



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

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

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE FORTY-FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION  
OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

\*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.

(Mr. Yusof, Malaysia)

of the problem of East Timor. In view of the Secretary-General's ongoing efforts, he proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should defer consideration of the item.

75. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands) said that the item had its roots in circumstances which were unfavourable to the decolonization process. The situation had entered a sensitive stage and, in view of current international contacts aimed at finding a solution, and the efforts of the Secretary-General, he concurred with the view that consideration of the item should be deferred.

76. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique) said that, while he had no difficulty with the deferment of the item, the argument for doing so, namely, that the Secretary-General was dealing with the matter, was not only unacceptable but dangerous since the Secretary-General was dealing with almost all the items on the current draft agenda.

77. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) supported deferment of consideration of the item.

78. Mr. HENAR (Suriname) also supported deferment of the item. His delegation was ready to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the parties concerned with a view to achieving a comprehensive settlement of the problem.

79. The Committee decided to defer a decision on the inclusion of item 111.

Items 112 to 142

80. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 112 to 142 in the agenda.

Item 143

81. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 143 had been proposed by Yugoslavia, on behalf of the Group of 77, in document A/41/144. The representative of Yugoslavia had asked to participate in the discussion of the item in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

82. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took a place at the Committee table.

83. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the item, said that the General Assembly had failed at its fortieth session to deal with the external debt issue and all attempts by the developing countries to achieve at least a minimum of progress on that issue had become bogged down owing to the absence of political will on the part of the developed countries. The external debt of developing countries had assumed serious proportions and was having devastating economic, political and social effects on them. The Group of 77 was of the view that the United Nations was the most appropriate universal forum for negotiations on that issue.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

84. The Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had decided that full consideration should be given to the issue at the forty-first regular session of the General Assembly. The Group of 77 therefore formally requested the inclusion of a separate item entitled "External debt crisis and development" in the agenda in order to promote the start of negotiations on that most crucial issue. The Group also proposed that the item should be allocated to the Second Committee.

85. Mr. FERM (Sweden) said that the problems referred to in the proposed new item were important to all and he supported the inclusion of the item. There were, however, differences of opinion on how the title should be worded. Consultations on that matter were taking place and he proposed that a decision on its inclusion should be deferred until consultations had been completed.

86. The Committee decided to defer a decision on the inclusion of item 143.

Item 144

87. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 144 in the agenda.

Item 145

88. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 145 had been proposed by 10 Member States in document A/41/191. The representative of Hungary had asked to participate in the discussion of the item in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

89. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Esztergalyos (Hungary) took a place at the Committee table.

90. Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary), speaking also on behalf of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the proposal to include the item in the agenda was prompted by their grave preoccupation with the fate of the world and about the future of the world's peoples. The realities of the nuclear and space age required a new approach to the problem of international security. The United Nations, in view of its experience in various aspects of international security, was the most appropriate forum for taking up that challenge.

91. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that the wording of the proposed agenda item was odd in that it did not also include the word "peace", which was consistently coupled with the word "security" in the Charter. He would welcome clarification as to whether the item was designed to do something outside the framework of the Charter, or whether Hungary wished to amend the Charter.

92. Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary) assured the representative of the United Kingdom that it was not the intention of the sponsors to rewrite the Charter.

93. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom) asked whether the delegation of Hungary would accept the inclusion of the words "peace and" before "security" in the item.

94. Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary) said that he would have to consult with the other delegations which had proposed the item.

95. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) said that the matter was a very complicated one and suggested that a decision on it should be deferred until the following meeting.

96. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the representative of the United Kingdom was questioning only the wording of the title of the proposed item. In the United Nations, the concept of international security was not always linked to that of peace, as was clear from the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. He called upon the representative of Oman not to press his proposal.

97. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) said that the sponsors of the item had already explained that its purpose was to strengthen the traditional activities of the United Nations in the area of international relations in fulfilment of the objectives of the Charter. He therefore appealed to the representative of Oman not to insist on his proposal.

98. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom) explained that his proposal was simply intended to make the title of the item more consistent with the language of the Charter. However, he understood that the sponsors might wish to discuss his proposal among themselves, and was therefore amenable to deferring a decision on the matter if necessary.

99. Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary) announced that the sponsors accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

100. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 145, as amended, in the agenda.

101. Mr. Esztergalyos (Hungary) withdrew.

Item 146

102. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 146 had been requested by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in document A/41/241.

103. Mr. OKUN (United States of America) said that, as a matter of long-standing principle, his delegation did not object to the inclusion of additional items in the agenda. However, with regard to the Libyan request, it should be recalled that the military operation in question had already been debated at length in the Security Council. Furthermore, the agenda for the current session of the General Assembly was already overburdened, and even without the addition of any new items

(Mr. Okun, United States)

it was possible that there would not be sufficient time to consider all items, particularly if the session was shortened. If, however, the Committee should decide to recommend the inclusion of item 146 in the agenda, perhaps the General Assembly might also consider the role of the Libyan Government in aiding, abetting and perpetuating international terrorism, since the action taken by his Government at Tripoli and Benghazi had been in response to acts against United States citizens and property for which Libya bore direct responsibility.

104. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 146 in the agenda.

Section IV. Allocation of items

Paragraph 37

105. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the three items of the draft agenda which had not been considered previously by the General Assembly and which were listed in paragraph 37 of the Secretary-General's memorandum. The sponsor of item 142 had proposed that the item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

106. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 142 in plenary meeting.

107. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsors of item 145 had proposed that the item should be allocated to the First Committee.

108. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 145 should be allocated to the First Committee.

109. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the Committee's decision to recommend item 146 for inclusion in the agenda confirmed the item's importance, despite the efforts that had been made to divert attention away from it. He urged that the item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

110. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 146 in plenary meeting.

Paragraph 38

111. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposals contained in paragraph 38 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 12.

Paragraph 39

112. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the proposal contained in paragraph 39 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which related to item 19.

Paragraph 40

113. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 28 should be considered directly in plenary meeting, on the understanding that bodies and individuals having an interest in the question would be heard in the Fourth Committee in conjunction with the consideration of the item in plenary meeting.

Paragraph 41

114. The Committee decided to recommend that item 33 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 that organization would be permitted to participate in the discussion in plenary meeting and that organizations and individuals having a special interest in the question would be permitted to be heard by the Special Political Committee.

Paragraph 42

115. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 36 should be considered directly in plenary meeting, on the understanding that hearings of the organizations concerned would be held in the Fourth Committee.

Paragraph 43

116. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 43 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which suggested that the Committee might wish to recommend that item 38 should be discussed directly in the plenary Assembly and that the item should be allocated thereafter to the Fifth Committee to consider the administrative and financial aspects thereof.

117. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia) recalled the mandate which the General Assembly had given to the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts (Group of 18) in paragraph 2 (a) of its resolution 40/237. For the Group's report to be considered appropriately, it should be considered first by the Fifth Committee, which would subsequently inform the General Assembly in plenary meeting of its deliberations thereon.

118. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil) noted that many of the policy decisions that would be taken on the basis of the report would affect the future of the entire Organization; consequently, the report should be dealt with by the General Assembly in plenary meeting. While the report would certainly be submitted at some point to the Fifth Committee, in keeping with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, it might also require consideration by other Main Committees, since its recommendations dealt with many different kinds of issues. Such decisions, however, should be taken by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

119. Mr. YUSOF (Malaysia) supported the view put forward by the representative of Brazil. Since the Group of 18 had been mandated by the General Assembly to consider the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the

(Mr. Yusof, Malaysia)

United Nations, it would stand to reason that it would report first to that body in plenary meeting. Furthermore, the Group had dealt with the question in a technical manner much as the Fifth Committee would do, so that initial consideration of the report by that Committee was unnecessary.

120. Mr. HAMER (Netherlands), supported by Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman), fully endorsed the remarks made by the representatives of Brazil and Malaysia. The report of the Group of 18 dealt with questions which transcended the scope of any single Committee.

121. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) said he thought it would be more efficient if the report of the Group of 18 was introduced in the plenary Assembly and subsequently submitted to the Fifth Committee, which would consider its technical aspects. The plenary Assembly might then resume its discussion of the report on the basis of the Fifth Committee's deliberations.

122. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) said that the report of the Group of 18 was one of the most important issues before the current session and the procedure adopted for considering the report should ensure that it received the careful attention it deserved. His delegation did not agree that if the item were to be referred first to a Main Committee, responsibility for it would be taken away from the plenary Assembly. The recommendation in paragraph 43 of the Secretary-General's memorandum inverted the logical sequence for considering the item, since the Fifth Committee, which had considerable experience in the matters dealt with in the report, must have an opportunity to consider various aspects of it before the plenary Assembly tackled the broad political issues involved. Both the Assembly's rules of procedure and other paragraphs of the Secretary-General's memorandum stressed the need for substantive items to be discussed initially in a Main Committee in order to ensure that they were considered adequately and in depth, given the already crowded agenda of the plenary Assembly. His delegation strongly favoured allocating the item for initial discussion to the Fifth Committee and perhaps specifying a time-limit for that Committee's consideration of the item so that there would be ample time for the plenary Assembly to conduct a full discussion of it. The General Committee must not proceed as if all that was needed was for the plenary Assembly to rubber-stamp the recommendations of the Group of 18.

123. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Norway 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.

124. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Vraalsen (Norway) took a place at the Committee table.

125. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway) said that the Committee's objective should be to adopt the procedure which would best provide for an in-depth and comprehensive review of the report of the Group of 18 in its entirety. In his capacity as Chairman of the Group, he had given much thought to that matter and had concluded that the report should be considered first in plenary meeting. No part of the report should be

/...

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

allocated at the current stage to any Main Committee because the report dealt with the entire United Nations system and went beyond the scope of any individual committee. The plenary Assembly should establish guidelines for the reforms to be undertaken, and that was a political, not a technical, question. The report had aroused great interest among Member States and open-ended consultations should be held in advance of the Assembly's taking up the item in plenary meeting so that they could obtain any clarifications they required. The plenary Assembly could decide at a later stage whether there was a need to refer any specific sections of the report to a Main Committee. It was to be hoped that, given its importance, the item would be taken up as soon as possible after the conclusion of the general debate in the plenary Assembly.

126. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that everyone recognized the importance and urgency of the item; the difference of opinion concerned only the procedure for dealing with it most effectively. Everyone also recognized the political character of the item and no one was unaware of the fact that the plenary Assembly had established the Group of 18 in connection with its commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization in order to highlight the political importance of a review of its administrative and financial functioning. That did not necessarily mean, however, that the Group's conclusions had to be discussed first in the plenary Assembly. The very title of the item referred to the "administrative and financial" functioning of the United Nations, matters which had been discussed year after year in the Fifth Committee. Practically all the items dealt with by the Group of 18 had, at one time or another, been before the Fifth Committee. Recommendation 3 (d) of the Group itself emphasized the importance of making the best possible use of the expertise of the Main Committees, while recommendation 7 emphasized strict adherence to the provisions of General Assembly decision 34/401, which emphasized that substantive items should be considered first in the Main Committees. The Secretary-General also drew attention to that decision in paragraph 4 of his memorandum. The item should be discussed initially in the Fifth Committee, which was the most appropriate forum since it had the necessary technical expertise and political experience to deal with the issues involved.

127. There was also the practical consideration of timing which had to be taken into account. It would be difficult for the Fifth Committee to deal adequately with the item if it was to be taken up only after the general debate in the plenary Assembly, since in all likelihood that would mean it could not discuss the item until November. Moreover, if the recommendation to shorten the current session of the Assembly was adopted, that would leave only three or four weeks to discuss such an important item.

128. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of Brazil, Malaysia and the Netherlands. Agenda item 38 had more than just financial and administrative dimensions. The plenary Assembly could always request the views of other committees, including, of course, the Fifth Committee.



129. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique) said that the discussion so far confirmed the need to allow more time for members to ponder the issue. Since another meeting of the General Committee was scheduled to take place in a few days, a decision on the item should be deferred until that time.

130. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Canada had asked to participate in the discussion. If there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

131. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Lewis (Canada) took a place at the Committee table.

132. Mr. LEWIS (Canada) said that there were three levels of logic operating in the discussion, all tending in the same direction. First, there was the logic of origin. Agenda item 38 was rooted in the plenary Assembly, where the discussion leading up to the establishment of the Group of 18 had taken place. That fact militated in favour of allocating the Group's report to the plenary Assembly. Second, there was the logic of procedure. There was something to be said for the plenary Assembly taking up that important item as a matter of priority. It could then decide to allocate specific aspects of the report to other Main Committees. The same procedure had been followed at the resumed fortieth session for dealing with the Secretary-General's report on the current financial crisis (A/40/1102). Past experience showed that the technical issues requiring clarification would emerge from a general discussion in the plenary Assembly. As to the proposal that initial discussion of the report should take place in the Fifth Committee, he reminded members that the latter always had far more to do than it could cope with. Lastly, there was the logic of importance. The report of the Group of 18 could well represent a turning-point for the United Nations and the eyes of the world were on the General Assembly to see what action it would take. The item cried out for initial consideration in plenary meeting.

133. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) said that his delegation agreed with the representatives of Canada and Norway that the report of the Group of 18 raised issues which were primarily of a political nature. Where technical matters were involved, there would be ample opportunity for discussion in the Main Committees.

134. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia), supported by Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica), suggested that the Committee should either decide that the item should be discussed initially in plenary meeting and then referred to the Fifth Committee, or defer a decision on the matter until its next meeting.

135. Mr. FERM (Sweden) said that it should be remembered that what was being sought was a consensus on matters of substance as well as procedure. The question was a political one and he therefore believed that it should be discussed at a higher level than the Fifth Committee. However, some aspects could perhaps be dealt with at the level of the Fifth Committee. In that respect, a precedent had been set at the resumed fortieth session in April when the financial crisis had been discussed both in the plenary Assembly and in the Fifth Committee.

136. Mr. LEWIS (Canada) said that in his earlier remarks he had intended to support the position taken by the representative of Brazil. He hoped that he had not misled any member of the Committee.

137. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana), supported by Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), said that the Committee was close to a decision and he therefore believed that if the Chairman held consultations, an agreement could be reached before the next meeting of the General Committee.

138. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 38 of the provisional agenda should be considered directly in plenary meeting, and that any relevant technical question pertaining to any Main Committee should be referred to that Committee as and when considered necessary by the Assembly.

139. Mr. Vraalsen (Norway) and Mr. Lewis (Canada) withdrew.

#### Paragraph 44

140. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it should defer a decision on the allocation of item 45 of the provisional agenda to an appropriate time in the future.

141. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) said that while his delegation supported the decision just taken, he noted that the Chairman had made a different ruling in connection with paragraph 43. His delegation therefore reserved the right to raise the matter again in plenary meeting.

142. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia) said that his delegation would reserve its position on paragraph 43 until the matter was taken up in plenary meeting after it had been discussed in the African Group.

#### Paragraph 45

143. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the paragraphs of the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency dealing with the subject-matter of item 62 should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee in connection with its consideration of that item.

#### Paragraph 46

144. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the annual report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the operations, management and budget of the Fund should be referred to the Second Committee under agenda item 82.

#### Paragraph 47

145. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 117 should be allocated to the Fifth Committee on the understanding that the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit dealing with subject-matters assigned to other Main Committees would be referred also to those Committees.

Paragraph 49

146. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 144 should be considered in plenary meeting, on the understanding that the Fifth Committee would deal with the clarification of technical questions relating to the item.

Paragraph 50

Items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting

147. Taking into account its decision regarding items 42 and 44, 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 items 142 and 146 of the draft agenda, should be allocated to the plenary Assembly.

Items proposed for consideration by the First Committee

148. 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 the new item which the General Committee had decided to recommend for consideration in the First Committee, should be allocated to that Committee.

Items proposed for consideration by the Special Political Committee

149. 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 consideration by the Second Committee

150. 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 consideration by the Third Committee

151. 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 consideration by the Fourth Committee

152. Taking into account its decision regarding item 111, 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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FORTY-FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/BUR/41/1)

Section I. Introduction

1. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to the provisions reproduced in annexes V, VI and VII to its rules of procedure.

Section II. Organization of the session

2. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to section II of document A/BUR/41/1 relating to the organization of the session. By its decision 34/401, reproduced as annex VI to its rules of procedure, the General Assembly had adopted a number of provisions aimed at rationalizing its procedures and organization. Many of those provisions had already been implemented at previous sessions and were therefore not referred to in document A/BUR/41/1. The Committee might, however, wish to draw the General Assembly's attention to those provisions which had not yet been or had been only partly implemented.

Paragraph 4 (General Committee)

3. The Committee took note of paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 5 to 7 (Rationalization of work)

4. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, in which it was suggested that in view of the current financial crisis of the United Nations and the efforts being undertaken to review the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the Organization, questions relating to the rationalization of the work of the General Assembly should be dealt with on a priority basis.

5. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique), supported by Mr. GBEHO (Ghana), said that documents A/40/377 and A/41/437, which were referred to in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, required further clarification and discussion by Member States. Further time should also be allowed for consultations among delegations on the best way of dealing with the issue raised in paragraph 7 of the memorandum.

6. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Committee that the previous year it had recommended that document A/40/377 should be referred to the Sixth Committee for consideration during its debate on item 142 of the agenda of that session. The same procedure should be adopted with respect to document A/41/437. In any event, it would be best to defer a decision on paragraph 6 until a later stage.

Items proposed for consideration by the Fifth Committee

153. 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 consideration by the Sixth Committee

154. 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 should be allocated to that Committee.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

7. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) said that members needed more time to consider paragraphs 6 to 10 and suggested that they should be deferred to a later stage.

8. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) said that his delegation agreed that priority should be given at the current session to rationalizing the work of the General Assembly. Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 should be considered together and without delay. Documents A/40/377 and A/41/437 and the report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts (A/41/49) should be considered as soon as possible, preferably before the general debate in the General Assembly.

9. The Committee decided to defer consideration of paragraphs 5 to 7 of the Secretary-General's memorandum until a subsequent meeting.

Paragraphs 8 to 10 (Closing date of the session)

10. The CHAIRMAN said that discussion of the rationalization of work would affect the closing date of the session and he therefore suggested that the Committee should revert to the latter question at another meeting in the near future.

11. It was so decided.

Paragraph 11 (Observance of the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the International Covenants on Human Rights)

12. The CHAIRMAN inquired whether the Committee wished to recommend to the Assembly that commemorative statements should be made at a plenary meeting in conjunction with the consideration of the relevant reports of the Third Committee.

13. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the commemorative statements should not be made in a manner other than that provided for in resolution 40/114. The reference to the reports of the Third Committee should therefore be deleted.

14. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union, consideration of paragraph 11 should be postponed until a later stage.

15. It was so decided.

Paragraphs 12 to 15 (Schedule of meetings)

16. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 3 of decision 34/401 regarding the schedule of meetings.

17. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that during the period of the general debate morning plenary meetings should begin at 10 a.m. instead of 10.30 a.m.

18. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), supported by Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique), said that the recommendation concerning the quorum in paragraph 14 of the Secretary-General's memorandum was an important matter which required further consideration. He therefore proposed that a decision on it should be deferred until a later stage.

19. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. Al-ANSI (Oman), proposed that paragraph 14 as it stood should be adopted without further delay.

20. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic), supported by Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) and Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica), said that delegations should continue to hold consultations on the subject and proposed that the Committee should defer a decision until a later stage.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that he would agree to defer consideration of paragraph 14 for the time being and to return to it at a meeting to be convened in the very near future. However, he took it that paragraph 15 concerning punctuality was acceptable to the Committee.

22. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that delegations should be reminded of the utmost importance of punctuality in the interest of ensuring an effective and orderly organization of work and achieving economies for the United Nations.

Paragraphs 16 to 18 (General debate)

23. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the large number of speakers already inscribed on the list of speakers for the general debate of the General Assembly, representatives were urged to take the floor in the order in which they appeared on the list. Those who were unable to speak at the scheduled time would be placed at the end of the list for the following day.

24. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique) said that he could agree with that arrangement on the understanding that two delegations could switch positions.

25. The Committee decided to endorse the suggestions contained in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Secretary-General's memorandum and to draw the Assembly's attention to paragraph 18.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 (Explanations of vote, right of reply and length of statements)

26. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of decision 34/401.

27. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposal set forth in paragraph 20 concerning the length of statements required further consideration. The Committee should therefore defer adoption of a decision on that matter to a later meeting.

28. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) suggested that the Committee should adopt the proposal before it and leave the setting of a time-limit for statements in the debate on items that had been considered by the Assembly at previous sessions to the President of the Assembly and the Chairmen of the Main Committees.

29. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) said that, although the proposal before the Committee was a helpful one, it should be given further consideration at a later meeting.

30. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica), proposed that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, paragraph 1, the Committee should meet either on Friday of that week or the following Monday in order to consider how the work of the current session could best be rationalized.

31. The Committee decided to defer consideration of paragraph 20 to a future meeting.

Paragraph 21 (Records of meetings)

32. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 23 (Election of the Chairmen of the Main Committees)

33. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraphs 18 and 19 of decision 34/401, to the fact that they had been only partly implemented so far and to the importance of their implementation.

Paragraph 24 (Concluding statements)

34. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to the need for the full implementation of paragraph 17 of decision 34/401.

Paragraphs 25 and 26 (Questions related to the programme budget)

35. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to the provisions contained in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 27 and 28 (Documentation)

36. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique) said that the views that he had expressed on the question of the rationalization of work also applied to the issue of documentation, particularly where document A/40/377 was concerned. Moreover, his views on that document applied to all relevant paragraphs in the Secretary-General's memorandum.

37. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 28 of decision 34/401 and to examine the question of the volume of documentation in depth with a view to proposing the adoption of stricter measures by the General Assembly.



Paragraphs 29 and 30 (Resolutions)

38. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 32 of decision 34/401 and to the relevant recommendations made by the Presidents of the General Assembly in the appendix to document A/40/377.

Paragraph 31 (Special conferences)

39. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 31 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 32 (Meetings of subsidiary organs)

40. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) proposed that the Special Committee against Apartheid should be authorized to meet during the forty-first session because circumstances might require that Committee to meet at any time.

41. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should authorize the three subsidiary organs listed in paragraph 32 of the Secretary-General's memorandum and the Special Committee against Apartheid to meet during the forty-first session.

Section III. Adoption of the agenda

42. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the Committee was not considering the substance of any item except in so far as it directly bore on the question of whether or not to recommend the inclusion of that item in the agenda. The draft agenda consisted of 146 items.

43. The Committee took note of paragraph 34 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Inclusion of items

Items 1 to 6

44. The CHAIRMAN said that items 1 to 6 had already been considered; he would therefore take it that there were no comments on their inclusion in the agenda.

Items 7 to 25

45. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 7 to 25 in the agenda.

Item 26

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan had asked to participate in the discussion of the item; if there was no objection, he would invite them to take places at the Committee table.

47. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) and Mr. Fareed (Pakistan) took places at the Committee table.

48. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan) said that his delegation strongly objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the item on the situation in Afghanistan. At previous sessions he had given detailed reasons why Afghanistan was not prepared to discuss its internal affairs in an international forum. The item in question related to an internal matter and hence a discussion of it would be contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Those seeking to have the item included in the agenda were determined to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. The imperialist and hegemonist forces were exploiting the issue in order to divert attention from vital problems for which they themselves were responsible. Their intentions were to exacerbate the problems of the region rather than help solve them.

49. His Government had put forward realistic proposals for the settlement of the dispute between Afghanistan and its neighbours, and Afghanistan was already engaged in promising negotiations. Only sincere political will could create the right climate for direct bilateral negotiations and only such negotiations could restore normal friendly relations and bring about peace and stability in the region. An acrimonious debate in the General Assembly would only complicate matters and his country would never submit to external pressure or intimidation. Moreover, the outcome of any debate in the General Assembly would not be binding on his Government. The Assembly's best course of action would be to avoid a harmful, propagandistic discussion.

50. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the question at issue had been pending for six years, despite the efforts of the Secretary-General and the General Assembly, and was not an artificial one because it seriously affected the whole region, and especially Pakistan, which already had to accommodate three million refugees. An acrimonious debate was not necessary, but a reasonable one was. The item should therefore be included in the agenda until the General Assembly's resolutions on the subject were implemented.

51. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) said that the General Assembly had been discussing the situation in Afghanistan for six years and that its resolutions had still not been implemented. The country was still under foreign occupation and the peace and security of the region was threatened. A discussion of the matter was therefore essential.

52. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported Afghanistan's contention that item 26 should not be included in the agenda because a discussion of the item would constitute interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and would thus be contrary to the Charter. It would make the achievement of a settlement more difficult, impede normalization of the situation in the region and undermine the talks currently under way with the Secretary-General's special representative.

53. Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) said that he supported the inclusion of the item until a just settlement had been reached.

54. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of item 26 because it was contrary to the wishes of a sovereign State, Afghanistan, and constituted interference in its internal affairs. A settlement could be reached only through negotiations which took into account the legitimate interests of the parties concerned. That also applied to agenda item 25.

55. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 26 in the agenda.

56. Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) and Mr. Fareed (Pakistan) withdrew.

Items 27 to 30

57. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 27 to 30 in the agenda.

Item 31

58. Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) said that it would be regrettable for the General Assembly to have to consider the item in question again. That would be in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, because the territory in question was under French sovereignty. Moreover, the issue was already under discussion by the parties concerned.

59. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 31 in the agenda.

Items 32 to 41

60. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 32 to 41 in the agenda.

Item 42

61. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana), supported by Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) and Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom), proposed that in order to reduce documentation and shorten the agenda, and to avoid the carrying over of an item from one session to the next, item 42 should be deleted from the agenda.

62. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should not include item 42 in the agenda.

Item 43

63. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 43 in the agenda.

Item 44

64. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana), supported by Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) and Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba), proposed that agenda item 44 should be deleted from the agenda for the same reasons as those put forward for the deletion of agenda item 42.

65. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should not include item 44 in the agenda.

Items 45 to 78

66. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 45 to 78 in the agenda.

Item 79

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

68. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Rakotondramboa (Madagascar) took a place at the Committee table.

69. Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar) said that the periodic contacts between the French and Malagasy governments had not yet led to a settlement of the dispute. Until such time as General Assembly resolutions 34/91 and 35/123 were implemented, the item should be kept on the agenda in accordance with General Assembly decision 40/429.

70. Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) regretted that the General Committee should have to consider the question of including item 79 in the agenda. His delegation was of the view that the inclusion of the item would be in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter since talks between his Government and the Malagasy authorities were continuing.

71. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 79 in the agenda.

72. Mr. Rakotondramboa (Madagascar) withdrew.

Items 80 to 110

73. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 80 to 110 in the agenda.

Item 111

74. Mr. YUSOF (Malaysia) drew attention to document A/41/602, in which the Secretary-General stated that substantive talks were continuing under his auspices between Indonesia and Portugal with a view to achieving a comprehensive settlement