



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WECHMAR (President of the General Assembly)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION
OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/35/SR.2
24 September 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued) (A/BUR/35/1)

Section III. Adoption of the agenda (continued)

Item 117 (continued)

1. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said he agreed with the representative of the Soviet Union that the situation in Afghanistan was an internal matter concerning only that country, and that item 117 of the draft agenda thus constituted gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. The situation in Afghanistan had been stabilized and the people, who had seized power, were engaged in building a new life. His delegation strongly opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda. It was an attempt to justify interference in Afghanistan by the hegemonistic and reactionary forces of world imperialism.

2. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was strongly opposed to the inclusion of the item, as was the Government of Afghanistan. If it were placed on the agenda, the United Nations would become involved in an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Moreover, the situation in Afghanistan did not represent a threat to peace and security. It would be more accurate to state that Afghanistan had been the victim of a threat to peace and security and, although the immediate threat had been countered, there was still danger. Finally, internationalizing the situation would only engender fruitless rhetoric and accusations. A solution to the situation could be constructed on the basis of the proposals made by the Government of Afghanistan in May 1980.

3. Mr. ZAINAL (Malaysia) said that Malaysia had joined in proposing the item because the situation in Afghanistan held the attention of the world and represented a threat to world peace and security. The General Assembly should consider the item for several reasons. The situation in Afghanistan had arisen from direct intervention by a major Power in the internal affairs of another State, resulting in instability, turmoil and uncertainty which had in turn given rise to tension and conflict. One consequence had been the movement of hundreds of thousands of Afghans into Pakistan in search of refuge. That in itself constituted a major problem which the Assembly should consider. Finally, intervention by a major Power in Afghanistan, a non-aligned and Islamic State, had created tension posing a threat to the security and stability of the area.

4. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 117 in the agenda.

Item 118

5. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) said that the Latin American Economic System was an entity of great importance and merited observer status in the General Assembly. Accordingly, his delegation supported the inclusion of item 118 in the agenda.

/...

6. Mr. SUAZO TOME (Honduras) said that his delegation also supported the inclusion of the item.

7. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that the Latin American Group, at its August meeting, had unanimously endorsed the inclusion of the item in the agenda, and his delegation therefore supported its inclusion.

8. Mr. ESCUDERO (Ecuador) agreed with the previous speakers that the item should be included.

9. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 118 in the agenda.

Item 119

10. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 119 in the agenda.

Item 120

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Viet Nam had asked to participate in the discussion of the item in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

12. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) took a place at the Committee table.

13. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) said that he wished, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Seychelles and Viet Nam, to introduce the request for the inclusion of item 120 in the agenda.

14. For the past 35 years, South-East Asia had known neither peace nor stability. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the region had been constantly violated or threatened. The situation in South-East Asia remained tense and explosive, thus posing a serious threat to peace and security in the region and in the rest of the world.

15. Although the countries of the region desired peace, stability and mutual co-operation, they had not yet succeeded in reaching agreements aimed at reducing tension and achieving those objectives, for reasons beyond their control. In the hope of enabling the international community to make an active contribution to the efforts of the countries of the region to attain those objectives, in the interests of peace and co-operation among all the countries of South East Asia and of world peace and détente, the Member States for which he spoke had submitted this request for inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

16. The desire of all the peoples of the region for peace and stability had been reflected in a number of bilateral and multilateral declarations or communiqués by countries or groups of countries in South-East Asia. The Sixth Conference of Heads

/...

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had called for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia.

17. The events of the past few years had clearly demonstrated that all the countries of South-East Asia had a long-term common interest in establishing peace and stability. It was gratifying to note that the leaders of the countries of the region had frequently stressed the importance of dialogue and co-operation to achieve those aims, and Viet Nam earnestly hoped that, with the assistance of the international community, they would be attained, thus strengthening international security, furthering détente and developing co-operation among the peoples of the world.

18. Mr. LING Qing (China) said that the proposal for the inclusion of the item was merely a manoeuvre on the part of the representative of Viet Nam.

19. It was generally known that the root cause of the turmoil - the "tension and explosiveness" - in South-East Asia lay in the hegemonistic policies of the Soviet Union and Viet Nam in that region. Viet Nam, aided by the Soviet Union, had committed expansionist aggression against Kampuchea. Consequently, in order for peace and stability to be maintained in South-East Asia, it was imperative for Viet Nam to put an immediate end to its armed aggression and unconditionally withdraw all its troops from Kampuchea. However, in the explanatory memorandum on the proposed item, Viet Nam deliberately ignored that root cause of the instability in South-East Asia and totally failed to mention General Assembly resolution 34/22 calling for the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea.

20. It was thus clear that Viet Nam, in proposing an item master-minded by the Soviet Union, was simply trying to cause confusion and hoodwink people in order to avoid condemnation by the international community and even to prepare the ground for a further expansion of its aggression against Kampuchea. That was of course futile.

21. Mr. ZAINAL (Malaysia) said that his country had long been preoccupied with the problem of peace in South-East Asia and how it might be achieved. Peace and security could only be attained if all countries were at peace, if all the States in the region implemented the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning respect for territorial integrity, non-intervention and sovereignty. The situation in Kampuchea, occupied by foreign troops, represented a threat to peace and regional co-operation and should be brought to an end.

22. In a spirit of goodwill and conciliation, his delegation would not oppose the inclusion of the item in the agenda, although it would have been more appropriate once the conflict in Kampuchea had been ended.

23. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) agreed with the view expressed by the representative of Malaysia.

24. The situation in South-East Asia was dangerous. The countries of the region were not at peace, and one of them had suffered armed intervention, in flagrant violation of international law and the principles of the Charter. A thorough and

/...

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

constructive debate on the problems of South-East Asia would help to improve the situation. Whether they liked it or not, the countries of the region were obliged to live together, and they were in sore need of peace, stability, the rule of law and scrupulous observance of the principles of the Charter. His delegation would not, therefore, oppose the inclusion of the item.

25. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Peace could only be achieved through agreement among the countries of the region, which should endeavour to promote mutual relations while respecting each other's rights and abiding by the principle of non-interference in the affairs of others. Such were the aims of item 120.

26. The Soviet Union supported all initiatives aimed at achieving peace and stability in South-East Asia. In order to fulfil its basic purpose of maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations should attempt to defuse the situation and to promote peace in the area.

27. His delegation was not surprised by China's opposition to the item. There was no room in China's foreign policy for discussion of peace and co-operation.

28. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 120 in the agenda.

29. Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) withdrew.

Item 121

30. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union's reasons for proposing the inclusion of the item were stated in document A/35/194. Irreparable damage was being done to nature by preparations for war, by the arms race, by the testing of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, and by the development of new systems of weapons of mass destruction. The arms race diverted resources from the solution of the problems facing mankind, especially those connected with environmental protection.

31. His delegation would support attempts by the international community to draw up a World Charter for Nature, as proposed by Zaire. If item 121 were included in the agenda, it would demonstrate the concern of the international community and indicate to those responsible that the arms race was detrimental to the environment.

32. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) said that the item proposed by the Soviet Union was complementary to item 114, proposed by Zaire, and he therefore supported its inclusion in the agenda.

33. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 121 in the agenda.

Section IV. Allocation of items

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, as suggested in paragraph 27 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/35/1), the Committee might wish to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 4 of its decision 34/401, which stated:

"substantive items should normally be discussed initially in a Main Committee and, therefore, items previously allocated to plenary meetings should henceforth be referred to a Main Committee unless there are compelling circumstances requiring their continued consideration in plenary meeting".

35. It was so decided.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider first the suggestions for the allocation of items dealing with matters which had not been considered previously at a regular session of the General Assembly, as listed in paragraph 28 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

37. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) said his delegation had proposed that item 114 should be discussed in plenary meeting because it did not want to stress the destruction of the environment which could result, for example, from the arms race or from industrialization, to the exclusion of other aspects of the problem. It would not be appropriate, therefore, to allocate the item to either the First or the Second Committee.

38. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) suggested that items 114 and 121 might be discussed together.

39. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) said that he would prefer not to merge the two items, since his delegation's approach was not exactly the same as that of the Soviet delegation. Item 114 was concerned with the responsibilities of States in the international sphere, while item 121 stressed their responsibilities at the national level.

40. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that the Assembly could consider the two items together without necessarily merging them.

41. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) said that the two items should be merged in the interest of streamlining the agenda. Although the approach was different in each case, the substance of the two items was essentially the same.

42. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) said that he would prefer merging the two items but, if that was not agreeable to the delegation of Zaire, he supported the suggestion that they should at least be discussed together.

43. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 114 directly in plenary meeting.

44. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 115 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.

45. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider items 116 to 120 directly in plenary meeting.

46. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was prepared to agree to the Assembly's discussing items 114 and 121 jointly, but they should remain two separate items in the agenda.
47. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) said that, if the Committee was prepared to recommend that item 121 should be discussed directly in plenary meeting, his delegation had no objection to the Assembly's discussing items 114 and 121 separately but during a single debate.
48. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 114 and 121 should be considered directly in plenary meeting as separate items in the course of the same debate.
49. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposals contained in paragraph 29 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 12.
50. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 30 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 18.
51. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 31 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, also relating to item 18, in which it was indicated that the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had decided to recommend to the General Assembly that a special plenary meeting should be held during its thirty-fifth session to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration.
52. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said that his delegation had no objection in principle to the Special Committee's recommendation concerning a special commemorative meeting to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration, but found it unacceptable that the Special Committee had also submitted a draft resolution and plan of action for adoption by the General Assembly. He would have expected that an effort would have been made to conduct broad consultations with all interested members of the General Assembly with a view to achieving a consensus. Instead, the draft resolution submitted by the Special Committee was a divisive and flawed document which took little note of the great strides that had been made in decolonization over the past 20 years and which had failed to obtain a consensus even in the Special Committee. The issue of decolonization was of such importance to all Member States that a consensus resolution should be sought. The United States was deeply committed to that process and co-operated fully with United Nations efforts, having participated in good faith in the work of the Special Committee for nearly a decade. In that connexion, he recalled that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had been adopted only when the non-aligned members of the Assembly had set aside the text originally proposed and put forward one of their own, enabling Member States which had reservations to abstain rather than oppose the adoption of the Declaration. In 1970, the General Assembly had demonstrated that it could speak with one voice on the question of self-determination by adopting the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and

/...

(Mr. Petree, United States)

Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which contained the only universally agreed statement concerning the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

53. It was essential that, in agreeing to the recommendation of the Special Committee, the General Committee should not take a position on the text of the draft resolution submitted. That draft resolution should not be urged on the General Assembly without first carefully scrutinizing its contents. He hoped that every effort would be made to produce a draft resolution which could be adopted by consensus at the special meeting, and his delegation would work in good faith towards that end.

54. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 31 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 18.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, on the basis of consultations he had carried out, he understood that there was a general desire that the question of the allocation of item 23, referred to in paragraph 32 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, should be considered by the General Committee after the conclusion of the general debate in the Assembly.

56. Although rule 43 of the rules of procedure did not apply, he took it that there was no objection to granting the request of the representative of Turkey to make a statement.

57. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Kirca (Turkey) took a place at the Committee table.

58. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) said he understood that it had been agreed to take up the question of the allocation of item 23 at some appropriate time in the future, but not specifically at the conclusion of the general debate. Flexibility was called for in deciding when the General Committee would take up the question, and the exact time should not be specified at the current stage.

59. His delegation had already expressed its doubts concerning the advisability of discussing the question of Cyprus at the current session, in view of the resumption of intercommunal talks. Having consulted the Turkish community of Cyprus, his delegation had agreed to defer the discussion of the allocation of item 23 to a later stage so as to preserve an atmosphere conducive to the success of those talks. It was to be hoped that any decision which the General Committee might subsequently take would allow for the item to be discussed in the General Assembly in a constructive manner.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was, of course, free to take up at any time any matter which a member of the Committee or of the General Assembly wished it to consider. If there was no objection, he would take it then that the Special Committee wished to inform the General Assembly accordingly in its report.

/...

61. The Committee decided to consider at an appropriate time after the conclusion of the general debate the question of the allocation of item 23.

62. Mr. Kirca (Turkey) withdrew.

63. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 27 should be considered directly in plenary meeting on the understanding that hearings of organizations concerned would be held in the Fourth Committee.

64. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 28 should be considered directly in plenary meeting on the understanding that the representatives of the Organization of African Unity and of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity would be permitted to participate in the discussion in plenary meeting and that organizations having a special interest in the question would be permitted to be heard by the Special Political Committee.

65. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the paragraphs of the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/35/365) dealing with the subject-matter of item 48 should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee in connexion with its consideration of that item.

66. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 36 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 61 (f).

67. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposals contained in paragraph 37 of the Secretary-General's memorandum on the understanding that the recommendations already approved, which might affect the proposed allocation of items, would be reflected in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

Items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting

68. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of item 29 and the addition of items 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120 and 121, should be allocated to the plenary Assembly.

Items proposed for allocation to the First Committee

69. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania), supported by Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador), Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire), Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece), Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius), Mr. SUAZO TOME (Honduras) and Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia), proposed that item 51 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee rather than the First Committee. The item had been included in the agenda of the thirty-fourth session on the proposal of the Romanian delegation, which had wanted the matter to be discussed initially in the First Committee. On the basis of the discussion of the item at that session, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 34/102 urging the preparation of a declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States. The Sixth Committee was the most appropriate forum for the preparation of such a declaration.

/...

70. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) observed that the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, which had done extensive work on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes, was considered in the Sixth Committee; it was only logical that item 51 should also be discussed in that Committee.

71. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the First Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of item 51, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Special Political Committee

72. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Special Political Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Second Committee

73. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Second Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Third Committee

74. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Third Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Fourth Committee

75. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Fourth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of item 85, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Fifth Committee

76. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Fifth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Sixth Committee

77. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Sixth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the addition of items 29, 51 and 115, should be allocated to that Committee.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.