solution. That is the extraordinary fact. We know now what our destination is. We shall reach it in the end.

The only question is whether that destination is to be reached through blood and suffering or over the dry land of common sense.

For a year we have been searching for a first step in the right direction. Often the first step is the most difficult.

If we could now take a first step on firm ground, then as my Foreign Secretary said, the atmosphere would be transformed. The sincerity of the search for peace would be clearly shown. Mistrust and suspicion would begin to diminish. There would be hope again.

The Arabs could look forward to the restitution of their territories. The Israelis could look forward to a permanent peace within secure and recognised frontiers—a peace based not on a perpetuation of hate but on a beginning of mutual respect. The road ahead would still be long and difficult. But at least we would have started.

What better start could there be than to allow innocent men and women and children to come down from the hills and go home?

If we could make that start this month, this November, then I am optimistic enough to believe that the way would be clear for new hopeful developments. We could turn to deal with the greater refugee problem

in a better spirit, we could sustain and speed the efforts of the indefatigable Dr. Jarring, we might even by taking the first step have ensured our eventual arrival at our destination.

We would have taken a step in the right direction to avoid a catastrophe so beastly and so bloody that we can scarcely imagine its scale or scope.

I realise that to take this first step calls for a sense of urgency and also for imagination and magnanimity and courage. Without such qualities we are unlikely to break out of the deadlock which we now face. We are justified, so I believe, in making an appeal that these qualities should be forthcoming before it is too late.

Perhaps we are fortunate that in this situation so complex and so dangerous we have something good we can do at once. The crying human need could unite us instead of dividing us.

I have no hesitation in saying that anyone who opposes help to the refugees is an enemy of a just settlement. Equally I have no hesitation in saying that those who come forward now without expectation of political advantage or national gain to bring comfort to those in deep distress will be working for a permanent peace. For they will have shown that what matters most is not political advantage or national gain but human decency and a considerate compassion and a sense of justice.

### ANNEX XIII

#### **STATEMENT BY MR. J. H. LAMBERT, IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 2 DECEMBER 1968**

##### **United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees : Report of the Commissioner-General**

My delegation has already intervened to make a plea for a magnanimous gesture permitting the return to their homes and camps of those who crossed over to the East Bank of the River Jordan during and after the hostilities of June 1967. My delegation has taken note of the thoughtful presentation on these matters made by the representative of Israel in his statement to the Committee on 26 November. I now turn to other matters dealt with by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA in his Annual Report circulated as Supplement No. 13 (A/7213).

In the introduction to his report Dr. Michelmore has indicated the matters of prime concern to him and to us all which will have to be faced in the coming year. The current mandate of UNRWA is due to expire on 30 June, 1969; further improvements are highly desirable in the educational and health services provided to the refugees; the Agency's financial situation continues to cause Dr. Michelmore serious concern. Though emergency aid from many quarters, including my own country, came in immediately and generously after the June 1967 hostilities, the Commissioner-General fears in particular that, with the passage of time, interest in the refugees and



the scale of aid will almost inevitably begin to dwindle. These factors give rise to much concern. I will deal with each subject in turn.

On finance, my delegation feels reluctantly bound to agree with the Commissioner-General's statement in paragraph 35 of the introduction to the report, that a further increase in the Agency's expenditure appears inevitable in 1969. Dr. Michelmore goes on to say that he believes it would not be feasible or realistic to solve the problems of the likely deficit for 1969 by reducing services to the refugees; and that increased income is therefore absolutely essential. My delegation agrees with the Commissioner-General that UNRWA's remaining working capital should not be used to cover any further deficit. Yet, in the interests of the refugees themselves, UNRWA's ability to help the refugees must in our view be planned within the limits of its income. Additional voluntary contributions to the Agency's finances are therefore absolutely essential—and my delegation believes that the Agency has a right to look for such additional contributions from countries which so far have contributed little or nothing towards the Agency's costs, while at the same time publicly expressing great concern about the condition of the refugees. A brief glance at Table 20 on pages 75 and 76 of the Report, which lists the contributors to UNRWA since 1950, reveals some notable absentees. I do not think that it is necessary to remind this Committee that over 90 per cent of the voluntary contributions to the Agency's budget have come from a mere handful of countries. My own country's contribution in 1969 to the Agency's budget will, once again, be substantial. Although some countries, including my own, face grave economic difficulties, we have nevertheless responded generously to appeals to keep up our voluntary contributions and to provide emergency contributions in special circumstances to the Agency. My delegation now feels that the time has come for these contributors to be joined by those, both big and small, who for one reason or another have not recently responded to the Commissioner-General's appeals. Let them now match their protestations of interest with a solid contribution in cash or in kind. Mere words and sentiments will not stave off hunger this winter.

In paragraph 41 of his report the Commissioner-General suggests that the General Assembly might wish to give further consideration to the proposal made two years ago that one means of improving the present basis of UNRWA's financing might be to transfer the Agency's administrative expenses of some \$4 million a year to the assessed budget of the UN. My delegation does not favour this suggestion, since it might adversely affect the flow of voluntary contributions to the Agency and thus be self-defeating.

To sum up, my delegation hopes that additional voluntary contributions will be forthcoming on a considerable scale in 1969. If this happens, there should be no need to reduce the scale of UNRWA's educational and training services, as these in our view make the greatest contribution towards the integration of the refugees into the economic life of the region, and give the rising generation hope of a better life in future and their parents some little comfort for the sadness of the past. My delegation's criterion for settling priorities, should additional funds not be forthcoming, has been that the Agency's educational and training services should be reduced last. But if it becomes clear in the next few months that new funds are not likely

to be forthcoming, in spite of the Secretary-General's and the General Assembly's appeals, it may be that an immediate review of the Agency's expenditure on administration and services should be undertaken to see what operational economies should be made. Needless to say, the return of persons displaced by the war of June 1967 to their homes on the West Bank of the Jordan would considerably help the Agency's finances. Furthermore, any progress towards the completion of the rectification of ration rolls makes funds available to use in other fields. My delegation welcomes in particular the completion of the rectification of ration rolls which has occurred recently in Lebanon.

My delegation warmly welcomes the co-operation and assistance which UNRWA has received since the June war from other international organisations and agencies, voluntary agencies and non-governmental sources. We earnestly hope that this help and support will continue. I would mention in this connection the generous help given by the World Food Programme as emergency aid for the "new" refugees. We recognise that continuance of the World Food Programme Emergency Aid may be necessary until such time as funds, for which our Secretary-General has recently made a special appeal, are available to replace the World Food Programme's generous contributions.

Let me now turn to the question of the Agency's future mandate. It is already quite clear that an extension of UNRWA's services beyond 30 June, 1969 is essential. The Commissioner-General has placed before us two possible alternatives: either an extension for as long a fixed term as possible, or an extension for an indefinite period, subject to annual review by the General Assembly. The latter would, in Dr. Michelmore's view, be a more flexible arrangement administratively, while still keeping complete control in the hands of the General Assembly. My delegation feels that an extension of the mandate for an indefinite period might be taken in some quarters to suggest that this Committee's considered view is that the Palestine refugee problem is going to be with us unsolved for ever. I am sure that this is not in fact the Committee's view. My delegation would have preferred to see the Agency's mandate renewed for a period of five years, subject to annual review by the Assembly. We felt that renewal in principle for five years should meet the Commissioner-General's concern for renewal for a reasonably lengthy period, so that adequate forward budgetary planning can be undertaken. We also felt that the renewal, for whatever term, should be subject to annual review, so that if promising developments on the wider scene occurred during the new mandate the General Assembly would be in a position to vary or terminate the Agency's new mandate at the appropriate time during the coming five years. However, we realise that the mandate can in fact be reviewed whenever this Committee so recommends to the General Assembly. For this reason we are pleased to support the draft resolution submitted by the US delegation and before us today. We once again repeat the plea which Lord Caradon made in this Committee on 29 November that any resolution tabled on the subject of those displaced as a result of the June 1967 hostilities should have impartial sponsorship and universal support. Its aim above all should be to serve the interests of the refugees themselves.

**STATEMENT BY MR. MARK ALLEN IN THE SECOND  
COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,  
5 NOVEMBER 1968**

**UN Conference on Trade and Development**

We have two things to discuss under this item. The first thing is the present state of affairs in UNCTAD itself: its policy, its work, a little of its history. And this aspect we might consider as focussed in the Report of the Second Session of the Conference. The second thing we have to think about is UNCTAD's function and place in the Second Development Decade. And this we can think of as concentrated in the report of the recent Session of the Trade and Development Board, where, amongst other things, they discussed UNCTAD's place in the Decade in the light of what had been said at ECOSOC earlier this year.

First, then, UNCTAD as revealed in the New Delhi report, UNCTAD in itself. Now, UNCTAD has been in existence as a permanent organ of the United Nations for some four years. This is not a long time. UNCTAD may not be an infant prodigy, but all the same it is certainly not a weak child. We can all draw encouragement from the progress that we have made in UNCTAD in the last four years. Radical changes in economic and commercial attitudes naturally take time to bring about but they are taking place.

It is easy, but unwise, to forget that it is in UNCTAD that members of the UN are putting into reality their recognition that the most-favoured-nation principle is not the only foundation on which the future structure of world trade should rest. It is in UNCTAD that new economic relations between the various countries and groups in the world are finding their expression. All this is new and good and important.

UNCTAD has served above all to focus attention more effectively than ever before on the economic problems and aspirations of the developing countries. And when I say "attention", I mean particularly the attention of a wider range of decision-makers around the world than are usually involved in international meetings. The first UNCTAD Conference in 1964 was the first time that many Ministers of Finance and Commerce and many of their senior officials attended this type of international meeting. Many senior people representing advanced countries were there first confronted with the problems and aspirations of the developing countries. Reality replaced the written word. And this has had a lasting effect. UNCTAD has brought together, co-operatively, many minds—and hearts—in the long-term effort to tackle these problems and to realise these aspirations. The problems are many of them exceedingly complex and difficult. The aspirations are high. But we are all now on the same path—thanks to UNCTAD.

Many people are disappointed with the results of the second session of UNCTAD. My delegation can understand this. Of course, some people certainly expected too much. And also, as the distinguished representative of Malaysia suggested in Plenary on 21 October, the problems discussed at New Delhi were often too complex to lend themselves to simple conclusions.

And the distinguished Secretary-General of UNCTAD said the other day in ECOSOC that we need more suitable techniques for dealing with these problems. This is very true. The best way of tackling them is almost certainly not to throw them every three or four years at a big international conference. All the same and despite the disappointments which some people feel, my delegation considers that the second session of the Conference did produce positive achievements, and their importance will show itself in the follow-up action. We were encouraged to note that both the distinguished President of the Second Session, Mr. Dinesh Singh, and the distinguished Secretary-General of UNCTAD, took much the same view. And we think that this applies to all the sectors of the Conference: preferences, commodities, the volume and terms of aid, supplementary finance and the rest. Of course a whole range of problems remains to be settled in all these sectors. But the question is did the Second UNCTAD Conference move measurably nearer to some of the practical goals? We think that it did.

Having said that let me hasten to agree with what Dr. Prebisch said at the opening of his admirable statement yesterday, namely that we should speak of the future and not of the past. As the distinguished representative of Ghana said, it will be for the historians to pass judgment on what was achieved at the second UNCTAD. We are not historians, and it is our task to press on with the follow up work after New Delhi. There is certainly much to do.

One obvious instance is the work that has already been done since New Delhi in the direction of international agreements on commodities, especially cocoa and sugar. We warmly echo the hopes which Dr. Prebisch has expressed that an agreement on cocoa will soon be a reality. We have recently been heartened to learn of the successful conclusion of the UNCTAD Sugar Conference. The new international agreement on sugar comes after many years of frustrated hopes. Much credit for this is due to the Chairman of the Sugar Conference, and we offer to our distinguished colleague from Jamaica our congratulations to Mr. Lightbourne, the Jamaican Minister of Trade and Industry, for his achievement. The distinguished Secretary-General of UNCTAD also deserves much credit. It is upon his proposals on all the major issues that the core of the new agreement rests. UNCTAD must indeed go on, as agreed at New Delhi, to work on other commodities.

In his statement yesterday, the distinguished Secretary-General of UNCTAD quoted a number of other things which also require attention. One that almost goes without saying is the elaboration of a preference system for manufactures and semi-manufactures. There is work to be done in the field of invisibles. The problems of the least developed countries also deserve much further attention. Dr. Prebisch also emphasised the importance of supplementary finance, on which the expanded intergovernmental group has had its first meeting and is due to report to the Trade and Development Board by the middle of next year. The New Delhi resolutions on the volume and the terms of financial resources transferred to developing countries are bound to mean at the very least that the Governments of donor countries will consider most carefully, in the light of their own economic situations, the steps that they can take to reach the new targets. This certainly applies to my own country and indeed on the terms of aid we do in fact already

provide well over 90 per cent of our aid either in grant or as interest-free loans. As regards the new 1 per cent target my Government takes this most seriously. We cannot at this time go beyond it with any undertaking to reach the 1 per cent target on a particular date. All we can say is that we will use our utmost endeavours to reach it as soon as possible.

This, then, is what we see as UNCTAD's post-Delhi function: the elaboration of the Delhi decisions, the examination of the problems unsolved at Delhi, the patient exploration of new economic territory in the directions pointed out at Delhi: hard work, and an unremitting search for mutually acceptable solutions of a number of difficult but not insoluble problems.

I now turn to what we see as UNCTAD's function and place in the Second Development Decade. And on this matter I will not conceal from the Committee that my Government has had a number of misgivings about one resolution—No. 47—which the Trade and Development Board adopted, by no means unanimously, on 21 September. That resolution can bear the interpretation that it represents an attempt to gather unto UNCTAD functions in relation to the Decade that properly belong to ECOSOC. It can be interpreted, in Stock Exchange language, as a takeover bid. Such an attempt my delegation would have been bound to resist. It was therefore with much pleasure that we listened to the speeches of the distinguished Secretary-General of UNCTAD last week at ECOSOC and yesterday before this Committee. We strongly agree with his views about UNCTAD's functions and its relations to ECOSOC. There is much work for UNCTAD to do on the Decade on the subjects of aid and growth. This work, as is obviously right, already for the most part devolves upon UNCTAD from the Delhi Conference. It must push ahead on trade; on the transfer of financial resources; and on measures to reduce what Dr. Prebisch aptly called the external vulnerability of developing countries. ECOSOC for its part will have plenty of work to do in co-ordinating and, again as Dr. Prebisch put it, integrating the work of the various parts of the UN system, including UNCTAD itself. This undoubtedly is the way to go forward. And if this chief principle, this division of responsibilities, is accepted, we think that the details should fall into place without too much difficulty. And by detail I mean, amongst other things, questions of subordinate machinery. On these, my delegation will probably have more to say when we reach the item on the Decade. But there is one point which I should like to make about it now.

This question of subordinate machinery is of course important. But it is possible to argue that the question has had undue prominence as a result, in part, of certain aspects of the group system. My delegation has noted with great interest the suggestions of the distinguished President of the Second Session, Mr. Dinesh Singh, and of the distinguished representative of Ghana, to the effect that the group system in UNCTAD has become altogether too rigid. We believe that these suggestions are well founded. No one who was at the New Delhi session could fail to remember how we all suffered there from the over-rigidity of the group system. At times it seemed to some of us that no real communication between the groups was possible, despite all the "contact groups" and "working groups" and

“ chairman’s informal groups ”, whose meetings overflowed the notice boards. My delegation is not of course proposing the abandonment of the group system. It is valuable, and indeed it is formalised and crystallised in Resolution 1995. But we do believe that very little is to be gained, and much can be lost, by throwing everything into a formal confrontation between the groups. One of the good things about this Committee is the ease with which ideas and contacts flow amongst us all, regardless of groupage or of economic status.

If the basis on which we should go forward to the Second Decade is the division of responsibilities between UNCTAD and ECOSOC to which I have just referred, then the manner in which we should go forward must surely be the harmony, the confidence and mutual trust that we all value and try to foster here, and for which we are so much indebted to you, Mr. Chairman, and the rest of the Bureau, and to the UN Secretariat.

If I have spoken at some length it is because of the importance which my delegation attaches to the work of UNCTAD. I have tried to show that we believe it has a most significant and definite part to play in the future, especially in relation to the Second Decade. We shall listen with great interest to the views of other delegations on this very important matter, and we look forward to rejoining the debate at a later stage when views have crystallised into drafts of resolutions.

## ANNEX XV

### STATEMENT BY LORD CARADON IN THE PLENARY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 13 December 1968

#### UNCTAD : Membership of South Africa

My delegation will vote against the resolution which came from the Second Committee.

The resolution contained two elements. On the one we had no doubts. On the other we had very serious doubts indeed.

We have no doubts that the world detests the policies of apartheid practised in South Africa, and so do we. They are policies rightly detested by almost every nation and every people.

It is the method by which the co-sponsors of the resolution have attempted to take action to try to express their abhorrence of those policies on which we have such serious doubts.

We believe that by proposing in effect to exclude or to expel South Africa from UNCTAD the resolution raises an issue which goes far beyond that of attitudes towards South Africa and her racial policies. There is clearly at stake here a constitutional issue of fundamental importance to all Members of the United Nations.

This has been emphasised in the opinion of the United Nations Legal Counsel, which is of special importance coming from this authoritative and impartial source.

In the view of my delegation, when—as in the case of UNCTAD—the General Assembly establishes a sub-organ and by the founding resolution includes in the membership all members of the United Nations expressly describing them as such, thus conferring membership on them in their capacity as United Nations Members, it is clearly recognising that participation of United Nations Members in that body is a right or privilege of membership of the United Nations Organisation itself. We have therefore the gravest doubts on the procedure which has been proposed.

I repeat that the United Kingdom holds no brief for South Africa in its evil policies of apartheid. But we have consistently opposed the thesis that political acceptability should be the criterion for membership of the United Nations or its bodies. We are on record as stating the conviction that the United Nations must seek to be a universal Organisation.

We should not exclude particular states or governments (provided they are genuine states or governments) on the grounds that we do not happen to approve of their regime or their policies. Any attempt to exclude any individual member from bodies which are open to the whole United Nations membership is discrimination, and that discrimination would not only be extremely doubtful constitutionally; it would weaken the representative character of this Organisation.

I go further. I am sure that I am not alone in objecting to discrimination in all its manifestations. Discrimination is the issue before us. I was surprised to find some Africans apparently speaking in favour of discrimination.

The distinguished representative of Kenya this morning told us that discrimination must be eliminated not only in Africa but in the world. It should certainly be eliminated from the United Nations.

It would be doing no service to our reputation here at the United Nations if practices of discrimination which we see in such contemptible form in South Africa were imported into the United Nations Organisation itself. I very much hope that we shall not again hear calls for racial votes in this Assembly. I prefer to remember the statements of President Nyerere when he said “What we fear are the evils of racialism in majorities and minorities alike”. Those are the words of President Nyerere.

Amongst the members of the United Nations I strongly feel that there is no other basis for our relationship here than the basis of equality.

It would be intolerable if we were to be misled into a state of affairs when selected individual members of the United Nations were to be subject to arbitrary boycotts and proscriptions, to be told when and where they might speak and when and where they could not, to be directed as to which United Nations bodies they might attend and which they could not—all such decisions to be dependent on strong feelings on questions of great importance no doubt but entirely irrelevant to the subjects to be considered. This would indeed be a mockery of democratic practice.

The Assembly is constituted on the principle of one nation one vote. Every member has a right to be heard. I for one will defend that right as fundamental to the whole concept of a representative world organisation: certainly I shall not be deterred from doing so by those who come here claiming that they have a monopoly of moral motive.

In the light of these broad and far-reaching considerations which, I repeat, go far beyond the issue of condemnation of South Africa's racial policies, my delegation will vote against the resolution.

One final comment. By seeking to give expression to the wide hatred of South Africa's racial policies in this way the very opposite of the purpose of the sponsors could be achieved. Nothing would give greater encouragement to the South African Government in pursuing its evil policies than to see the United Nations divided—divided by proposals which appear to be vindictive and discriminatory. That is why so many of us so strongly regret that the resolution has been forced to a vote. That is why we shall not hesitate in voting against it.

## ANNEX XVI

### STATEMENT BY LADY GAITSKELL IN THE PLENARY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 26 NOVEMBER 1968

#### War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity

My delegation will vote against the draft Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations on war crimes and crimes against humanity as annexed to draft resolution 1 in document A/7342.

I should make it clear that my Government has consistently supported the proposal that there should be no time limit on the initiation of legal proceedings, or the imposition of punishment, with respect to war crimes and crimes against humanity. There is no such time limit in the United Kingdom, and we would have had no difficulty in supporting a Convention designed to establish this principle in international law. We have also recognised that there is a good case on human rights grounds for some form of international action. We have had our share of suffering from the Nazis and we do not speak from ignorance of what other countries have suffered also.

We have two basic objections to the text. First, it was always our understanding, from the time when the Polish Delegation proposed in the Human Rights Commission in 1965 that a Convention should be prepared, that it should be confined to the simple proposition that there should be no time limit for the prosecution and punishment of those accused of committing war crimes and crimes against humanity. This appears also to have been the Secretary-General's understanding since the first draft of the Convention which he prepared was limited to this proposition. In particular he did not seek to produce new definitions of war crimes and crimes against humanity and we consider that the General Assembly has strayed from the original purpose by attempting in Article I of the Convention to redefine these crimes. The consequence of this is that the basis on which states take action against those accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity has been put in doubt. Moreover, the detailed enumeration of crimes against humanity in Article I(b) creates particular difficulties. These go



beyond the scope of the existing rules of international law as laid down, for example, in the Charter of the Nurnberg Tribunal and the Red Cross Conventions of 1949. This is bound to create difficulties for those states whose domestic law is at present based on these rules. In addition, the enumeration is imprecise. To take but one example, the phrase "inhuman acts" must be specifically circumscribed, as was done in the Nurnberg Charter, if it is to have any meaning at all. As it is used in Article I(b) it is capable of being stretched to suit any individual interpretation. This is a slippery slope leading to a situation in which an individual may be persecuted by arbitrary decision of a particular regime. This is just what we should be on guard against.

The particular reference in this Article to "inhuman acts resulting from the policy of apartheid" is misplaced. My Government's attitude to apartheid is well known. We deplore and condemn it and we have said so on innumerable occasions in the United Nations and elsewhere. But we are here concerned with a legal instrument, or what purports to be one. Either this reference to apartheid adds nothing to the phrase "inhuman acts", in which case it is unnecessary, or it adds something and implies that inhuman acts committed in consequence of the policy of apartheid are worse than identical acts committed in other circumstances, in which case it is objectionable in principle.

Our second basic objection is that the Convention fails to make any allowance for those states which are faced with the problem of respecting the principle of non-retroactivity in criminal law. As I have indicated, the United Kingdom is not faced with this particular problem in respect of the prosecution and punishment of war criminals and those guilty of crimes against humanity, but we consider that the position of other states having statutes of limitations which have expired should have been taken into account.

Our objections to the Convention do not end with those which I have already mentioned. We consider, for example, that, as proposed by several delegations in the Third Committee and as originally provided for in the Secretary-General's draft, the definition of war crimes in Article I(a) should have been limited to war crimes of a grave nature. In our view the fact that the definition of these crimes has been framed so widely as to embrace, for example, minor acts of looting, is likely to create problems. We also consider that Article III has no place in the Convention. This touches upon the very complex question of extradition and it was never intended that the Convention should attempt to deal with this. Consideration of the question of extradition in relation to war criminals and those guilty of crimes against humanity is in any case being undertaken separately in the United Nations. This Article, as well as Articles II and IV, were supported in the Third Committee by the positive vote of a small minority only. Slightly less than one-fifth of the total membership of the United Nations voted for these Articles. Surely this is not the way to write international conventions?

In short, we will vote against this Convention since we consider that it is a thoroughly vague and imprecise instrument. We are opposed to attempts to write international conventions in this way.

## ANNEX XVII

### STATEMENT BY LADY GAITSKELL IN THE THIRD COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 2 DECEMBER 1968

#### International Year for Human Rights

My delegation considers this item as the most important one on our agenda, and we regret that our original proposal that it should be taken first did not find general support. We shall not have as much time as we would have wished for doing justice to the developments which have taken place during the International Year for Human Rights.

I should like first of all to pay tribute to the Government of Jamaica, on whose initiative 1968 was designated as Human Rights Year. The Jamaican delegation deserves its reputation as a watchdog for Human Rights.

The measures and activities which have been undertaken during the International Year are noteworthy. The Report in document A/7195 and the Addenda to it contain much information about useful steps which member states and others have taken to make people properly aware of the importance of Human Rights. The measures add up to a substantial effort by the international community.

The measures undertaken by the United Nations itself are impressive, too. There has been a tremendous outflow of information, and I am sure that the gratifying list which Mr. Schreiber gave us of the number of additional signatures, ratifications and accessions to human rights instruments this year owes much to the great educational job done by the United Nations. Mention must be made of the work done by the Secretariat, specialised agencies and regional inter-governmental organisations, which have underlined the human rights aspects of their work. Last but not least, I should like to applaud the way in which non-governmental organisations and thousands of private individuals have contributed. I will only mention two among the many conferences organised by non-governmental organisations during the year: the World Assembly for Human Rights, held in Montreal in March; and the International Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations for Human Rights, held in Paris in September. I do not think we realise that when we speak of participation it is largely through these non-governmental organisations that thousands of ordinary people can be reached and involved.

I do not intend to give a full account of how the International Year was celebrated in the United Kingdom. In my district in London they are holding the last meeting on the 10th of December of their campaign for Human Rights where a number of speakers will give a conspectus on human rights as furthered or retarded during 1968. I am the Chairman of this campaign, though my work in Parliament and in this Committee have sometimes made me an absentee Chairman.

The United Kingdom has sent two reports to the Secretary-General. Among the steps taken I would like to mention that the United Kingdom Government signed the Human Rights Covenants on the 16th of September, and acceded to the Protocol relating to the status of Refugees on the 4th of September. We have recently introduced in Parliament a Bill to enable

us to accede to the 1948 Genocide Convention. My Government is also reviewing other United Nations instruments to which the United Kingdom is not a party. As Mr. Schreiber mentioned in his excellent statement introducing this item, the United Kingdom was host to a United Nations seminar in London in June of this year, on Freedom of Association.

The Government also made a contribution of £10,000 to the United Kingdom Committee for Human Rights Year, which has carried out a large programme of measures designed to give as many people as possible a greater knowledge and insight into their human rights.

I have listened with great interest to the statements made by distinguished delegates on the progress made in their own countries over the whole field of human rights and the story is a creditable one, but what does it all add up to in the advancement and protection of human rights?

Why did the NGO's Conference in Paris allude to "the repeated and flagrant violations of human rights in all countries and in all fields during the anniversary year"?

We feel there is much cause for concern among those dedicated to progress in human rights.

In some cases this has been due to the continuation of policies and practices which existed before 1968. In others, it is due to disturbing new developments which have taken place during the course of this year. The Secretary-General himself at the Tehran Conference stated "it is clear that in spite of greater awareness and demands for the respect of the individual, serious violations of human rights including resort of violence and terror continue to occur in a number of places and these are made known and publicised more than ever". I feel I must cite certain matters which have given particular cause for concern. In doing so, I wish to emphasise that I am not seeking to embitter relations with those responsible. These matters are such that we feel that the United Nations, and this Committee especially, would be failing in its duty if it did not come to the defence of the rights of the individual whoever he may be and wherever he may be living.

The continuation by the Government of the Republic of South Africa of the repugnant and indefensible policy of apartheid remains the most blatant example of the denial of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the majority of the people of that country. The segregation of the races and the officially advocated policies of racial discrimination in Southern Africa are an affront to the spirit of the International Year for Human Rights.

The situation in the Middle East is another which gives cause for concern to those working for the promotion and protection of human rights. We sincerely hope that the circumstances which have given rise to this concern will change and bring about a situation in which all the people living there are able to realise their basic rights to the fullest possible extent.

Among the several new and disturbing developments during the course of 1968 I must mention the occupation of a member state of this Organisation, which occurred in August of this year. This was a major setback to the hopes of those who have worked during this year to secure better promotion and protection of human rights throughout the world. The actions

of other members of this Organisation led to infringements of and encroachments upon numerous human rights and fundamental freedoms in the country concerned ; their right to self-determination, their right to freedom of information, their right to freedom of assembly, their right to freedom of speech, and their right to freedom of movement. These are but some of the basic rights of the people of this country which have been trespassed upon. Those responsible for these developments had only some three months earlier endorsed the Proclamation of Tehran in which they had re-dedicated themselves to upholding the very rights in the Universal Declaration which they subsequently trampled upon.

Some delegations have expressed scepticism about freedom of speech to which others of us attach fundamental importance. I might point out to those delegations who are so quick to criticise us for any breaches of principle in our own country that it is our freedom of speech which provides them with the ammunition to do so.

Another situation rooted in the past and which has distressed us is the continued evidence of widespread and officially inspired religious persecution in the Soviet Union although their constitution purports to guarantee freedom of religious worship to all its citizens. Other delegations have referred to evidence of anti-semitism in that country, but my delegation would like to stress that not only Jews are being persecuted for their faith, though they are suffering worst of all. All religious denominations are the victim of this policy. A recent statement on the subject included the following: "Religion was, and is, our serious ideological antagonist. One cannot relax the struggle with it in a single sector, and the attacks should be carried on over a broad front". I am quoting from Pravda of 18 April 1968. This is not a simple matter of atheistic propaganda. We have, for instance, noticed a fluctuating but ruthless campaign conducted against the Baptist Reform Movement. The large Muslim minority in the Soviet Union is also subjected to a continuous campaign designed to undermine its customs and beliefs. While speaking of religious discriminations we must refer to the regrettable resurgence of anti-semitism in Poland. It is masked by attacks on what is called International Zionism. The Nazis used to cloak their anti-semitism by speaking of the threat from International Jewish Financiers. It is ironic that this kind of conspiratorial formula can still be put forward seriously.

I am conscious, when making these remarks about what has been going on in other countries, that our own record during 1968 has not been an unblemished one. It is well-known that there have been developments during the year which have not helped towards the improvement of, and might even have exacerbated, race relations in the United Kingdom. Much remains to be done in this field, but a major advance has recently been made with the coming into operation of the 1968 Race Relations Act, on the very Tuesday we began this item. This is a very comprehensive piece of legislation and makes discrimination on grounds of race, colour or ethnic or national origins unlawful in the fields of housing, employment and the provision of goods, facilities and services. The latter include, among other things, insurance and credit facilities, education, transport and professional services.

I turn now to action at the international level. We cannot help being uneasy about the way in which human rights questions are being dealt with

by the international community. We consider that the United Nations should be concerned with the promotion and protection of human rights everywhere. Human rights, like peace, are indivisible, and if they are infringed in one place they are jeopardised in another. We fully accept, as I have already implied, that the gross violations of human rights in Southern Africa deserve special attention by our Organisation. At the same time we feel strongly that while paying this special attention to Southern Africa we should not abdicate our responsibilities for doing what we can to protect human rights elsewhere. At present we are in danger, as a recent writer on human rights has put it, of shrinking the notion of human rights to fit a particular situation. We consider, in the terms of Economic and Social Council Resolution 1235 of the Forty-Second session that the United Nations should consider situations which reveal a consistent pattern of violations of human rights. It was a matter of regret to us, therefore, that at its last session the Human Rights Commission failed to take any action whatsoever on the two cases of suspected violations of human rights referred to it. Whatever were the merits of these particular cases, a better effort should have been made to get at the facts. If the United Nations applies a double standard in dealing with human rights matters, its reputation in the outside world will inevitably be impaired. The whole purpose of United Nations human rights activity would then be put in question.

Turning now to the second part of the item before us, I should like to express my Government's deep appreciation for the arrangements made by the Iranian Government for the Conference in Tehran and the gracious hospitality given to all who participated.

The purpose of the Conference was to review the progress made in the field of human rights; to evaluate the effectiveness of methods used by the United Nations in this field, and to formulate and prepare a programme for future measures. The results of the three-weeks Conference fell short of the expectations of those who wish to see the United Nations become a useful and effective instrument in the human rights field. In particular, the Conference's failure to get to grips with the question of improving the techniques of the machinery available to the United Nations in human rights matters was disappointing. Nevertheless, the achievements of the Conference were by no means negligible. At the top of the list of these achievements we would put the unanimous adoption of the Proclamation of Tehran. We recognise the masterly hand of Ambassador Hoveyda in the literary style of the Proclamation. It is particularly gratifying that 84 countries could support this reaffirmation of the principles of the Universal Declaration. We attach the greatest significance to the provisions in paragraph 5 of the Proclamation which states "The primary aim of the United Nations in the sphere of human rights is the achievement by each individual of the maximum freedom and dignity. For the realisation of this objective, the laws of every country should grant each individual irrespective of race, language, religion or political belief, freedom of expression, of information, of conscience and of religion, as well as the right to participate in the political, economic, cultural and social life of his country".

The Conference adopted a number of useful resolutions which open up new fields of interest. Into this category we would put the resolutions estab-

lishing a new United Nations programme in the field of racial discrimination; on human rights and scientific and technological developments; on the rights of detained persons; on legal aid; on youth; and the important resolution on human rights in armed conflicts. My delegation can claim credit for taking the initiative in two of these proposals.

There are also a number of very interesting ideas in the draft resolutions which the Conference did not have time to deal with, e.g., the Netherlands proposal for a committee of experts on Unratified Conventions and the Nigerian proposal for reforming the international machinery for dealing with human rights questions.

We support the draft resolution in L. 1623/Rev.1, introduced by the distinguished representative of Sweden.

One last word as far as Human Rights are concerned: it is an uphill struggle. Perhaps a truer analogy would be to compare the struggle to the navigation by man of a long winding river, a river which traverses vast and different terrains, a river slow-flowing in some parts, swift flowing and dangerous in others. But no hazard can stop man on his relentless journey towards larger freedoms.

## ANNEX XVIII

### STATEMENT BY LADY GAITSKELL IN THE THIRD COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 12 DECEMBER 1968

#### Human Rights in Southern Africa

It will be no surprise to this Committee that my delegation finds itself unable to support this draft resolution. I should like to make it equally clear that we have considerable sympathy with the spirit which prompted it. That is to say, we share the view of the sponsors that the policy of apartheid, and the subjection of a people by a governing power, are violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

This Committee is right to focus attention on these abuses—wherever they occur. That is our mandate. But my delegation must part company with the sponsors of this draft resolution because of the sweeping language they have used, and because of some of the far reaching legal and political implications.

In the short time at my disposal I can comment only on the main provisions which we should have to oppose.

First, operative paragraph 2. We condemn the policy of racial discrimination of the illegal minority régime in Rhodesia. Distinguished delegates sometimes speak as though they had a monopoly of disapproval, but it was the United Kingdom Prime Minister who condemned the illegal declaration of independence on the 11 November, 1965, and my Government which took the lead in the Security Council in appealing to all countries to follow our lead in breaking off relations with the illegal régime. But we cannot accept the language “*refusal* of the United Kingdom Government to take effective measures” to suppress the illegal régime. Yes, we have refused to use

force—if that is what is meant by “effective measures”. And it is my belief that distinguished delegates from African countries will perhaps at some future stage realise that it was in their best interests that we did refuse. It is easy to start a war—how difficult to stop it, we all know, if we just glance around the world where fighting is going on. With the authority of the Security Council we have all embarked on a policy of mandatory sanctions. It may well be a long haul before we achieve our objective. We accept that. I would ask the Committee to heed the advice of an earlier speaker who urged governments to do their utmost to make the policy of economic sanctions effective, instead of condemning us for not taking action which could so easily have led to much bloodshed and suffering in Africa.

The draft resolution refers in a number of places to “colonialism”. Even before the Universal Declaration of Human Rights we had begun the process of decolonisation—we have pursued this policy steadily over the last 20 years and more. In those few remaining territories where there is a British Governor—but where, may I remind the Committee, the day to day government is in varying degrees carried on by representatives of the people themselves—we reject utterly the thought in this resolution that *this form of colonialism* is a subjection of peoples which requires them to fight for their freedom.

We have serious doubts about the legal implications of operative paragraph 5. We do not agree that freedom fighters in Southern Africa could be regarded as prisoners of war in the precise terms of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

Finally, operative paragraph 7. We have of course already severed relations with the illegal régime in Rhodesia. But to sever relations with a legal government is a most serious step which any Government must weigh carefully before taking. My Government is not prepared to take any such step in relation to *any* country as the result of a debate on the International Year for Human Rights—and one in which delegates have only five minutes to explain why they think this should be done. Surely it is irresponsible for the Third Committee to call for such a step? It is the policy of my Government to remain in relations with these governments and to use our influence—as indeed we are told to do by other resolutions of the United Nations—to remind them of their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

## ANNEX XIX

### STATEMENT BY MR. D. E. T. LUARD, M.P., IN THE FOURTH COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 25 NOVEMBER 1968

#### Decolonisation

It is useful that we should have an opportunity in this debate for a general discussion of the problems of colonialism that remain. This enables us to review the progress made here in the United Nations in recent years on colonial questions, particularly since the adoption of Resolution 1514 of 1960, and to examine the way we should proceed in the future. For it is

clear we are approaching a stage in the work of this Committee when much of its original task will have been completed. It will then be necessary to consider what should be its method of operating and what should be the subject matter of its discussion in the future.

The Committee is still known as the Trusteeship Committee. Originally it was designed to consider only Trust Territories in the strict sense. Today almost all these territories are independent. Only two Trust territories remain and one of these is a Strategic Trust Territory which does not come under the authority of the Assembly. Even among colonial territories of other kinds, on which the Committee has recently spent the bulk of its time, the process of decolonisation is now approaching its end. Among British territories, for example, the overwhelming majority have attained their independence and nearly thirty are now represented in this organisation. Of those that remain, except for Rhodesia which we have already discussed, and Hong Kong which is another very special case of a different kind, all the remaining British territories together only have a population of rather over a million people. Only one of these has a population approaching half a million, four have a population between one and two hundred thousand, and the rest range between Pitcairn with a population of 86 to St. Vincent with a population of 87,000. Certainly, therefore, as has been widely recognised in recent years, one of the main problems facing this Committee in the next few years will be the appropriate final status for territories of this kind: whether independence, association with another state, or some other constitutional status. I will describe in a few moments the main steps in the constitutional development of the remaining British territories towards this final goal over the past year.

Another category of remaining problems are those territories of Southern Africa, mostly of a much larger size than those I have just been describing, which have still not achieved their independence like the other states of Africa. Apart from South West Africa which is discussed elsewhere, these are Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories. Since we have already had separate debates on these territories I will not say more about them now. But I think we probably all agree that these remain the largest and most serious problem of all, to which it is urgently necessary to find a satisfactory solution which will provide freedom and self-government for all their peoples. In this connexion I would only make one further point, re-emphasising a comment I made during the debate on Portuguese territories. I believe there is nearly universal agreement about the ultimate objective in this areas; that is, to bring about a solution that will provide independence and freedom under democratic governments. For this reason I believe that it should normally be possible to formulate resolutions affirming those aims which would win almost universal support, and certainly provoke very few adverse votes. Whether this is possible in particular cases depends to a considerable extent on the procedure adopted in drafting the resolution, and on the degree of consultation between groups that takes place during this process. The precedent established over the recent resolution on Portuguese Territories was an encouraging one and the effect was strikingly demonstrated in the vote that took place on the resolution. In that vote I believe about twelve delegations changed their vote from last year, something like



half of those who had not already voted in favour before. As a result that resolution is far more likely to exert some influence on the Portuguese Government. If this tradition of consultation can be maintained, and if some regard is paid to the doubts of a number of delegations on particular points, I believe it should be possible in many other cases to arrive at nearly unanimous resolutions on questions of this sort, which can demonstrate unmistakably the views of the Organisation on the questions of Southern Africa.

Finally there are a number of peripheral problems affecting colonial territories as a whole which are perhaps relevant to the concerns of this Committee. For example, it is not inappropriate for this Committee to consider in general the economic problems of the remaining dependent territories, especially those of very small size: Article 73 of the Charter, which is the Article that binds all of us on these questions, mentions the obligation to ensure economic advancement in dependent territories. But it is important that such debates, if they are to be of any value, should examine impartially and objectively these problems, and should avoid being converted into purely polemical exercises, reflecting ideological prejudices or cold war aims. Dependent territories, especially those that are very small, have real development problems deserving careful attention. A worthwhile examination requires full factual evidence of the situation in the territories, an objective comparison of their standard of living and levels of wages with those in others already independent, and a study of the benefits and disadvantages which investment from outside, whether private or public, may bring them. It should also include a comparison with the policies adopted by independent developing countries to the same problems. If economic growth is assisted in independent countries by outside investment, the same thing is surely true in dependent territories. And if economic growth is assisted, this will usually promote rather than hinder the attainment of independence, by increasing the standard of living, the standard of education, and the level of political consciousness. The plain fact is that the rate of progress to independence will depend mainly on one thing and one thing only: the policy of the colonial power. The existence of foreign investment does not in itself influence this one way or the other. But it certainly provides a far more valuable heritage for the new government once independence is achieved.

This is not to deny that there is reason for this Committee to be genuinely concerned that independence, when it comes, should be a real and meaningful independence, in the economic as much as in the political sense. Investment from abroad, whether public or private, may increase independence or reduce it according to the conditions attached to its use. The fact that most countries when they become independent choose to receive, and even seek to attract, such investment, private as well as public, suggests that in most circumstances it serves to increase rather than reduce independence. The freedom of any country or territory to choose freely the type of economic relations it undertakes is an essential right of its people. It is the policy of my Government to ensure that, even before independence, locally elected Governments in British territories exercise this freedom. It is of course an important matter of principle that every Government should be free to undertake its foreign economic relations with whatever countries

it chooses to do so. It is a matter particularly to be deplored, for example, that within the last few months, even in Europe, a Government appears to have been prevented from undertaking such economic relations freely by the power which has occupied its territory. If neo-colonialism has any meaning at all, it must presumably be applied to actions of this kind, and all similar attempts to impose a particular economic system. This applies equally, indeed even more strongly, to restraints on independence in the wider, political sense. In the Commonwealth to which my country belongs we attach great importance to the fact that each individual member after attaining sovereignty is free to pursue its own policies in total independence. It is thus a matter of special concern to us to find the name of our association used today to justify a brutal interference in the internal affairs of another state, on the grounds of preserving a "socialist commonwealth" (especially since the boundaries of that commonwealth are left uncertain). For this Committee, which expresses concern over colonialism and "neo-colonialism", such examples of interference and denials of independence and freedom, perhaps the only new expression of colonialism of our age, must surely be a matter of special concern.

I wish now, having considered some of the more general questions of colonialism with which this debate is concerned, to turn to the process of decolonisation as it has been taking place in British territories over the past year.

Once again, in most of these territories still under British administration, this has been a year of substantial constitutional progress. As the Committee knows the majority of those territories which remain are small islands with limited resources, far from the main lines of world communications. This means that they must face, as the Special Committee of 24 has rightly recognised, difficult and peculiar problems which demand special attention. My delegation is thus glad that the Special Committee, in a decision which it reached a few days ago, has accepted the need for a special study of these problems, essentially directed to questions of self-determination and the eventual status appropriate in these cases. My Government will be happy to co-operate in that study if it is approached on constructive lines. The United Kingdom Government cannot yet say exactly what the ultimate constitutional future of a good many of its smaller territories will be. It would be wrong to impose detailed blueprints. A few may wish to proceed to full independence. Others may not. Whatever the future position, as Mr. Thomson, formerly Commonwealth Secretary and now Minister without Portfolio, recently stated, the United Kingdom Government will adhere to the principle which we have adopted in the past in these cases: the wishes of the people concerned must be our main guide to action.

Since the General Assembly last discussed the question of decolonisation, we have all welcomed to the membership of our Organisation two new states, formerly among the larger of those territories still remaining under British administration: Mauritius, which has a population of about three-quarters of a million, and Swaziland with 400,000 people. As a result, with the important exception of Rhodesia, the United Kingdom no longer has any colonial responsibilities in the continent of Africa, an immense contrast with the position there only some twelve years ago. In addition, *Nauru*, the

last trust territory for which the United Kingdom, together with Australia and New Zealand, had responsibilities has become independent in accordance with decisions taken in the United Nations.

I reported to the Committee last year the progress made in the *Solomon Islands Protectorate*. There was a substantial increase in the number of elected members in the Legislative Council and an Executive Council was established there. Elections have recently taken place under universal adult suffrage for this Legislative Council. Further constitutional progress is at present under review.

In the *Gilbert and Ellice Islands*, with 50,000 inhabitants, a House of Representatives and a Governing Council were established. Within the House of 30 members, the 23 elected members elect from among themselves the Chief Elected Member and four other members to serve on the Governing Council. My Government has given a specific undertaking to consider the next step in constitutional advance when so requested by the House of Representatives.

In the *British Virgin Islands*, with their population of 8,500, the Legislative Council now consists of eleven members, seven of whom are elected. The Executive Council consists of three Ministers, one of them the Chief Minister, all appointed from among the elected members of the Legislative Council. In both the Legislative and the Executive Councils there are only two *ex-officio* members, the Attorney-General and the Financial Secretary.

A new constitution has been brought into effect in the *Seychelles* (population 46,000), since I addressed the Committee on this question at our last session. Under the new constitution, a single Governing Council has been set up with executive and legislative functions and a system of executive Committees to supervise groups of government departments. The Governing Council has a majority of elected members. This new constitution has been a major step towards full internal self-government for the islands.

Under the new constitution in *St. Helena*, with a population approaching 5,000, the Legislative Council elected in February this year has twelve elected seats with two *ex-officio* members. Council committees, composed of a majority of members of the Legislative Council, have been established and charged with general responsibilities for government departments and with certain executive responsibilities. The Executive Council consists of two *ex-officio* members and the six Chairmen of the Committees, who are of course elected members of the Legislative Council. In all these territories I have mentioned, that is in the Solomon Islands Protectorate, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the British Virgin Islands, the Seychelles and St. Helena, elections have been held, either this year or last, on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

I turn now to two further territories, in which there have been significant steps in the course of 1968. The first of these is *Bermuda* (population 50,000). The Committee may recall that Bermuda has had representative government since 1620, when its General Assembly first met, and in practice has long enjoyed a wide measure of internal self-government. The new constitution, which was introduced in June this year, recognises the wide

measure of internal self-government which has already been enjoyed, and establishes what is in effect a ministerial system. There is a Legislative Council with limited powers, and a House of Assembly of 40 elected members. The Executive Council, which is in effect a cabinet, consists of a Government leader (the leader of the Party which has a majority in the House of Assembly) and not fewer than six other members of either House appointed on his advice. The members of the Executive Council have been allocated portfolios on the advice of the Government leader. The Governor retains responsibility only for defence, external affairs, and internal security and police matters. In recent years, the franchise, which before 1963 was based on property, has been radically broadened, and the elections in May this year which preceded the introduction of the new constitution were conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

A constitutional conference was also held in September for the *Bahamas* (population 140,000), where elections were held on the basis of universal adult suffrage in April this year. The new constitution will confer a very wide measure of internal self-government on the islands. It will entail considerable extensions to the degree of internal self-government which the Bahamas already enjoy under the existing 1963 constitution. The additional powers for the Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahama Islands (as the territory will henceforth be known) will include authority to negotiate and conclude certain trade agreements with other countries, and authority to conclude agreements of purely local concern, or for technical assistance, or relating to emigration. Although ultimate responsibility for the police and internal security will remain with the Governor, the Governor will entrust immediate responsibility for the police to a Minister designated on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Governor will retain his special responsibility for defence and external affairs, but will of course consult Bahamas Ministers, through the islands' Security Council, on matters relating to these which may involve the political as well as the economic or financial interests of the Islands.

This is an appropriate place for me to refer to the small South Atlantic Island of *Tristan da Cunha*, which has a population of 269. The first part of 1969 is likely to see the establishment of Committees of the Island Council which already exists there. This measure is aimed at according to the community's elected representatives a greater role in the running of affairs.

In the island of *St. Vincent* in the Caribbean, with a population of 90,000, it is clearly the policy of both local political parties that the territory should proceed to associated statehood, in association with the United Kingdom. Both parties favoured this at the general elections held in 1966 and in 1967, and the United Kingdom Government is fully in agreement with this goal. Talks took place with the representatives of both parties on this basis in London earlier this year. The present Government, which was in opposition when the proposals were first drawn up, has proposed certain minor changes (concerning the number of elected seats and the voting age), but the United Kingdom Government hopes and expects that *St. Vincent* will proceed to associated statehood after debate in the Legislative Council and consideration by the people of the territory. This status, as the Committee will be

aware, gives the Associated State a unilateral option to proceed to independence. The United Kingdom Government would have no say in the matter if an Associated State chose to proceed to independence or association with another country. That option will be permanently open to St. Vincent from the time when it accedes to associated statehood, and as I have said, it is my Government's firm hope that St. Vincent will emerge from its present dependent status as soon as possible to attain associated statehood.

Next, the *Falkland Islands* (population 2,000). During the past year, the United Kingdom Government has continued negotiations with the Government of the Argentine Republic in accordance with Resolution 2065 (XX) of the General Assembly with a view to reaching a peaceful settlement of the question as soon as possible. The Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Lord Chalfont, has been visiting the Falkland Islands this month.

Finally, I turn to *British Honduras*, with its population of 115,000. A Minister of the United Kingdom Government said in the House of Commons in August, 1966, that

“ it was recognised at the time of the 1963 constitutional conference that independence was a natural and legitimate aspiration for the people of British Honduras, and both the political parties had declared themselves in favour of eventual independence . . . We stand ready to consider any proposals which may be put forward to achieve independence ”.

In the course of 1968, the proposals put forward by the mediator for a solution to the British Honduras question were rejected by both the Government and the Opposition in British Honduras. However, Guatemala and the United Kingdom are still investigating means of reaching an amicable and peaceful solution to their differences with regard to British Honduras, which will take into full account the interests of the people of the territory.

I have spoken briefly on developments in these smaller territories. Three of the fourteen I have mentioned have become independent, and constitutional advance has taken place or is envisaged in the near future for most of the remaining eleven. The type of constitutional development in such small territories must vary according to their circumstances and will depend first and foremost on the wishes of the people. In nearly all the territories I have described there is active discussion among the political parties and public opinion of the next stages in constitutional advance and of the kind of ultimate status that is appropriate for them. Progress and advance have been fully maintained during 1968 and as the Committee will have seen there is every prospect during the coming year of continuing progress towards the goals which are proclaimed in Article 73 of the Charter and which have long been the policy of my Government: to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions.

## ANNEX XX

### STATEMENT BY MR. D. E. T. LUARD, M.P., IN THE FOURTH COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 29 NOVEMBER 1968

#### Gibraltar

I am sorry to detain the Committee at this late hour, but we have listened to a long speech on this subject and I would like to have the opportunity of putting forward the view of my Government on some of the points that have been made.

First, the distinguished representative of Spain criticised my delegation for not having made any mention of this subject in our own intervention in this debate at an earlier stage. Now, as the speech that we have just heard has shown, this is a somewhat contentious and controversial subject. It is one which requires a fairly long space of time, as again that speech demonstrated, if it is to be covered adequately. My delegation had in its earlier speech to cover a considerable number of other territories, and we did not think it was in the interests of the Committee to inject controversy of this kind on a very special topic into that general discussion of the problems of decolonisation on which we are now engaged. We shall be having a discussion at a later stage—there is already, I understand, a resolution before the Committee on this subject—so that it was already clear that we were to debate the question, and it did not seem advisable to inject this very contentious subject into my general statement.

But since this speech has now been made this morning I would like the opportunity of correcting some points of fact made by the distinguished representative of Spain.

The first point is on the question of the talks which took place in March of this year—which is an important point in our consideration of the developments on this subject during the past year. I must categorically deny that my Government was in any way responsible for the failure of those talks. My Government has frequently made clear in the past its readiness to hold talks with Spain under appropriate conditions on the subject of Gibraltar. I said this several times in our discussions here last year. My delegation voted in favour of the resolution of the previous year calling for such talks: and indeed it is the view of my Government that this is the most appropriate way of seeking to resolve this problem. But one thing we have always made clear, and that is that discussions of this kind should be without preconditions and that either side should be free to raise whatever subjects they think are relevant to the future of Gibraltar. It was the position of the Spanish Government that no such uncommitted talks without conditions should take place in March of this year, and that they should take place only on one particular document, that is the resolution which was passed in this Committee last year. Now, my delegation made it very clear last year at that time and at all times since, that it does not accept that resolution, the effect of which would be, as I am sure the Committee is aware, that Britain should simply hand over Gibraltar and its inhabitants to Spain. In other words, the course that the Spanish Government envisage, would have been simply for Britain to go to the talks and

announce "Here is Gibraltar, here are the people of Gibraltar for you to take over". We do not consider that this is a constructive way of undertaking negotiations on this particular subject, and it was for this reason that my Government wished a much more wide-ranging discussion of the problem of Gibraltar. It was on this account alone that the talks broke down, and it was rather the Spanish Government than the British Government which brought them to an end on those grounds.

Next, the distinguished representative of Spain spoke about the general question of decolonisation and asserted that Britain was not prepared to undertake the decolonisation of Gibraltar. I reject that this is the case. Indeed, on the contrary, it is the Spanish Government which is more than any other government responsible for the fact that it is not possible to proceed further with the decolonisation of Gibraltar. As members of this Committee are probably aware, the Spanish Government has always strongly insisted on the maintenance of that part of the Treaty of Utrecht which states that, should the British Government relinquish sovereignty in Gibraltar, it can only do so by handing over Gibraltar to Spain. In fact, as the distinguished representative of Spain himself made clear in his speech, some measures towards the decolonisation of Gibraltar have been taken this year: a new constitutional arrangement has been established in Gibraltar, under which a new House of Assembly has been established, a new Charter of Human Rights has been incorporated into this, and increased powers have been given to the Government of Gibraltar. But my Government has not by those measures altered the present international status of Gibraltar, because we do recognise that, as the Spanish Government has said, we are at present bound by that provision of the Treaty of Utrecht which I have described. And I would repeat here the question which I raised to the distinguished representative of Spain in our discussions last year, and which he never answered, and neither has the Spanish Government ever answered this important point: Would the Government of Spain be ready to relinquish the British Government from this provision of the Treaty of Utrecht, so that it should become possible for the British Government to decolonise Gibraltar in the normal way: by granting independence to Gibraltar?

The next point which was made by the distinguished representative of Spain was his reference to the fact that, in his interpretation, Resolution 1514 applies only to indigenous people, and could not therefore be said to apply to the so-called "settlers" of Gibraltar. There is one point which I must make straight away because I find that it is still the subject of some misunderstanding by some people. The people of Gibraltar with whom we are here concerned, the people who have the constitutional rights in Gibraltar—about 20,000 people—are not people of British origin. They are people who have come from other parts of the Mediterranean, either Malta or Italy mainly, and who have made Gibraltar their home for nearly 250 years. In other words, they have been established in Gibraltar for quite as long if not longer, indeed, than many other of the peoples of what are now sovereign states. Indeed, they have been in Gibraltar for longer than Spanish people themselves have even been in Gibraltar, for the only period when Spain itself ruled Gibraltar was after the Arabs had been driven out in 1494: the period between 1494 and the time when the British Government took it over was a shorter period than the period since the Treaty of

Utrecht. But in any case, if we were to accept this particular doctrine I am afraid there would be many peoples who would be deprived of their homelands and of their sovereign status. It really is not a doctrine that could be accepted by this Committee that people who have lived in a territory for 250 years have not lived there long enough to establish their own rights to that territory and to political rights within that particular territory.

The distinguished representative of Spain talked about aggressive expansion by Britain from Gibraltar to Spain. I think any member of this Committee who knows Gibraltar and who knows the frontier area between Gibraltar and Spain will realise what a fantastic claim this is. Neither the people of Gibraltar nor the British Government have any desire to extend the territorial extent of Gibraltar, and why should they? They desire only to be allowed to live in peace within the existing land which they hold. They do also, of course, desire to live without provocation, without blockade and without the various restrictions that are placed on them, and they desire access and communication by air and sea. This is all they want, and they want no further territory.

The distinguished representative of Spain stated that the desire of the people of Gibraltar to be British could still be met under the kind of arrangement which Spain has offered. The great difficulty here is that what the people of Gibraltar themselves are concerned about is their future way of life, their future security, and assurances—guarantees—that these can be retained. The difficulty in their eyes is that, once sovereignty itself is relinquished, such guarantees will never be available; that whatever special status may be given to them, it may at any time in the future be taken away once again. And their desire is therefore not simply to have a special way of life, but that that special way of life should be guaranteed to them; and at present, for better or for worse, they believe they are more likely to have that guarantee under their existing situation, under a relationship with the British Government, than under a relationship with the Spanish Government. It is, and here I entirely accept some of the words of the distinguished representative of Spain, it is for the Spanish Government to assure the people of Gibraltar, by co-operation and by communication and the kinds of policy that are likely to change their belief, that the Spanish Government could and would assure their rights and their way of life as effectively as Britain if the existing situation is to be changed.

Next, the distinguished representative of Spain said that he and his Government could not accept that the present situation should be allowed to drag on. And I understand that the resolution that has already been circulated on this subject includes some suggestion for a time-limit. I must make it clear that this would be almost unprecedented in the history of the United Nations, to seek to establish a time limit of this kind. But I must also make clear a much more important point, and that is that if time limits are to be set for decolonisation they must surely always be for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to implement the purposes set out in the Charter: in other words, in this colonial territory as in all others, to create self-government, self-determination, and if possible and if necessary independence. And one of the first needs, surely, if a time-table of this kind is



to be established, is to test what the wishes of the people are. The only comparable situation I can think of in the history of this organisation is that in the case of West Irian, where a kind of time limit was also given. And here of course an essential element of the procedure was that some test should be made of the wishes of the people of West Irian, and I understand that that procedure is being started and will be taking place over the next year. Similarly, in the case of the North Borneo territories that were claimed by another state, the United Nations itself decided that before acknowledging independence in the form in which it was proposed a test of the wishes of the people of that territory should be undertaken to find out what these were. If there were to be any question of a time limit in this situation, it must surely be for this purpose rather than for any other—to find out what are the wishes of the people, so that the United Nations could then determine in the light of that knowledge in what form decolonisation should take place.

I will not attempt to answer any more of the detailed points which were raised by the distinguished representative of Spain, because we shall of course have another opportunity to take up this matter in greater detail at a later stage. But I would like to finish by making two much more general points, as I think that they are of great importance in our consideration of this item and indeed in all examination of the future of Gibraltar.

I think it was significant that the distinguished representative of Spain although he did at one stage use certain words about the interests of the people of Gibraltar and the way in which he felt the Spanish Government could protect these, he never at any time mentioned the wishes of the people of Gibraltar. But this consideration has always been in every previous case of decolonisation—and there have now been very many which have been considered by this Organisation—has always been the prime consideration. And there is of course a very good reason for this, and the reason is that this is what the Charter lays down. Now, the distinguished representative of Spain referred—and I think possibly in somewhat disparaging terms—or he appeared at any rate to dismiss the importance of certain parts of Article 73. But I think that it is important that the Committee should be very well aware of precisely what these passages state, because these are the passages of the Charter which set out what are the obligations of the administering powers, and therefore of the Organisation as a whole, in their administration of non-self-governing territories. Article 73 opens like this: “Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognise the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount”. This is the obligation which the British Government as an administering power has accepted and has attempted to fulfil. It is the obligation that every member of this Organisation in signing the Charter has also recognised. Later on in that Article, the means by which those ends can be attained are set out, and it is said that the means of attaining those ends shall be “to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions”. This is the object of the British Government in Gibraltar, although it recognises that there are

certain special conditions there and that it is necessary to find some compromise between that objective and the legitimate rights of Spain. And it is the obligation that we have also accepted under the Treaty of Utrecht that has prevented us so far from being able to accord full independence to Gibraltar.

The final point I want to make is this—and perhaps this is the most fundamental of any in considering this item. I am sure that there are very many people in this Committee, as there are in Britain, who feel the greatest sympathy for Spain and for the people of Spain in the situation in which they find themselves over Gibraltar. Certainly the British Government has never denied the special interest which Spain has in the future of Gibraltar. But we do have another interest and another obligation, and that is our obligation towards the people of Gibraltar themselves. It must be clear I think to members of this Committee, and I hope it is clear to the Government of Spain, that it will not be possible for them to attain the objective which they aim at, and with which many people sympathise, by the method of obtaining large majorities for resolutions passed in this Committee or in the General Assembly. My Government have made clear that they do regard their obligation which I have just read out under Article 73 as being an overriding one. They will not be deterred from that obligation and the general obligations which they have to all the peoples for which they are responsible, by any resolution which is passed here, however many times it may be passed, and by however large majorities. The object surely for the Government of Spain must therefore be, on the one hand to persuade the people of Gibraltar by their treatment of Gibraltar and by their contacts with Gibraltar that they will as they say be able to provide the assurances which they have promised equally well with the British Government; and their other object must be to be able to enter into negotiations with Britain to bring about the objectives which they have in mind. Now, two members of this Organisation which are confronted by a very similar problem have recognised this fact: they have been willing to enter into negotiations, and certainly, in one case, substantial progress has been made as a result of that. That surely is the course which Spain should seek to follow over her own problem; it is surely the course of action which this Committee should seek to encourage in the resolutions that it passes on such questions. But certainly, simply by scoring voting victories on resolutions in this Committee, Spain will not advance her interests and, on the contrary, she may very well move them further back because she will antagonise the people of Gibraltar, she will antagonise the people of Britain and perhaps the Government of Britain. By co-operation perhaps we can confront this problem together and see what kind of solution may be arrived at. But by attempts at intimidation and voting victories I do not believe that this will be accomplished.

**STATEMENT BY LORD CARADON IN THE PLENARY OF  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 18 DECEMBER 1968**

**Gibraltar**

Much has been said in the debates in previous years and in this about Gibraltar. I have no wish to go over the ground again. Nor do I wish to withdraw or change what has been consistently maintained by my delegation. But even in the haste of these closing days of this session it is necessary for me to speak again to explain why I shall vote against this resolution. I shall give that explanation as shortly and as clearly as I can.

We believe in the principle stated in Chapter XI of the Charter that the interests of the inhabitants should be paramount.

We believe moreover that the requirement in the Charter, "to develop self government, to take due account of the aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions," meant what it said.

That is what we have endeavoured to fulfil in vast and varied territories for which we have had responsibility. We see no cause to exclude the people of Gibraltar—a small but proud and brave people—from the protection of the fundamental provisions of the Charter.

We believe that the policy adopted by Spain, directed against the people of Gibraltar, the policy of attempting by restriction and harassment to intimidate and coerce and harm the people, has been misconceived and misdirected. Indeed by alienating instead of attracting the people that policy has militated against any positive progress. It has united the people in their resistance. I am sure that no progress will be possible until this attempt to put into force a punitive policy is reversed, until an effort is made to establish relations not of intimidation but of conciliation. I look forward to that day.

It is well known that in recent weeks a number of delegations came forward with proposals to seek a course not of confrontation but of co-operation. They hoped to avoid the negative repetition of past prescriptions for deadlock which this resolution represents. We respected their motives. We welcomed their efforts. We greatly regretted that their endeavours achieved no change of course on the part of the Spanish Government. There was no readiness to abandon the Spanish insistence that the inhabitants should be handed over against their will to a regime which has been at such pains to offend and alienate them.

Nevertheless I trust that the search of these well-disposed delegations for a way forward in co-operation and harmony will not be wasted. I am convinced that the road of conciliation to which they pointed is the only road which can lead to the peace and friendship we wish to see.

The proposition that the people should be handed over against their will is happily so far removed from possibility as to be incredible. Certainly such a clumsy attempt at coercion is wholly unacceptable to them and to us.

It is a matter to be deplored that, often for reasons entirely irrelevant to the question at issue, a number of delegations should have supported a proposition which they know will not and cannot be put into effect, which can only bar the way to practical progress and which has, I greatly regret to say, brought wide discredit to the United Nations.

On the other hand I express admiration for those who in spite of intense pressure have declined to associate themselves with a resolution so barren and so hopeless, but have instead advocated a return to conciliation and co-operation.

It is constantly our duty here at the United Nations to seek for agreement. However deep divisions may be and however intensely feelings may run, we must always be ready to look for common ground, for conciliation and for co-operation. We on our side would warmly welcome a new endeavour to proceed in such a search in good faith and good will.

It is my hope that not because of but in spite of this resolution there will very soon be a start in the right direction. I trust that we shall see a readiness by the Spanish Government to abandon the endeavour to achieve its purpose by ill-will and ill treatment directed against the people concerned. Such an endeavour cannot succeed. It can only make matters worse.

The resolution before us marks the end, the dead-end, of one road. I trust that it will not be too long before we start out on another.

## ANNEX XXII

### **STATEMENT BY MR. J. I. M. RHODES IN THE FIFTH COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 20 DECEMBER 1968**

#### **United Nations Budget Estimates, 1969**

After three months deliberation we have today fetched up with a budget figure of almost \$155 million.

My Government has been one of the most consistent supporters of the finances of the United Nations in all its many activities. We have paid our assessed contributions without question and without delay. We have made very substantial voluntary contributions for a variety of purposes. We have said—and we still say—that we are not opposed to increases in expenditure within reasonable bounds. But we have now reached the point where we have been unable to satisfy ourselves that all the increases now before us are either reasonable or inescapable. Moreover, we have heard nothing during our discussions in this Committee during the present session which would allay our doubts. On the contrary, we have been conscious of a tendency for the Committee to shy away from measures that smack even remotely of financial restraint or discipline. Thus, we have deferred a decision on the report of the ACABQ on unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure. We have watered down the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences.

We have been preoccupied with questions which, though important, are not essential to the smooth working of the Organisation. Our time might have been better employed considering how to arrest, let alone eliminate, the mounting deficit. Instead we have been asked to consider means of transferring more of the burden to those who have in the past demonstrated their willingness to pay. And for this purpose the Committee has even indicated that it is ready to contemplate a repudiation of the terms on which this Organisation has borrowed money in the past.

At the eleventh hour we have been faced with an avalanche of papers containing financial implications, and the estimates are now some \$15 million higher than those presented initially ; or \$17 million if we take account of the original recommendation of the ACABQ. We were warned to expect additions ; but not on this scale.

These are not achievements of which this Organisation can be proud. They are not achievements which inspire confidence in the financial responsibility or viability of the Organisation.

I said in my budget statement that my own country is going through a period of financial stringency. Our people are being asked to exercise financial restraint in many ways. It is doubly necessary therefore for my Government to satisfy itself that every dollar which it contributes to this Organisation is well and wisely spent.

If therefore the budget continues to rise at the present rate, and some of the present attitudes continue to prevail, my Government will need to review the total level of the contributions which it is able to support, and to consider how the financial burden which it bears, as one of the major contributors, can be kept within bounds. Our pocket and our patience are not unlimited.

### ANNEX XXIII

#### STATEMENT BY MR. H. G. DARWIN IN THE SIXTH COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 20 NOVEMBER 1968

##### Question of Defining Aggression

The Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression is an interesting document. It reflects the careful and reasoned course of the debate in the Special Committee. It shows the serious consideration of the advantages and dangers of such a definition, and of the various elements which might be included in such a definition. The delegation of the United Kingdom offers its thanks and congratulations to the Chairman of the Special Committee, Ambassador Yasseen, who is happily here with us today, and to its officers for the successful conduct of the business of the Special Committee.

We regret however that so much space has been taken in the Report for polemical material relating to specific assertions of aggression. It is recognised that it may be necessary, in discussion of general propositions, to quote examples. These examples may be drawn from past or current history.

My delegation has no objection to that. It will indeed have occasion to do so in the further discussion of this matter. But we regret very much that such matters are set out at such great length in the Report. In saying this, I make no criticism of the distinguished Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Lamptey. His services as Rapporteur were, in the view of my delegation, in the best traditions of the United Nations. These passages were included at the insistence of a particular delegation; when the distinguished Chairman of the Special Committee appealed to that delegation to moderate their demand for the inclusion of controversial material, the delegation in question refused to accede. While therefore it is clear where the fault lies, we must still regret that the Report should be so over-burdened with such material.

As the delegation of the United Kingdom has said, the work of the Special Committee was serious and constructive. And it viewed the proposals then made in this light. It is not necessary here to comment on the specific proposals which were brought before the Special Committee, since this was done during the debates in Geneva by the delegation of the United Kingdom. But my delegation would like to offer some general comments on the question of definition.

The United Kingdom is not opposed to the establishment of a satisfactory definition of aggression. But it is essential that the definition should be satisfactory. The concept of aggression is referred to in the Purposes of the United Nations, but the principal reference lies at the heart of the Charter, in Article 39, the introductory article to Chapter VII. It forms an essential element in the competence of the highest political organ of the United Nations, specially charged with responsibility for peace and security, the Security Council.

If a definition is to be adopted, it must be certain that the gain in clarity exceeds the loss. The definition must help rather than hinder the United Nations in its task of maintaining peace and security. It must not hamper the Security Council in its task, already difficult enough in all conscience. It must not turn the debates of the Security Council away from fundamental consideration of the facts and the necessary measures to be taken in a moment of crisis, into wrangling about the verbal application of technicalities of legal language.

Above all, the definition must not be such as to appear to exonerate aggressors or hamper defence against aggression. It must not, by omissions or otherwise, indicate to an aggressor the way in which he may safely go. It was said many years ago that the attempt to define the aggressor should be opposed because "it will be a trap for the innocent and a signpost for the guilty".

At the San Francisco Conference it was decided, after debate, that it was inappropriate to include in the draft Charter of the United Nations a definition of aggression. As the report of M. Paul-Boncour says, "The progress of the technique of modern warfare renders very difficult the definition of all cases of aggression. It may be noted that, the list of such cases being necessarily incomplete, the Council would have a tendency to consider of less importance the acts not mentioned therein; these omissions would encourage the aggressor to distort the definition or might delay action

by the Council. The Committee therefore decided to adhere to the text drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks and to leave to the Council the entire decision as to what constitutes a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression."

In the view of the United Kingdom, the definition must be such as to allow in practice the Security Council to evaluate in their full extent all the circumstances of a case which may be brought before the Security Council in order to determine whether it falls within Article 39 and what action is appropriate.

The definition must be clearly and firmly and soundly based on the Charter of the United Nations. One of the purposes of the United Nations, set out in Article 1(1), is the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. The act of aggression is seen as a particularly serious breach of the peace. And to this end, in Article 39, the Security Council is given power to determine the existence of such acts of aggression and, when it does so, it is to make recommendations or decisions on measures under Articles 41 and 42.

Article 39 contemplates circumstances which could lead to military action under Article 42. This is a true sign of the gravity of acts of aggression. The use of violence by one state on another may take many forms. It may be an attack by armed soldiers wearing the uniform of their country, in open warfare. But it may equally be through the infiltration and organisation of armed bands to enter, for the purposes of violence, into the territory of the state under attack. An attack may be made by men in uniform with the sub-machine guns in their arms. An attack may be made by a group of men in an ordinary civil aircraft flight with the sub-machine guns in their luggage. But the purpose, the intent and the effect is the same. There is a saying that half a loaf is better than no bread. This is not at all true in the present instance. An inadequate definition and an insufficiently complete definition will not deter but encourage aggression. A bad definition is much worse than no definition at all.

The difficulty remains to find a satisfactory definition, and a definition which could deter aggression and assist the Security Council.

The Soviet Union has been a leading figure among those who favour a definition of aggression. As recently as 1956, it submitted a definition which provided that a state "shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts: (b) invasion by its armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state." In particular, it is said elsewhere in the definition: "any revolutionary or counter-revolutionary movement, civil war, disorders or strikes" may not be used as a justification for an attack.

And yet, without any trace of legal justification, without a trace of consent given by the legal government, the Soviet Union invaded the independent state of Czechoslovakia on 21 August with forces ultimately amounting to half a million men. Never has a state been so clearly condemned by its own words. Never has an aggressor state so failed even to offer any legal argument justifying its action under international law.

If a state is not deterred by its own definition, how much will it be deterred by that written by others? Deeds speak louder than words; when these are the deeds, it is doubtful whether there is value in listening to the Soviet Union when it proposes definitions of aggression.

What is then needed? Not more involved and elaborate and detailed definitions in technical legal terms! The Security Council in dealing with Czechoslovakia found no need of definitions. What is needed is not more texts, but greater compliance.

Let me, however, briefly recall the principles which, in the view of the United Kingdom, any draft definition of aggression should comply with. It should not exonerate or make it more easy to commit any possible aggression; it should not hamper the legitimate self-defence in the face of aggression. It must allow the fullest and freest evaluation by the Security Council of all the circumstances in any case which may arise in the future, since those circumstances cannot possibly all be foreseen at the time when the definition is drafted. It must be soundly based on the provisions of the Charter concerning aggression, as the gravest of breaches of the peace.

These are the views of the delegation of the United Kingdom. But we look forward with interest to hearing the views of other delegations, especially those who did not serve in the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression. Only after hearing further views will the delegation be in a position to consider the further conduct of this item. My delegation therefore reserves the right to intervene again at a later stage in our debate.

#### ANNEX XXIV

### **THE UNITED KINGDOM DELEGATION TO THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

#### *Representatives*

The Rt. Hon. Michael Stewart, C.H., M.P., Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

The Rt. Hon. The Lord Caradon, G.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs. Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

The Rt Hon. Fred Mulley, M.P., Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

The Lady Gaitskell.

Mr. D. E. T. Luard, M.P.

#### *Alternate Representatives*

Sir Leslie Glass, K.C.M.G.

Mr. Mark E. Allen, C.M.G., C.V.O.

Mr. David H. T. Hildyard, C.M.G., D.F.C.

Mr. John I. McK. Rhodes.

Mr. H. G. Darwin.

Printed in England by Her Majesty's Stationery Office  
at St. Stephen's Parliamentary Press

(329053) Dd. 149970 K15 8/69 St.S.