SPEECH BY HE JUDGE JOAN E. DONOGHUE, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

26 OCTOBER 2023

Mr President,
Excellencies,
Distinguished Delegates,

It is an honour for me to address the General Assembly today, as it considers the annual report of the International Court of Justice. The Court greatly values the interest in its work shown by this August Assembly.

[Before embarking on a review of the Court's significant judicial activities during the last 12 months, I would first like to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency Mr Dennis Francis on his election as President of the seventy-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly. I wish him every success in this distinguished office.]

*

Mr President,

Since 1 August 2022 — the starting date of the period covered by the Court's annual report — the Court's docket has remained full and has continued to reflect a wide variety of legal disputes involving States from all regions of the world that present questions of international law that concern all of humanity. There are currently 18 contentious cases on our List and two advisory proceedings relating to questions put to the Court by this Assembly. The 20 cases on the docket include seven cases that were brought in the course of the reporting year — the two requests for an advisory opinion and five contentious cases.

During my speech to you last year, I briefly mentioned the filing of the first of the contentious proceedings — namely, the case brought by Equatorial Guinea against France on 29 September 2022 with regard to the alleged violation by France of its obligations under the United Nations Convention against Corruption of 31 October 2003.

With regard to the other new cases, on 16 November 2022, Belize instituted proceedings against Honduras with reference to a dispute concerning sovereignty over the Sapodilla Cayes, which it describes as a group of cayes lying in the Gulf of Honduras at the southern tip of the Belize Barrier Reef in the Caribbean.

In June 2023, Canada and the Netherlands filed a joint application against the Syrian Arab Republic concerning alleged violations of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Applicants contend that Syria, through its State organs, State agents, and other persons and entities acting on its instructions or under its direction and control, has been employing torture on a massive scale at least since 2011, in particular in detention facilities. Together with the Application, Canada and the Netherlands filed a Request for the indication of provisional measures. Oral proceedings on that request, originally scheduled to take place in July, were postponed following a request from the Respondent, and held earlier this month on 10 October 2023. Regrettably, the Respondent did not appear at those hearings. The request for the indication of provisional measures is currently under deliberation.

On 27 June 2023, the Islamic Republic of Iran instituted proceedings against Canada concerning alleged violations of State immunities. The Applicant contends that certain legislative, executive and judicial measures adopted and implemented by Canada against Iran and its property abrogated certain immunities to which Iran is entitled under international law.

On 4 July 2023, Canada, Sweden, Ukraine and the United Kingdom jointly instituted proceedings against the Islamic Republic of Iran concerning alleged violations of the 1971 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, also known as the "Montreal Convention". The Applicants' allegations concern events surrounding the downing of Ukraine International Airlines Flight 752 on 8 January 2020 which, they contend, gave rise to violations of obligations under the Montreal Convention.

In addition, during the period in question, as the General Assembly is well aware, the Court received two requests for an advisory opinion, the first in January 2023 on "Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem" and the second in April 2023 on the "obligations of States in respect of climate change".

With regard to the advisory proceedings relating to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, written statements were filed by 53 United Nations Member States, by the observer State of Palestine and by three intergovernmental organizations. Just to complete the procedural picture, I mention that the time-limit for the filing of written comments on the written statements expired yesterday and that, as was publicly announced a few days ago, the hearings on this request for an advisory opinion are scheduled to open on 19 February 2024.

With regard to the advisory proceedings relating to climate change, the time-limits originally fixed by the Court were extended, in response to requests from a number of States and from an international organization. Currently, the time-limits for the filing of written statements and of written comments thereon are set for 22 January 2024 and 22 April 2024, respectively.

For each advisory procedure, the Secretariat has prepared a dossier containing a collection of all documents that are likely to throw light upon the relevant questions before the Court, pursuant to Article 65, paragraph 2, of its Statute. These materials are available on the Court's website.

*

Mr President,

Of course, in addition to this work on the seven newly-filed cases that I have mentioned, the cases that had been initiated prior to the reporting period have also kept the Court busy. Since 1 August 2022, the Court has held hearings in nine cases and has rendered four Judgments. Among the many orders that the Court has delivered over that period are two Orders relating to the indication of provisional measures, two Orders on requests for the modification of previously-imposed provisional measures, and one Order on the admissibility of declarations of intervention under Article 63 of the Statute.

*

As is customary, I shall now give a brief account of the Judgments delivered and the substantive Orders rendered during the reporting period.

On 1 December 2022, the Court rendered its Judgment on the merits in the case concerning the *Dispute over the Status and Use of the Waters of the Silala (Chile* v. *Bolivia)*. In that case, the Court was called upon to decide certain claims and counter-claims regarding the Silala, a river that has its source in the territory of Bolivia and then flows into Chile. The rights and obligations of the Parties in that regard are governed by customary international law, since neither Chile nor Bolivia is party to any relevant treaties. In its Judgment, the Court noted that the positions of the Parties had converged in many respects over the course of the proceedings. Accordingly, it found that many of the claims that had been made by Chile and the counter-claims by Bolivia no longer had any object and that, therefore, the Court was not called upon to give a decision thereon.

The Court did however find that there was a disagreement between the Parties as to Bolivia's obligation to notify and consult with respect to measures that may have adverse effects on the Silala. On the law, the Court concluded that any planned activity that poses a risk of significant harm to another riparian State must be the subject of notification to and consultation with that State. On the facts, the Court found that Bolivia had not breached this obligation when planning and carrying out certain activities in the vicinity of the Silala.

*

On 30 March 2023, the Court rendered its Judgment on the merits in the case concerning *Certain Iranian Assets (Islamic Republic of Iran* v. *United States of America)*. This case arose out of a series of legislative and executive measures taken by the United States, which led to a number of judgments awarding substantial damages being issued by US courts against the State of Iran and, in some cases, against Iranian State-owned entities. Further, the assets of Iran and certain Iranian entities, including the Central Bank of Iran, which is known as Bank Markazi, were subject to enforcement proceedings in the United States or abroad, or had already been distributed to judgment creditors. Before the ICJ, Iran argued that the United States had thereby acted in violation of its obligations under several provisions of the Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights of 15 August 1955, to which I shall refer as the "Treaty of Amity" or the "Treaty".

The Court began by considering two objections to jurisdiction and admissibility raised by the United States. The first, an objection to the Court's jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, related to whether the Central Bank of Iran, Bank Markazi, was a "company" within the meaning of the Treaty of Amity and thus entitled to protection under its provisions. The Court considered that the evidence was insufficient to characterize Bank Markazi as a "company" within the meaning of the Treaty and thus upheld this objection to jurisdiction.

The Court rejected, however, an objection to the admissibility of the Application based on an alleged failure to exhaust local remedies.

The Court then turned to the claims of Iran concerning alleged violations of the Treaty of Amity and found that the United States had violated its obligations under various provisions thereof.

First, the Court determined that the measures adopted by the United States disregarded the legally acquired rights and interests of the Iranian companies in question, which was in violation of the obligation to accord fair and equitable treatment and the obligation to guarantee the recognition of their juridical status within the territory of the other Party. Secondly, the Court concluded that the Respondent had violated its obligations with respect to the prohibition of expropriation except for a public purpose, and the requirement of prompt payment of just compensation. Thirdly, the Court ruled that the United States had violated its obligations with regard to freedom of commerce and navigation as set out in the Treaty of Amity.

On the other hand, the Court found no violation of the Respondent's obligations under other provisions of the Treaty of Amity concerning access to the courts of the other Party, the purchase and sale of property and the prohibition of exchange restrictions.

In light of these findings, the Court considered that Iran was entitled to compensation for the injury caused by the violations by the United States that had been ascertained by the Court. It stated that if the Parties were unable to agree on the amount of compensation due to Iran within 24 months, the matter would, at the request of either Party, be settled by the Court. The case therefore remains on the Court's General List.

*

On 6 April 2023, the Court delivered its Judgment on the preliminary objection raised by Venezuela in the case concerning *Arbitral Award of 3 October 1899 (Guyana* v. *Venezuela)*. I recall that, when Guyana instituted proceedings in this case in 2018, Venezuela stated that it would not participate in the proceedings, as it considered that the Court lacked jurisdiction. By an Order issued in June 2018, the Court ruled that, in the circumstances of the case, it was necessary first of all to resolve the question of its jurisdiction. The Court then rendered a Judgment in December 2020, finding that it had jurisdiction to entertain the Application filed by Guyana in so far as it concerned the validity of the Award regarding the Boundary between the Colony of British Guiana and the United States of Venezuela of 3 October 1899 and the related question of the definitive settlement of the land boundary dispute between Guyana and Venezuela.

After Guyana filed a Memorial on the merits, Venezuela appeared in the case, raising a preliminary objection and asserting that the United Kingdom was an indispensable third party without the consent of which the Court could not adjudicate upon the dispute — thus raising an objection based on what is commonly called the "*Monetary Gold* principle".

In its Judgment of 6 April 2023, the Court first concluded that Venezuela's preliminary objection was an objection to the exercise of the Court's jurisdiction and not to the existence of jurisdiction. Since the Court in the 2020 Judgment had only decided on the existence of its jurisdiction, the force of *res judicata* attaching to that Judgment did not bar Venezuela's preliminary objection.

The Court then examined the substance of Venezuela's preliminary objection. It considered that, by virtue of being a party to the "Agreement to Resolve the Controversy between Venezuela and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland over the Frontier between Venezuela and British Guiana" signed at Geneva on 17 February 1966, the United Kingdom had accepted that the dispute between Guyana and Venezuela could be settled by one of the means set out in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations, and that it would have no role in that procedure. Under these circumstances, the Court considered that the *Monetary Gold* principle did not come into play in the case. Consequently, the Court rejected Venezuela's preliminary objection. The case has now proceeded to the merits stage.

*

I now turn to the Judgment delivered by the Court on 13 July 2023 in the case concerning the *Question of the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf between Nicaragua and Colombia beyond 200 nautical miles from the Nicaraguan Coast (Nicaragua* v. *Colombia)*. In an earlier case between these two States, the Court had rendered a Judgment in 2012 establishing, *inter alia*, a single maritime

boundary delimiting the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zones of Nicaragua and Colombia up to the 200-nautical-mile limit from the baselines from which the territorial sea of Nicaragua is measured. On 16 September 2013, Nicaragua filed an Application instituting new proceedings.

In a Judgment rendered on 17 March 2016 on the preliminary objections raised by Colombia, the Court found that it had jurisdiction, on the basis of Article XXXI of the Pact of Bogotá, to entertain the first request put forward by Nicaragua in its Application, in which it asked the Court to adjudge and declare "[t]he precise course of the maritime boundary between Nicaragua and Colombia in the areas of the continental shelf which appertain to each of them beyond the boundaries determined by the Court in its [2012] Judgment".

Following the filing of the written pleadings on the merits, the case became ready for hearing. In the circumstances of the case, before proceeding to any consideration of technical and scientific questions in relation to the delimitation requested by Nicaragua, the Court considered that it was necessary to decide certain questions of law. Therefore, by an Order issued on 4 October 2022, the Court directed the Parties to present their arguments at the then-forthcoming oral proceedings exclusively on two specific questions.

The Court held oral proceedings in December 2022 and rendered its Judgment in July 2023. In that Judgment, The Court concluded that, under customary international law, a State's entitlement to a continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of its territorial sea is measured may not extend within 200 nautical miles from the baselines of another State.

The Court went on to state that, in the absence of overlapping entitlements over the same maritime areas, it could not proceed to a maritime delimitation.

The Court further stated that, within 200 nautical miles from the baselines of Colombia's mainland coast and of Colombia's islands, there was no area of overlapping entitlement to be delimited in the case. In addition, the Court considered that it did not need to determine the scope of the entitlements of the islands of Serranilla and Bajo Nuevo to settle the dispute before it, and that the effect of the maritime entitlements of one maritime feature (Serrana) had already been determined in its 2012 Judgment. The requests in Nicaragua's submissions were thus rejected.

*

Mr President,

I shall now move to some of the more substantive Orders issued by the Court during the period under review.

When I spoke before this Assembly last year, I gave a brief summary of the two Orders on the indication of provisional measures rendered on 7 December 2021 in the cases concerning *Application of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, one brought by Armenia against Azerbaijan and a second brought by Azerbaijan against Armenia. In each of these cases, the Applicant alleges racial discrimination in violation of this Convention, to which I will refer as "CERD", against persons of Armenian or Azerbaijani national or ethnic origin, respectively, carried out during and after hostilities in the Nagorno-Karabakh region that erupted in autumn 2020.

During the past year, the Applicant in each of these two cases sought the indication of additional provisional measures. On 22 February 2023, the Court rendered its Orders on two such

requests. In the Request made in the *Armenia* v. *Azerbaijan* case, Armenia alleged that Azerbaijan was acting in violation of various provisions of CERD by orchestrating a blockade of the Lachin Corridor, which links Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. In its Order, the Court observed in particular that, since 12 December 2022, the connection between Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia via the Lachin Corridor had been disrupted, and that a number of consequences had resulted from this situation, including impeding the transfer of hospitalized individuals to Armenia, as well as hindering the importation into Nagorno-Karabakh of essential goods. The Court thus ordered Azerbaijan, pending the final decision in the case and in accordance with that State's obligations under CERD, to take all measures at its disposal to ensure unimpeded movement of persons, vehicles and cargo along the Lachin Corridor in both directions.

In the new Request for the indication of provisional measures made in the *Azerbaijan* v. *Armenia* case, Azerbaijan alleged that Armenia had continued to lay landmines in or after 2021 in civilian zones to which displaced persons of Azerbaijani national or ethnic origin were due to return and that it had refused to share information about the location of landmines and booby traps in areas over which Azerbaijan had recently regained control. In its Order, the Court recalled that it had previously found that CERD did not plausibly impose any obligation on Armenia to cease planting landmines or to enable Azerbaijan to undertake demining. In that connection, the Court had recognized that a policy of driving persons of a certain national or ethnic origin from a particular area, as well as preventing their return thereto, could implicate rights under CERD, but had found, prima facie, that Azerbaijan had not placed before it evidence indicating that Armenia's alleged conduct with respect to landmines had the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of rights of persons of Azerbaijani national or ethnic origin. In its 22 February 2023 Order, the Court found that the same conclusion applied to the then-present circumstances, including the allegations regarding booby traps. The Court thus found that the conditions for the indication of provisional measures had not been met and rejected the request submitted by Azerbaijan.

In addition to these decisions, the Court issued two Orders in the *Armenia* v. *Azerbaijan* case in response to two requests by Armenia for the modification of previously imposed provisional measures (filed in September 2022 and in May 2023, respectively). In the first Order, dated 12 October 2022, the Court found that the circumstances, as they presented themselves to the Court, were not such as to require the exercise of its power to modify provisional measures previously indicated by it. The second Order, which was issued on 6 July 2023, related to a request for the modification of the Court's Order of 22 February 2023, to which I just referred, and concerned allegations by Armenia that the establishment of two military checkpoints by Azerbaijan constituted a significant new impediment to movement along the Lachin Corridor. The Court considered that, even if it could be said, in light of these developments, that there had been a change in the situation that existed when the Court issued its 22 February 2023 Order, Armenia's request still concerned allegations of disruption in movement along the Lachin Corridor. The consequences of any such disruption for persons of Armenian national or ethnic origin would be the same as those noted by the Court in the Order of 22 February 2023. Moreover, the measure that the Court had imposed in that Order applied without limitation to the cause of the impediment of such movement. Therefore, the Court found that the circumstances, as they presented themselves to the Court, were not such as to require the exercise of its power to modify its Order of 22 February 2023. At the same time, the Court reaffirmed the provisional measure indicated therein.

One additional request by Armenia for the indication of provisional measures is currently under deliberation. On 29 September 2023, Armenia submitted a Request for the indication of provisional measures in the context of the proceedings instituted by it against Azerbaijan. In that Request, Armenia states that

> "[o]n 19 September 2023, Azerbaijan — in manifest violation of the ceasefire agreement included in the 2020 Trilateral Statement and its obligation not to aggravate the dispute reiterated in multiple Orders of the Court — launched a full-scale military

assault on the 120,000 ethnic Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh, indiscriminately shelling the capital, Stepanakert, and other civilian settlements".

Armenia refers to what it describes as credible reports of atrocities against civilians, and states that, as of 27 September, tens of thousands of ethnic Armenians had been forcibly displaced. Accordingly, Armenia requested the imposition of ten provisional measures. Hearings on this request were held on 12 October 2023.

*

I turn next to several procedural developments in the case concerning *Allegations of Genocide under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Ukraine* v. *Russian Federation:32 States intervening)*, instituted by Ukraine on 26 February 2022. I recall that Ukraine's Application in this case centred on the initiation by the Russian Federation of "a 'special military operation' against Ukraine with the express purpose of preventing and punishing purported acts of genocide that have no basis in fact". As I reported in my last address to the Assembly, on 16 March 2022, the Court issued an order indicating provisional measures in this case, *inter alia*, ordering the Russian Federation immediately to suspend military operations that it had commenced on 24 February 2022 in the territory of Ukraine.

On 3 October 2022, the Russian Federation raised preliminary objections to the jurisdiction of the Court and to the admissibility of Ukraine's Application. In accordance with the Rules of Court, the proceedings on the merits have been suspended pending the Court's decision on the preliminary objections. Hearings on these objections were held from 18 to 27 September 2023 and the case, at the preliminary objections phase, is currently under deliberation.

Between 21 July and 15 December 2022, 33 States filed declarations of intervention in the case under Article 63 of the Statute. This provision grants State parties to a convention a right to intervene in a case when the construction of that convention is in question. These 33 States, all parties to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 (or "Genocide Convention"), sought to intervene to present observations on the construction of Article IX, which is the compromissory clause of that instrument, and of other provisions relevant to the jurisdiction of the Court. Some of these States also sought to present observations on provisions of the Genocide Convention relating to the merits of the case.

The Russian Federation raised objections to the admissibility of all of the declarations of intervention. By an Order issued on 5 June 2023, the Court considered these objections and decided that the declarations of intervention submitted by 32 States were admissible at the preliminary objections stage of the proceedings in so far as they concerned the construction of Article IX and other provisions of the Genocide Convention that are relevant for the determination of the jurisdiction of the Court.

In particular, responding to the arguments advanced by the Russian Federation, the Court explained that its task in determining the admissibility of a declaration of intervention under Article 63 of the Statute was limited to ascertaining whether that declaration related to the interpretation of a convention in question in the proceedings, and that the question of a State's motivation in filing a declaration of intervention was not relevant. The Court also concluded that admitting the declarations of intervention in the case would not infringe the principles of equality of the parties or the good administration of justice.

Looking ahead to later steps in the case, the Court undertook to organize the proceedings in a manner which would ensure the equality of the Parties and the good administration of justice and

indicated that it would not, at the preliminary objection stage, have regard to any part of the written or oral observations of intervening States going beyond that scope.

In the 5 June 2023 Order, the Court also upheld an objection raised by the Russian Federation with respect to the admissibility of the declaration filed by the United States. The United States had entered a reservation to Article IX of the Genocide Convention, which is the basis of jurisdiction invoked by the Applicant in the case and will be interpreted by the Court in the preliminary objections phase. The Court held that the United States may not intervene in relation to the construction of Article IX of the Convention while it is not bound by that provision. Accordingly, the declaration of intervention of the United States was found to be inadmissible in so far as it concerns the preliminary objections stage of the proceedings.

Following the issuance of the Court's Order on 5 June 2023, most of the States whose declarations of intervention were found admissible at the preliminary objections stage availed themselves of the right, pursuant to the Rules of Court, to file written observations and to present oral observations during the hearings on the preliminary objections of the Russian Federation. Their oral observations were presented after the first round of pleading by the Parties. During the second round of oral argument, the Russian Federation had two sessions of three hours to respond to the arguments of Ukraine and the oral observations of the intervening States, while a single session of three hours was reserved for Ukraine's response to the arguments of the Russian Federation and the oral observations of the intervening States.

*

Mr President,

The preliminary objections raised by the Russian Federation in the aforementioned case are only one of the matters presently under deliberation. The Court is also currently deliberating on the merits of the case concerning *Application of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (Ukraine* v. *Russian Federation)*, following public hearings which were held in June 2023, as well as on the requests for the indication of provisional measures filed in the case concerning *Application of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Canada and the Netherlands* v. *Syrian Arab Republic)* and in the case concerning *Application of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (Armenia* v. *Azerbaijan),* which I mentioned earlier.

*

Mr President,
Excellencies,
Distinguished Delegates,

Before concluding my report, I would like to update the Assembly on a few matters of note.

First, let me briefly turn to an important initiative taken by the Court as part of its ongoing review of its procedures and working methods. I am pleased to announce that earlier this year the Court promulgated certain amendments to render gender inclusive the Rules of Court, the Resolution concerning the Internal Judicial Practice of the Court and the Practice Directions. A key motivating factor in making these changes is the Court's recognition of the importance of language in shaping viewpoints and beliefs on gender equality and inclusion. As the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, it is incumbent on the Court to uphold the ideals of the United Nations in promoting gender equality and overcoming gender bias through the language it uses in its own official documents. These amended rules and other documents, which came into effect earlier this week, can be found on the Court's website and will in due course be published in paper form.

*

Allow me to now turn to the Trust Fund for the Court's Judicial Fellowship Programme, which, as you know, was established in 2021 by the Secretary-General, at the request of the General Assembly, to encourage more geographically diverse participation in the Fellowship Programme. As I mentioned in my address to you last year, thanks to the generous contributions received, three of the 15 Judicial Fellows who joined the Court as part of the 2022-2023 cohort were beneficiaries of the Fund. I am delighted to inform you that, this year too, three of the 15 Judicial Fellows who arrived at the Court last month are recipients of a stipend through the Fund. It is my hope that States, international organizations, individuals and other entities will continue the financial support of this excellent initiative. To date, nationals of Brazil, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of the Congo, South Africa and Tunisia have received Judicial Fellowship grants through the Fund.

*

I would also like to share the latest developments concerning the asbestos-related situation in the Peace Palace, an iconic building which has come to symbolize peace in action, having served as the seat of the Court and that of its predecessor, the Permanent Court of International Justice, for over a century.

You may recall that, in 2016, the Peace Palace was found to be contaminated with asbestos. As a result, the Government of the Netherlands announced its intention to carry out asbestos removal works and, at the same time, to renovate the building. As mentioned in my speech to the General Assembly last year, the Dutch authorities informed the Court in the course of 2022 that they had decided on a more limited approach, which involves, as a first phase, the removal of asbestos from the attic of the Peace Palace building, and the undertaking of a survey to locate asbestos in the other contaminated areas. Based on the results of these investigations, the Dutch authorities will decide on the next steps to be taken. Consultations between the Court and the host country are ongoing to determine how the first phase of the plan should be carried out.

The Court understands that this is only the beginning of a complex and resource-intensive project, which may have budgetary implications for the Court in the coming years, depending on the outcome of this first phase. While the Court is grateful to the host country for its efforts in moving

ahead with the first phase of its plan, it trusts that the host State, which bears the responsibility for the project, will ensure that the planned works do not hinder the Court's judicial activities, at a time when it has an extremely busy workload. The Court also trusts that the host State will ensure that the necessary framework is in place to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the project. Let me add that, independently of the asbestos problem, the Peace Palace requires pressing maintenance and modernization works. The Court hopes that, with more active support from the host country, these issues will be addressed swiftly in order to enable the Court to discharge efficiently its judicial activities.

*

Mr President,

Before bringing my speech to a close, I would like to touch on the budgetary situation of the Court. As my report on the Court's judicial activities has shown, the Court is currently experiencing one of the most dynamic periods of its history — a trend that shows no sign of slowing. Members of the Court are honoured by the confidence that the international community continues to place in the Court. At the same time, the resources allocated to the Court and the size of our very lean and dedicated Registry do not come close to matching the significant increase in the Court's docket in recent years. The workload ahead of the Court in the coming years will likely call for appropriate adjustments of the Court's budgetary resources to ensure that it can continue to fulfil its mandate under the United Nations Charter.

* *

Mr President,
Excellencies,
Distinguished Delegates,

That concludes my remarks. I thank you for giving me this opportunity to address you today, and I wish this seventy-eighth session of the General Assembly every success.

_____