

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records \**



UN/SA COLLECTION

GENERAL COMMITTEE  
2nd meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 19 September 1979  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SALIM (President of the General Assembly)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH 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 incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

79-57042 4655E (E)

Distr. GENERAL  
A/BUR/34/SR.2  
25 September 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

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

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
(continued) (A/BUR/34/1)

Section III. Adoption of the agenda (continued)

Item 123

1. The CHAIRMAN said that in document A/34/142 the Iraqi delegation had requested the inclusion of a new item entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". Iraq had asked to be invited in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure to participate in the discussion of the item.

2. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Bafi (Iraq) took a place at the Committee table.

3. Mr. BAFI (Iraq) said that the Israeli authorities were pursuing expansionist and colonialist policies and using methods of terrorism and intimidation in an attempt to impose a solution on the Arab nation and the people of Palestine. Those policies were contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Worse still, there was evidence that Israel possessed nuclear weapons and was expanding production with a view to using them in due course in its policy of aggression against the Arab peoples. It had carried out nuclear tests and had resorted to acts of thievery against even its closest friends, such as the United States of America, in order to obtain the raw materials for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. In addition, Israel maintained its opposition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and had been the only State to vote against General Assembly resolution 33/64 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. In view of Israel's continuing policy of expansionism, annexation and occupation, his delegation felt that item 123 should be included in the agenda.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Israel had asked to participate in the discussion of item 123; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Eilan (Israel) took a place at the Committee table.

6. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that Israel was opposed to the formulation of item 123 and to its inclusion in the agenda. The allegations contained in Iraq's explanatory memorandum (A/34/142) were absurd and unfounded. They had nothing whatsoever to do with disarmament and could only be understood as being part and parcel of the Arab warfare against Israel waged over the past 30 years in the United Nations and on the field of battle. The request for the inclusion of the item was even more preposterous in the light of constant and alarming reports in

/...

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

the world press of attempts by certain countries in the Middle East to acquire a nuclear capability. Allegations such as those contained in the formulation of item 123 were an attempt to divert attention from real dangers threatening the peace and security of the world.

7. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to place on record its reservations concerning the tone and character of the Iraqi explanatory memorandum contained in document A/34/142.

8. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation firmly supported the proposal to include item 123 in the agenda.

9. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that, as a matter of principle, Pakistan had never opposed the inclusion of items in the agenda, because the General Assembly was the most appropriate forum for the discussion of any item of concern to Member States. There was no issue of greater urgency to the entire world community than the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The proposal to include item 123 was therefore timely and welcome.

10. Mr. KOH (Singapore) said that at all previous sessions the General Committee had taken a liberal attitude towards the inclusion of new items in the agenda for the reason given by the representative of Pakistan. The two exceptions to that general rule were cases in which the proposed item was clearly frivolous or fell outside the competence of the United Nations. The proposed item was in neither category.

11. His delegation would, however, reserve its position concerning the substance of the item until it heard the relevant arguments.

12. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 123 in the agenda.

13. Mr. Bafi (Iraq) and Mr. Eilan (Israel) withdrew.

#### Item 124

14. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) said that, in a letter dated 16 July 1979 (A/34/143), his Government had requested the inclusion of a new item entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States". One of the major purposes of the United Nations was to maintain international peace and security. The States Members of the United Nations had undertaken, in the terms of the Charter, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Nothing could justify the use or threat of force in relations between States, for such a course of conduct endangered international peace and security, gave impetus to the arms race, and hampered détente, international co-operation and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. Lasting and truly viable solutions to disputes of any kind, however complicated they might be, could be found only through talks between the parties concerned, at the negotiating table. Romania was convinced that the United Nations should assume greater responsibility with respect to efforts to prevent conflicts between States.

/...

(Mr. Murgescu, Romania)

15. Many States, including Romania, had put forward proposals designed to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to contribute more effectively to the peaceful settlement of disputes. Member States had concluded many bilateral or regional agreements organizing procedures for peaceful settlement. It was time for the General Assembly to initiate a far-reaching discussion on the subject with a view to the formulation and adoption of an international instrument in which specific procedures for the settlement of disputes between States were provided for and regulated. It was encouraging to note that, during the most recent session of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, a consensus had been reached on the desirability of formulating a declaration of the General Assembly concerning the peaceful settlement of international disputes. He hoped that the General Committee would support the inclusion of item 124 in the agenda.

16. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 124 in the agenda.

Item 125

17. The CHAIRMAN said that in document A/34/191 the States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) had requested the inclusion in the agenda of a new item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea".

18. Mr. GUNA-KASEM (Thailand) said that the armed conflict in Kampuchea was continuing and could escalate further. It was creating a refugee problem, thus imposing an immense strain on neighbouring countries. The ASEAN member States were gravely concerned over the conflict and felt that the United Nations was the most appropriate forum for a comprehensive discussion designed to achieve a constructive political solution. They therefore felt that item 125 should be included in the agenda.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Viet Nam had asked to participate in the discussion of item 125; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

21. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) said that the request to include the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" was unjustifiable. It had been made without the express consent of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea, the sole legitimate representative of the people of Kampuchea, and thus represented flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the people of Kampuchea in violation of Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. The question which the ASEAN member States wished to raise had to do with the maintenance of international peace and security and, under the Charter, was primarily within the competence of the Security Council.

22. According to the explanatory memorandum attached to the request of the ASEAN member States (A/34/191), the reason for the request was the so-called "armed

/...

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

intervention against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea". An impartial observer could well ask why the ASEAN member States and their supporters had remained silent when a permanent member of the Security Council had used the genocidal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime to impose a society which the people did not want and had brought into Kampuchea tens of thousands of military advisers to provoke a bloody war of aggression against Viet Nam. The ASEAN member States had raised their voices precisely when the people of Kampuchea had just fully exercised their right to self-determination by overthrowing the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime and establishing a new régime with the People's Revolutionary Council. The Council had mobilized the entire population to reconstruct the nation: it had immediately put an end to the border wars with Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand and had called for a foreign policy of independence, peace, friendship and non-alignment in accordance with the objectives of the non-aligned movement and the Charter of the United Nations. ASEAN opposed the right of the people of Kampuchea to self-determination and wished to revive the defunct Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime. Some States members of ASEAN, while demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea, supported the United States presence in the region. The ASEAN member States were raising the question of the so-called "situation in Kampuchea" precisely when Viet Nam's neighbours to the north were multiplying their threats to teach Viet Nam "a second lesson". The ASEAN proposal was therefore part of Beijing's concerted manoeuvres against Viet Nam and the other countries of Indo-China and against the peace and stability of South-East Asia. The aim was to cause confusion and divert world attention from China's preparations for a second war of aggression against Viet Nam.

23. The present situation in Kampuchea did not at all resemble that described in the explanatory memorandum (A/34/191). Since the overthrow of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime, the people had gained control of the country. The People's Revolutionary Council had control over the entire national territory, including the capital, Phnom Penh. The new régime, with its policy of independence, peace, democracy and non-alignment, was a factor for peace and stability in South-East Asia and the world. The real threat to peace and security in the region lay in the persistence of Beijing in opposing the right of the people of Kampuchea to self-determination, in its flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and in its threat of aggression against Viet Nam.

24. History had shown that the friendship and militant solidarity between the peoples of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Kampuchea had never harmed the interests of any State, including the States members of ASEAN, some of which were to some extent involved in the war of aggression against Viet Nam and other countries of Indo-China. On the contrary, history had shown that that friendship and solidarity were a factor contributing actively to peace and stability in South-East Asia and the world. The peoples of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Kampuchea were determined to frustrate any attempt to divide and rule them and to impose on them régimes which they did not want. The People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea was fully able to fulfil all the international commitments of Kampuchea as a member of the United Nations and of the non-aligned movement.

/...

(Mr. Ha Van Lau, Viet Nam)

25. For all those reasons, his delegation absolutely opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" and firmly supported the position of the People's Revolutionary Council as reflected in the message published in document A/34/460. The inclusion of an item of direct relevance to Kampuchea without the express consent of the People's Revolutionary Council and the consideration of such an item in the absence of the Council's representatives would be an insult to a nation which, after undergoing such suffering, had been triumphant in ridding itself of its tormentors and freely exercising its right to choose its own distinctive path of development. His delegation therefore hoped that the just position of the People's Revolutionary Council in rejecting the request for the inclusion of item 125 and in respect of the question of the representation of Kampuchea at the United Nations would be supported by members of the General Committee truly committed to the noble purposes and principles of the Charter and to peace and security in South-East Asia.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic had asked to participate in the discussion of item 125; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

27. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Sourinho (Lao People's Democratic Republic) took a place at the Committee table.

28. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his delegation did not oppose requests for the inclusion of items in the agenda of the General Assembly when they were likely to consolidate international peace and security; however, it had reservations as to the outcome of a General Assembly debate on item 125. The situation in Kampuchea concerned, first and foremost, the people of that country. His delegation was very concerned to note that the question had been raised by third countries, most of them far removed from Kampuchea, and not by the people of Kampuchea through their legitimate and authentic representative, the People's Revolutionary Council. He wondered what right those countries had to meddle in the affairs of another country. The situation in Kampuchea, which shared a common border with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, did not pose a greater threat than the situation faced by the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam along the border which they shared with China. The latest Chinese aggression against Viet Nam, the public threat of the reactionary and expansionist leaders in Beijing to teach Viet Nam a second lesson and the massive concentration of Chinese troops along the border with the Lao People's Democratic Republic were a genuine threat to the peace and stability of Indo-China, South-East Asia and the world. It was that question which should be included in the agenda if peace and stability were really to be safeguarded.

29. The people of Kampuchea had definitively overthrown the genocidal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime, which had massacred millions. Like all other peoples, they had the right to choose their own political system. There should be no interference in their internal affairs, and they should be given a chance to bind their wounds and normalize their lives. The tension in Kampuchea was caused by the persistence of the Beijing expansionists, the imperialists and others in supporting the criminal activities of the remnants of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary army in a desperate attempt to revive a defunct régime. If those countries ceased such support, the situation

/...

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

in Kampuchea would return to normal and peace and stability in South-East Asia and the world would be safeguarded.

30. For those reasons and in the light of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, his delegation urged the General Committee not to recommend the inclusion of item 125 in the agenda.

31. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation, as a matter of principle, supported the inclusion of item 125 in the agenda. The concerns expressed by the ASEAN member States were valid, and their timely proposal could facilitate a political solution to the various humanitarian problems involved.

32. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) said that at the end of 1978 the Vietnamese authorities had dispatched more than a dozen divisions of regular troops to invade Democratic Kampuchea in an attempt to annex a sovereign State. That represented the crudest trampling upon the Charter of the United Nations and a flagrant violation of the principles guiding international relations, and it posed a serious threat to peace in South-East Asia and to international security. Earlier in 1979, during the Security Council deliberations on Viet Nam's aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and the situation in South-East Asia, the seven non-aligned members of the Council and the five ASEAN member States had submitted the draft resolutions contained in documents S/13027 and S/13162 respectively, both calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Democratic Kampuchea. In spite of the overwhelming majority of 13 affirmative votes for both draft resolutions, neither had been adopted because of the unreasonable obstruction by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a permanent member of the Security Council.

33. Subsequently, in continued defiance of universal opposition and condemnation, the Vietnamese authorities not only had refused to withdraw their troops from Democratic Kampuchea but had sent reinforcements and emigrants to Democratic Kampuchea in an attempt to swallow up the whole of that country and turn it into a colony of Viet Nam. That had further threatened the security and stability of South-East Asia and endangered international peace and security. The General Assembly should consider the grave situation caused by Viet Nam's aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and adopt effective measures to force the Vietnamese authorities to withdraw all their aggressive forces from that country, thus preventing the further deterioration of the situation, defending the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Democratic Kampuchea and safeguarding the peace and security of South-East Asia and the world. His delegation therefore firmly supported the request to include item 125 in the agenda.

34. With regard to the slanderous statement made by the representative of Viet Nam, such lies would not deceive anyone and could not cover up Viet Nam's crimes of aggression. The representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic had attempted to imitate the representative of Viet Nam in a colourless performance which merited no further comment.

/...

35. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was definitely opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. There had been a genuine people's revolution in Kampuchea, and the genocidal Pol Pot clique had been overthrown. The People's Revolutionary Council, the only legitimate government, was in full control, enjoyed the support of the people and had wide international recognition. It was working to restore normality in the country and was responsible for all internal and external affairs. Inclusion of the item in the agenda would be an artificial attempt to interfere openly in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and could lead to further conflicts in the South-East Asian region. In that connexion, he cited the message dated 7 September 1979 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea addressed to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (A/34/460). The Soviet delegation fully supported the position of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and wished to state emphatically that inclusion of the proposed item in the agenda would be a gross violation of the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 2, paragraph 7, and would jeopardize the authority and prestige of the General Assembly and the United Nations and divert their attention from important items.

36. Mr. BOYA (Benin) suggested that the Committee should proceed along the lines suggested by the Chairman in his statement in the plenary concerning the representation of Kampuchea in the General Assembly, in which he had said that no decision should be taken by the General Assembly until the Credentials Committee reported on the matter on Friday, 21 September. The General Committee should now likewise defer its consideration of the inclusion of the proposed item until the Credentials Committee had reported.

37. Mr. KOH (Singapore) said that the question of the representation of Kampuchea, now before the Credentials Committee, differed from the item proposed by the ASEAN member States. He stressed that the ASEAN member States had no quarrel with Viet Nam or the Lao People's Democratic Republic and sought only friendly and co-operative relations with those States on the basis of mutual interests. The representative of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic had referred to the Chinese attack on Viet Nam, claiming that the position taken by the ASEAN member States with regard to that attack was ambiguous. He wished to make it clear, therefore, what the position of the ASEAN member States with regard to the Chinese attack on Viet Nam was, and had always been, namely that China had no right to attack Viet Nam; that position had been stated in the Security Council at the earliest opportunity when the crisis had arisen, as could be seen from the draft resolution submitted by the ASEAN member States in the Security Council. However, two wrongs did not make a right and the ASEAN member States could not condone the armed Vietnamese attack against Democratic Kampuchea. The claim made by Viet Nam that its forces had entered Democratic Kampuchea at the invitation of the new Government of the country was invalid, since that Government had not been in power when the Vietnamese attack had begun. Furthermore, the representatives of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic had referred to the poor human-rights record of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. The ASEAN member States had drawn attention to that problem long before the Governments of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic had been willing to admit that it existed. However,

/...



(Mr. Koh, Singapore)

even if a government violated the human rights of its citizens, there was no principle of international law which allowed the armed intervention of other States to overthrow that régime and impose another in its place. He stressed that the ASEAN member States were not in favour of the Pol Pot régime but wished to protect the principles of territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence. All peoples had the right to choose their own government without foreign intervention. With regard to the legal point raised by the representatives of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic that inasmuch as the Security Council was seized of the matter the General Assembly was not competent to deal with it, he said that both Articles 11 and 14 of the Charter and numerous precedents involving such questions as Cyprus, the Middle East and Palestine, which were on the agendas of both the Security Council and the General Assembly, supported the inclusion of the item.

38. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) supported the request by the ASEAN member States for the inclusion of the item in the agenda. There had been a succession of tragedies in Kampuchea, including cruel violations of human rights, foreign occupation and impending famine. The situation demanded the attention and concern of the international community.

39. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the question of including the item in the agenda must be considered in the context of the purposes of the United Nations. In the present case, a small group of countries had requested the inclusion of an item which ran counter to the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 2. It was a fact that the Kampuchean people had overthrown the previous genocidal régime and that the People's Revolutionary Council was the only legitimate authority. The General Assembly must not violate the right of the Kampuchean people to solve their own problems nor must it interfere in the efforts of the new Government to restore normal conditions in the country and represent the country in international forums. His delegation opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda and would vote against the proposal.

40. Mr. PARSONS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda because a serious situation existed in Kampuchea which had repercussions on the entire South-East Asian region. There had been foreign armed intervention, much loss of life and extensive suffering as a result of war and famine. The situation fell precisely within the terms of the Articles of the Charter referred to by the representative of Singapore.

41. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea) said that the fact that there was a real problem in Kampuchea was evident to everyone, especially in the South-East Asian region. A solution must be found, and his delegation therefore supported the inclusion of the item.

42. The Committee decided, by 19 votes to 5, with 1 abstention, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 125 in the agenda.

43. Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) and Mr. Sourinho (Lao People's Democratic Republic) withdrew.

/...

Item 126

44. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 126 in the agenda had been requested by Panama on behalf of the Latin American Group (A/34/241). The representative of Nicaragua had asked to participate in the discussion of the item; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take his place at the Committee table.

45. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Tinoco (Nicaragua) took a place at the Committee table.

46. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) said that, after the devastation suffered by Nicaragua in the recent civil war, the Latin American Group had requested prompt, effective assistance from the United Nations for the people of Nicaragua and the inclusion of an additional item entitled "Assistance for the Reconstruction of Nicaragua" in the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. He pointed out that Nicaragua had not fully recovered from the 1972 earthquake when the civil war had broken out in 1978, leading to great destruction of housing and a pressing need for the restoration of public services and facilities, such as hospitals, utilities and drinking water. Agricultural assistance, including the provision of livestock, was required in order to put the country back on its feet. The matter was extremely urgent and should be considered as a matter of priority.

47. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) supported the Panamanian proposal, which could be seen as a test case for international solidarity. Substantial international assistance would be required to produce an effective solution to the problem.

48. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) said that the Government and people of Nicaragua welcomed the proposal by Panama. The situation in Nicaragua was extremely serious and complex. From an economic point of view, the country's main export crop, cotton, had been destroyed in the war; indiscriminate bombing had led to great destruction, and industrial activity was at a standstill. From a social point of view, the war had led to tremendous dislocation of families. Forty thousand people had been killed, and there were 50,000 orphans who needed care within the country. The situation was further complicated by an illiteracy rate which approached 70 per cent. He requested that the item be considered as a matter of priority.

49. Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus) supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The sufferings inflicted on the people of Nicaragua made that country a most deserving case for international assistance.

50. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana) supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Reconstruction of Nicaragua would require the assistance of the entire international community.

51. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 126 in the agenda.

52. Mr. Tinoco (Nicaragua) withdrew.

/...

Additional item entitled "Measures to assist the Dominican Republic and Dominica following the severe disasters caused in those countries by hurricane 'David' and hurricane 'Frederic'"

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of the item had been requested by Panama on behalf of the Latin American Group (A/34/242). The representative of the Dominican Republic had asked to participate in the discussion of the item; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

54. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Esquea Guerro (Dominican Republic) took a place at the Committee table.

55. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) said that his delegation was submitting the request for the inclusion of the additional item out of humanitarian concern for the difficult situation of the peoples of the Dominican Republic and Dominica following the severe disasters caused in those countries by hurricanes "David" and "Frederic". Inasmuch as document A/34/242 containing the request for the inclusion of the additional item was as yet available only in Spanish, he read out the explanatory memorandum contained in that request for the benefit of the members of the Committee.

56. Mr. ESQUEA GUERRO (Dominican Republic) said that the situation in his country merited the attention of the United Nations. The hurricanes had left more than 1,500 people dead and several thousand homeless. There was a shortage of food, and 80 per cent of agricultural production had been destroyed. Despite the provision of some valuable assistance, an emergency situation continued to prevail.

57. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) and Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) supported the inclusion of the item.

58. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana) said that it was the humanitarian duty of the United Nations to assist the peoples of the Dominican Republic and Dominica following the devastation caused by the two recent hurricanes. His delegation therefore supported the inclusion of the item.

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

60. Mr. Esquea Guerro (Dominican Republic) withdrew.

#### Section IV. Allocation of items

61. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 26 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/34/1), in which he suggested that 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 were compelling circumstances requiring their continued consideration in the plenary. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to proceed in accordance with that suggestion.

/...

62. It was so decided.

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to examine the proposals concerning the allocation of items dealing with matters which had not been considered previously by the General Assembly, which were listed in paragraph 27 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

64. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should allocate item 122 to the First Committee.

65. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should allocate item 123 to the First Committee.

66. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the representative of Romania, as the sponsor of item 124 of the draft agenda, entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States", had proposed that the item be allocated to the First Committee.

67. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said that, in the light of the explanatory memorandum on item 124, his delegation believed that that item would best be allocated to the Sixth Committee. He wished to know therefore why the Romanian delegation had proposed its allocation to the First Committee.

68. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) explained that his delegation had proposed that item 124 be allocated to the First Committee because the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the prevention of armed conflicts between States were central to all efforts to strengthen international peace and security. If the First Committee could discuss disarmament as a means of eradicating the instruments of war, it could likewise consider recourse to peaceful settlement of disputes as a means of eradicating the causes of armed conflict.

69. Consideration of the item could begin in the First Committee, the appropriate forum for such a preliminary debate, thus enabling the General Assembly to reaffirm the political will of all States to honour their obligation under the Charter to settle their differences by negotiation and other peaceful means. Once that preliminary debate had taken place, the item could of course be referred to another Committee, such as the Sixth Committee, for discussion of the actual content and precise legal terms of an international declaration on the peaceful settlement of disputes. His delegation believed that that was the approach most likely to meet the objectives of item 124.

70. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should allocate item 124 to the First Committee.

71. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 125 directly in plenary meeting.

72. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should allocate item 126 to the Second Committee.

73. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) said that, following consultations with the representative of the Dominican Republic and the Secretariat, he wished, as the

/...

(Mr. Illeuca, Panama)

sponsor of item 127, to propose that that item, like item 126, should be allocated to the Second Committee.

74. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should allocate item 127 to the Second Committee.

75. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the proposals contained in paragraphs 28 and 29 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

76. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposals contained in paragraph 28 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 12.

77. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 29 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 18.

78. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 30 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which recalled, in connexion with item 21, the procedure followed at the thirty-third session.

79. Mr. ERALP (Turkey) recalled that, when the inclusion of item 21 in the agenda of the thirty-fourth session had been discussed at the previous meeting, he had stressed the importance of avoiding an acrimonious debate on the question of Cyprus at a time when the Secretary-General was striving to secure a resumption of talks between the two Cypriot communities. At that same meeting, however, the representative of the Greek Cypriot community had made it quite clear that he did not want the question of Cyprus to be resolved.

80. The procedure followed at the thirty-third session with regard to the item on Cyprus had proved totally inadequate for the real debate on that issue had taken place in plenary meeting without the participation of the Turkish Cypriot community. Such a procedure not only discriminated against the Turkish Cypriot community but also ignored the fact that there were two separate administrations on Cyprus and that the question of Cyprus could be resolved only by intercommunal talks in which both communities participated on an equal footing. It was clear that, if the question was to be discussed directly in plenary meeting, both Cypriot communities must participate if the negotiating process was to be resumed successfully.

81. The problem of Cyprus had entered a crucial stage, following the May 1979 summit meeting at which the leaders of the two Cypriot communities had decided to resume talks with a view to creating a non-aligned, federated, bi-zonal State and to refrain from any action which might jeopardize those talks, the creation of an atmosphere of mutual confidence and a return to normal conditions on the island. It was thus obvious that both parties must be able to participate in the debate on Cyprus in plenary meeting on an equal political footing.

82. While his delegation was aware of the procedural constraints involved in debates in plenary meeting, it saw no reason why the item should not be allocated

/...

(Mr. Eralp, Turkey)

to an appropriate Committee in order to enable the Turkish community to participate in the debate and take part in consultations on a draft resolution. The Greek Cypriot community had always argued in the past that the question of Cyprus was too important to be discussed in committee. Such an argument was fallacious, for the purpose of any debate should be to solve the problem at issue, and the General Assembly could not do so if it ignored one of the parties to the dispute.

83. His delegation therefore proposed that the procedure described in paragraph 30 should be modified to include a recommendation that item 21 should be allocated to the Special Political Committee. If adopted, such a modification would help to enhance the principle of the equality of the two Cypriot communities and would be in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly and its rules of procedure and with the procedure suggested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 26 of document A/BUR/34/1.

84. His delegation hoped that the Committee would also take due account of the views of the representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community, as expressed in his letter to the President of the General Assembly (A/34/490), in which he expressed the hope that the Committee would decide to allocate item 21 to the Special Political Committee in order to permit a constructive debate on the question of Cyprus. At a time when the intercommunal talks were about to resume, the General Assembly had an increased responsibility to ensure that its debate on the question of Cyprus took equal account of the views of both communities.

85. Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus) observed that the proposal just made by the representative of Turkey contradicted past General Assembly practice and the principles guiding its work. The Turkish representative had simply reiterated the arguments which he had used in previous years. He had invoked the suggestion contained in paragraph 26 of the Secretary-General's memorandum but had conveniently overlooked the proviso "unless there are compelling circumstances requiring their continued consideration in the plenary". There was no lack of compelling circumstances to justify discussion of item 21 in plenary meeting, as the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly had themselves made clear. For instance, United Nations resolutions calling on Turkey to withdraw from Cyprus and to allow Cypriot refugees to return to their homes had still to be implemented.

86. The procedure outlined in paragraph 30 was not just a precedent; it represented a delicate balance enabling intercommunal issues to be discussed in committee, while the substantive international aspects of the Cyprus problem could be discussed in plenary meeting. The Turkish proposal, on the other hand, would create a very dangerous precedent, for it was designed simply to enable Turkey to sneak into Cyprus by the back door by creating a federated State on the island.

87. The representative of Turkey had mentioned only one of the 10 points of the May agreement between the leaders of the two Cypriot communities. That point simply called on both sides to do nothing to threaten the resumption of the intercommunal talks, and many of the other points were more important and had in fact been given priority by Turkey in the past. The agreement showed that there had been no substantive progress in resolving the Cyprus issue. His delegation therefore requested a vote on the procedure outlined in paragraph 30.

/...

88. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) recalled that in the past the question of Cyprus had always been discussed in plenary meeting, where the Turkish Cypriot community had been unable to participate. Given the obvious inadequacies of that approach, the time had perhaps come to ask whether a new, fairer approach might succeed in reconciling the two communities. The General Assembly must also avoid any discriminatory action which might jeopardize the Secretary-General's efforts to relaunch the intercommunal negotiations on the basis of the 10-point agreement reached in Nicosia in May 1979. His delegation therefore supported the Turkish proposal, which was in line with the Secretary-General's recommendation that items should be discussed initially in a Main Committee, and also supported the appeal by the President of the General Assembly that the leaders of both communities establish a more meaningful dialogue in order finally to solve the Cyprus problem.

89. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the Turkish proposal. If that proposal was defeated, the Cypriot proposal would be adopted automatically.

90. The Turkish proposal was rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

91. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 21 should be considered directly in plenary meeting on the understanding that the Assembly would, when considering the item, invite the Special Political Committee to meet for the purpose of affording representatives of the Cypriot communities an opportunity to take the floor in the Committee in order to express their views, and that it would then resume its consideration of the item, taking into account the report of the Special Political Committee.

92. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Turkish proposal in the belief that the Committee should implement the Secretary-General's recommendation on the rationalization of procedures as contained in paragraph 19 of document A/34/320.

93. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, expressed regret at the fact that, despite the numerous resolutions on the question of Cyprus adopted by the United Nations, no progress had been made in resolving that issue. Relegating the issue to a Main Committee would only further undermine the United Nations efforts to find a solution. The United Nations resolutions on Cyprus must be implemented forthwith. His delegation had voted against the Turkish proposal in the belief that, while the two Cypriot communities should be able to resolve their internal problems without outside interference, the international implications of the issue must be considered at the highest level.

94. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the proposals contained in paragraphs 31 to 35 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

95. 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.

96. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 28 should be considered directly in plenary meeting on the understanding that 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.

97. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the paragraphs of the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/34/497) dealing with the subject-matter of item 45 should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee in connexion with its consideration of that item.

98. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 34 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 56.

Items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting

99. 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 addition of item 125, should be allocated to the plenary Assembly.

Items proposed for allocation to the First Committee

100. 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 addition of items 122, 123 and 124, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Special Political Committee

101. 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

102. The CHAIRMAN indicated that the representative of Tunisia had asked to participate in the discussion on the allocation of item 55, which the Secretary-General had proposed should be allocated to the Second Committee. If he heard no objection, he would invite the representative of Tunisia to take a place at the Committee table.

103. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) took a place at the Committee table.

104. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, proposed that item 55 (a) (Report of the Committee of the Whole Established under General Assembly Resolution 32/174) should be considered directly in plenary meeting, since the issues involved were of special interest to the Group of 77 and were not purely

/...



(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

economic. At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, consideration of that item directly in plenary meeting had enabled Member States to express their views on the considerable political repercussions of the failure of the Committee of the Whole to make any progress in the North-South dialogue. As a result, it had been possible to entrust a precise mandate to the Committee of the Whole so that it had a specific part to play in that dialogue. The Committee had followed that mandate in 1979 and achieved some results. Those results had not been sufficient, however, to permit a dialogue on the main issues and to resolve the impasse in the North-South dialogue.

105. The Group of 77 had tried to save that dialogue by proposing, at the most recent meeting of the Committee of the Whole, that there should be global consideration of such issues as raw materials and energy at the special session of the General Assembly to be held in 1980. The Group had prepared a full draft resolution detailing how such negotiations should be carried out, but the Committee of the Whole had failed to reach agreement on the draft because of negative reactions to a number of proposals. Such reactions had no doubt arisen because some delegations had not had time to consult their Governments. The Committee of the Whole had, however, decided that the Group's proposals on economic co-operation could lend considerable impetus to the North-South dialogue and had recommended that the General Assembly should consider them, as a matter of priority, at its thirty-fourth session in order to reach a decision thereon. Such a decision would be facilitated by consideration of the item in plenary meeting. His delegation hoped that the developed countries would agree that there was a need to arrive at a common political will to relaunch the North-South dialogue and that a discussion in plenary meeting would give the necessary importance to that issue and to its political dimensions.

106. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said that his delegation looked forward to being able to consider the terms of a resolution on that issue in the near future.

107. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to recommend that item 55 (a) should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

108. It was so decided.

109. Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) withdrew.

110. 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, with the exception of item 55 (a) and the addition of items 126 and 127, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Third Committee

111. The CHAIRMAN recalled that a decision had been taken to postpone to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly consideration of item 88, which had

/...

(The Chairman)

been proposed for consideration by the Third Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum.

112. Mr. SOBHY (Egypt), speaking as Chairman of the Third Committee, said that he had held consultations with members of the Third Committee on whether they wished to discuss item 67. It had been their feeling that, as the item had been considered by the Second Committee in the past, that procedure should be maintained. They had, however, indicated that they attached great importance to all development issues and that their individual delegations to the Second and Third Committees would co-ordinate their work on that item.

113. 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, with the exception of item 88, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Fourth Committee

114. 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 should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for allocation to the Fifth Committee

115. 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

116. The CHAIRMAN recalled that a decision had been taken to postpone to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly consideration of item 112, which had been proposed for consideration by the Sixth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum.

117. 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 exception of item 112, should be allocated to that Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.