

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



GENERAL COMMITTEE, 165th
MEETING

Wednesday, 20 September 1967,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Organization of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General</i>	1
<i>Adoption of the agenda of the twenty-second session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General</i>	1
<i>Items 1 to 6</i>	1
<i>Items 7 to 23</i>	1
<i>Item 24</i>	1
<i>Items 25 to 32</i>	1
<i>Items 33 and 94</i>	2
<i>Item 34</i>	4
<i>Item 35</i>	4
<i>Items 36 to 46</i>	5
<i>Items 48 to 61</i>	5
<i>Item 62</i>	5
<i>Items 63 to 70</i>	6
<i>Item 71</i>	6
<i>Items 72 to 91</i>	7

Chairman: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

Organization of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/167)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Secretary-General's observations and suggestions in his memorandum on the organization of the twenty-second session (A/BUR/167).

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposals contained in the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Adoption of the agenda of the twenty-second session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/168 and Add.1-3)

2. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Secretary-General's proposals in paragraphs 3 and 4 of his memorandum (A/BUR/168), namely, that item 47 on regional development should be deleted and that the title of item 48 should be amended to read:

"Multilateral food aid:

"(a) Programme of studies on multilateral food aid: report of the Secretary-General;

"(b) Review of the World Food Programme."

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposals contained in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

ITEMS 1 TO 6

3. The CHAIRMAN said that the Assembly had already dealt with items 1 to 6 in plenary session and invited the Committee to consider the inclusion in the agenda of item 7 and the following items.

ITEMS 7 TO 23

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 7 to 23 in the agenda.

ITEM 24

4. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) pointed out that consultations between delegations were still proceeding on the best way of wording item 24. He therefore proposed that the General Committee should postpone consideration of that item.

5. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said his delegation was perfectly ready to discuss the activities of foreign economic and other interests and their role in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, it had serious reservations about the biased wording of item 24. It was a dangerous precedent to include in the agenda items phrased in such a way as to seek to record a conclusion prior to discussion.

6. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) and Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) supported the Tanzanian proposal.

7. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone consideration of item 24 until the following day.

It was so decided.

ITEMS 25 TO 32

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 25 to 32 in the agenda.

The printed official records of the meetings of the General Committee of the General Assembly are published in fascicle form, the record of each meeting being issued separately. At the end of the session, a prefatory fascicle is issued, containing a table of contents, the composition of the General Committee, and other prefatory matter. The fascicles are bound subsequently in volumes by session. The complete list of delegations attending the session is published in the prefatory fascicle to the plenary meetings.

ITEMS 33 AND 94

8. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) proposed that, as items 33 and 94 dealt with the same topic, they should be combined into a single item entitled:

"The Korean question:

- "(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;
- "(b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations."

A similar proposal had been made at the twenty-first session^{1/} but had given rise to procedural difficulties. In order to avoid such difficulties at the present session and in the interests of logic and good order, the Committee should combine the two items, as it had done at the seventeenth session, and thus save a considerable amount of time.

9. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation categorically objected to the inclusion in the agenda of item 33. Such an inclusion would be a gross violation of the basic principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, which forbade interference, including interference by the United Nations, in the internal affairs of States. For many years the United States had pressured the United Nations into discussing the question of Korea but debate on that subject had not solved the problem or even allowed Korea to move one step forward towards reunification. Reunification of that country was the legitimate aspiration and inalienable right of the Korean people, who were entitled to decide their own destiny without outside interference of any kind. If that aim had not been achieved, the sole reason was continuing interference in their internal affairs by the occupying forces of the United States, which had set up a puppet régime, turned the country into a military base and resisted efforts to bring about reunification. Discussion of the so-called Korean question imposed on the United Nations by the United States had not helped to unite Korea and had shown the futility of setting up illegally constituted bodies such as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. That body had been used as a cover for the aggressive activities of the United States and had merely served to foster hatred and disunity between peoples. All foreign interference in Korea should therefore cease forthwith and the Koreans should be allowed to exercise their sovereign right of determining their own future. The illegally constituted Commission should be abolished and the item should be removed from the agenda.

10. His delegation also opposed the United States proposal to combine items 33 and 94 because it represented an obvious and hasty attempt to prejudge the question. Item 94 was an important and urgent problem which must be studied separately by the General Assembly. In any case, the General Committee could not decide to combine the items; that was a matter for the Committee to which the items were allocated.

11. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said that the starting point for the discussion of the Korean question must be the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. To delete item 33 would be to ignore the whole history of United Nations involvement in Korea and all the work the United Nations had done to bring the principles of the Charter to bear on the problem of Korea.

12. The wording of item 94 was controversial and prejudged the question in a manner that the General Committee had come to expect from certain delegations. His delegation did not object to its inclusion, since a considerable degree of latitude was now allowed in the wording of certain items, but it supported the United States proposal that it should be dealt with in conjunction with item 33. The Assembly must conduct a full discussion of the Korean question and it would be quite unable to do so without the report of the Commission.

13. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) agreed with the representative of Australia that it would be quite unthinkable for the General Assembly to discuss the Korean question without taking up the report of the Commission. He therefore could not accept the USSR proposal to delete item 33. It was true that the Charter forbade interference in the domestic affairs of States but it was absolutely proper for the United Nations to intervene in a situation which threatened international peace and security. Everyone knew that in 1950 peace had been threatened and broken in Korea and that the United Nations intervention had been fully justified. The USSR representative had said that no progress had been made in restoring peace in the area, but that would be an added reason for the item to be kept on the agenda. To hold separate debates on item 33 and item 94 would be a waste of time.

14. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that no serious arguments had been put forward to counter his objection to the inclusion of item 33. Discussion of the stereotyped reports of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was fruitless. It must be repeated that nothing could justify outside interference, including interference by the United Nations, in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. The existence of the Commission was a flagrant violation of the Charter and had created a dangerous situation which threatened security and public order in Korea. The United Nations must put an end to that abnormal situation by abolishing the so-called Commission. Some delegations supported Washington's policy in Korea and sought to convince the Committee that the reports of the Commission were useful. However, discussions of those reports over the past decade had shown that the Commission was of no value whatsoever for the Korean people and only harmed their national interests.

15. The Soviet Union also strongly opposed the United States proposal that items 33 and 94 should be combined because the General Committee could not prejudge the question of how the Committee to which those items were allocated would actually discuss them. The same proposal had been made to the General Committee at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly

^{1/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, General Committee, 163rd meeting, para. 39.*

but had not been adopted. After such a recent precedent it was fruitless to reintroduce the same proposal.

The Committee decided by 16 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 33 in the agenda.

16. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the inclusion of item 33 should be interpreted as indicative, not of its position on the substance of the question, but of its commitment to the principle that all items proposed should be discussed.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the inclusion of item 94.

18. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) wondered whether the Committee would also vote on the United States proposal that items 33 and 94 should be combined, which he believed should be considered by the appropriate Main Committee.

19. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) felt that the Committee should first decide on the inclusion of item 94 and then on the United States proposal. To vote on the United States proposal at the present stage would be tantamount to seeking to reverse the decision taken on item 33, which had been adopted in the form in which it had been presented in the provisional agenda.

20. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) said that he had no objection to a vote being taken first on the inclusion of item 94. However, he would press his proposal to the vote because it had been the first proposal made, was formally before the Committee and was fully in accordance with the precedents established at the thirteenth, fourteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and twentieth sessions, when the General Assembly—and not the appropriate Main Committee—had decided to combine various items. Moreover, the General Committee had just adopted a similar proposal by deciding, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/168), to combine two items on multilateral food aid. There could therefore be no question that the General Committee had the authority to combine items when it considered it desirable to do so.

21. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) observed that the United States proposal was supported by precedents but not by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In his view, that proposal trespassed on the competence of the organ which would ultimately be responsible for the discussion of the Korean question and, by combining two separate and distinct issues, constituted an attempt to prejudge one of them. The United States representative had based his argument on precedents, which were not always an infallible guide. For those reasons, he would be unable to support the United States proposal.

22. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation opposed the combining of items 33 and 94, which were quite different in substance and must be discussed separately. He fully shared the views of the representative of the

United Arab Republic, especially since under rule 100 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly each Main Committee adopted its own priorities. The arguments advanced in favour of combining the two items were groundless and were not justified under the rules of procedure.

23. With regard to item 94, the USSR, together with other socialist countries, had proposed the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" as an important, urgent and separate question.

24. The occupation of South Korea by United States imperialists under the flag of the United Nations, the aggressive policy pursued by the United States with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the systematic provocative actions of the United States troops in the vicinity of the demarcation line were among the chief sources of the tension prevailing in that area and throughout the Far East. The task of all peace-loving countries and peoples was to prevent the aggressive imperialist forces from building up tensions in the world, implanting lawlessness and misrule, and curtailing the right of peoples to free and independent development. The withdrawal of United States forces from South Korea was the main prerequisite for a peaceful reunification of the country; it would ease the existing tension and make it possible to take practical measures designed to ensure peace in the area. His delegation therefore considered it essential to put an end to all foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people, who must decide their own destiny. That was the only lawful and correct way to a solution of the problem which would be in keeping with the interests and aspirations of the Korean people.

25. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said his delegation had understood that the vote on item 33 had been taken in response to the USSR proposal for its deletion, which had been rejected. The second issue now facing the Committee was the United States proposal. The General Committee was fully competent to alter the wording of item 33; in fact, it had already decided to defer the consideration of item 24 in order to provide an opportunity for its possible reformulation. However, his delegation would have no objection to a vote being taken first on item 94 and then on the United States proposal.

26. Mr. MOLINA UREÑA (Dominican Republic) drew the USSR representative's attention to rule 41 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which gave the Committee the authority to make recommendations to the Assembly with a view to assisting it in determining the priority of the items of the agenda. Naturally, each Main Committee remained free to decide on its own order of priorities on the basis of the General Committee's recommendations. His delegation therefore supported the United States proposal.

27. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador), supported by Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras), pointed out that the General Committee could hardly combine two items unless it had first adopted them.

28. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should take a decision first on the inclusion of item 94 and then on the United States proposal.

It was so decided.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 94 in the agenda.

29. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the Committee had decided to recommend the inclusion of both item 33, to which his delegation had objected, and item 94, the question was now closed and there was no reason for any further discussion of it. The United States representative was proposing an entirely new item which did not appear on the provisional agenda and had so far not even been given a definitive wording. Such a proposal should be submitted in accordance with the proper procedure for the submission of new items. Lastly, if the Committee wished to consider the United States proposal and vote on it, it would have to reverse the decisions it had already taken; it could not simply ignore them.

30. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that, in supporting the inclusion of item 94, his delegation had been concerned less with the wording than with the content of that item. It now supported the wording proposed by the United States representative.

31. Mr. MOLINA UREÑA (Dominican Republic) pointed out that the Committee had decided to recommend the inclusion of item 94; it must now decide where to place it in the agenda, as the General Committee had the authority to do and as the United States representative had proposed it should do.

The Committee decided, by 12 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions, to combine items 33 and 94 under a single heading.

32. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) recalled that, in a similar situation at the twenty-first session, his delegation had opposed the proposal to combine the two Korean items 2/ because it had felt that only the General Assembly or the Main Committee concerned could legally take such a decision. In the vote just taken, however, it had simply abstained because of the General Committee's prior decision to combine two items dealing with multilateral food aid.

33. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because, as Chairman of the First Committee, which would presumably discuss the item, he did not wish in any way to prejudge its consideration. He still felt, however, that the Committee concerned should decide how the items allocated to it were to be discussed.

ITEM 34

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 34 in the agenda.

ITEM 35

34. The CHAIRMAN stated that the representative of South Africa wished to address the Committee on the question of the inclusion of item 35.

35. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) drew the Committee's attention to rule 43 of the rules of procedure of the

General Assembly, regarding participation by representatives of Members which had requested the inclusion of items in the agenda. He asked the Chairman to state whether rule 43 was applicable to the South African representative's request.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, since rule 43 of the rules of procedure was not applicable in the present instance, it was for the Committee itself to decide whether or not the representative of South Africa should be heard.

37. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that in other United Nations bodies, such as the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, his delegation had always advocated that representatives of States not members of the body concerned should be able to express their views on matters which were of particular concern to them, provided that the rules of procedure expressly authorized them to do so. However, under the rules of procedure governing the General Committee's work, a Member of the General Assembly which had no representative on the General Committee could participate in the Committee's discussions only if it had requested the inclusion of an item in the agenda. As the request by the representative of South Africa was not based on the applicable rules of procedure, it should be rejected.

38. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the representative of Ecuador had been quite right in drawing attention to rule 43. As the so-called representative of South Africa had not requested the inclusion of an item in the agenda, he was not entitled to be heard. The General Committee would be creating a dangerous precedent if it ignored the provisions of the rules of procedure.

39. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan) agreed that the Committee should not accede to the South African representative's request. Rule 43 was quite explicit and, as the Chairman had stated, it was not applicable in the present instance.

40. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said he too believed that the Committee had no valid grounds for inviting the South African representative to address it. If, notwithstanding the provisions of the rules of procedure, there were a formal motion to invite the representative of South Africa to address the Committee, his delegation would vote against it.

41. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of South Africa had withdrawn his request to be heard by the Committee.

42. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) said that, although the question of allowing the representative of South Africa to address the Committee was now closed, his delegation wished to express its belief that all United Nations bodies should observe the principle of freedom of speech in their deliberations and should allow the representative of any country to express its views, whether or not those views were acceptable to a majority of members. Rules of procedure should be interpreted in a liberal, and not a technical, manner; rule 43, as he understood it, did not specifically exclude the participation in the Committee's discussions of representatives of coun-

2/ Ibid., paras. 44 and 52.

tries which had not requested the inclusion of an item in the agenda.

43. The Committee might do well to follow the practice of the Security Council, which had never denied a hearing to any member of the United Nations that was not a member of the Council, regardless of whether the interests of the State requesting a hearing were—in the words of rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council—"specially affected" by the matter under discussion. At the twenty-first session the General Committee had, in fact, invited the representative of South Africa to address it, and it had also heard a statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia, although the latter had not requested the inclusion of an item to the agenda.

44. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that his delegation had always upheld the principle of freedom of expression. However, the deliberations of United Nations bodies must be conducted in an orderly manner, and the rules of procedure established for that purpose must at all costs be observed. There was no provision in the rules of procedure governing the General Committee's work which would have justified the Committee's inviting the South African representative to address it.

45. The reason why the Security Council had never refused a request for a hearing from a Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council, was that it was extremely difficult to decide whether the interests of a State were or were not specially affected by a given matter. Since the rules of procedure governing the General Committee's work were quite unambiguous, the Committee could not be expected to follow the Security Council's practice.

46. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation, too, was strongly attached to the principle of freedom of speech. However, if the representative of South Africa wished to express his views on item 35, he would be able to do so in the General Assembly itself or in one of its Main Committees.

47. The United States representative had urged the Committee not to interpret rule 43 of the rules of procedure too rigidly; yet he could recall many occasions on which the United States delegation, for its own reasons, had insisted on the very strictest compliance with the rules of procedure.

48. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said his delegation had always believed that the principle that the representative of any country interested in a matter under discussion should be heard was one of the very corner-stones of United Nations practice. In the interests of fair play at least, the General Committee should abide by that principle. Whatever its views might be on the substance of item 35, his delegation would have had no objection to hearing the South African representative.

49. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said he wished to make it clear that his intention in making his earlier statement had not been to deprive the South African representative of the opportunity to address the Committee. He had merely been asking the Chairman to inform

the Committee whether rule 43 of the rules of procedure was applicable.

50. His country had always attached great importance to the principles of fair play and freedom of speech; any difference between his own attitude to the applicability of rules of procedure and that of the United States representative was merely a reflection of the difference between the legal systems of Latin America and the United States. In Latin America, rules of law were always strictly observed. In the United States legal system, custom and precedent were also taken into account.

51. The United States representative had referred to the practice adopted by the Security Council. However, rule 37 of the Council's rules of procedure contained at least one phrase which was open to different interpretations, while rule 43 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure was completely unequivocal.

52. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) said he did not think that there was any fundamental difference of opinion between himself and the representatives of Ecuador and the United Republic of Tanzania with regard to the applicability of the rules of procedure. In his earlier statement he had merely been expressing his delegation's attachment to the principle *audi alteram partem*.

53. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that the question before the Committee was not one of freedom of expression or fair play, but one of practical expediency. At its present meeting, the Committee was concerned solely with matters of procedure, and there was no provision in the rules of procedure which would have justified its acceding to the South African representative's request.

54. The United States representative had said that the Security Council had never denied a hearing to a Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Security Council, but no Member State which was not a member of the Council had ever been invited to take part in any of its discussions on matters of procedure.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 35 in the agenda.

ITEMS 36 TO 46

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 36 to 46 in the agenda.

ITEMS 48 TO 61

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 48 to 61 in the agenda.

ITEM 62

55. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to the inclusion of item 62 in the agenda.

56. In the first place, the General Assembly had not yet been provided with adequate documentation for a substantive discussion of the item at the present session. Secondly, consideration of the item by subsidiary bodies during the past year had been marked by deplorable one-sidedness and lack of objectivity. The Working Group established by the

Commission on Human Rights in accordance with its resolution 4 (XXII),^{3/} which had undertaken a preliminary study of the matter, had been completely unrepresentative, being compiled solely of delegations which advocated the appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights. Thirdly, although Economic and Social Council resolutions 1237 (XLII) and 1238 (XLII) of 6 June 1967 referred to the implementation of human rights through a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights "or some other appropriate international machinery", the draft resolution recommended by the Council for adoption by the Assembly spoke only of a High Commissioner for Human Rights and contained no reference whatsoever to other machinery.

57. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) recalled that the General Assembly itself had decided, by its resolution 2062 (XX) of 16 December 1965, that the item should be considered by the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. It was therefore only natural and legitimate that a report on the question should be made to the Assembly. His delegation had taken note of the objections voiced against the inclusion of item 62 in the agenda of the twenty-second session.

58. First, it had been argued that there was insufficient documentation on the question; however, the topic had been debated for a number of years by various United Nations bodies, which had compiled reports at different levels. The documentation should therefore be quite adequate. Secondly, it was complained that the Working Group established by the Commission on Human Rights had shown insufficient objectivity in studying the question. It was true that a certain section of the United Nations membership had not participated in the Group, but as those Members had themselves refused to serve on the Working Group they were scarcely in a position to complain. In any case, that Group's deliberations had constituted only a secondary stage of the discussions, and the Commission on Human Rights, which represented all regions and shades of opinion, had debated the topic at length and pronounced on the recommendations of the Working Group.^{4/} Indeed, a two-thirds majority of the Commission—which had recently been enlarged to ensure wider representation—had, on the basis of those recommendations, adopted resolution 14 (XXIII)^{5/} on the question. The Economic and Social Council itself had decided, by an even greater majority, to make recommendations on the subject to the General Assembly. There could therefore be no grounds for complaining of any lack of objectivity, and his delegation saw no reason for opposing the inclusion of item 62 in the agenda.

59. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that he fully supported the arguments put forward by the representative of Dahomey. He suggested that, in order to save time, the Committee might vote on the USSR proposal that the item should be deleted.

^{3/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-first Session, Supplement No. 8, para. 328.

^{4/} E/CN.4/934.

^{5/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-second Session, Supplement No. 6, para. 509.

60. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that item 62 dealt with a very controversial issue, and it was hard for his delegation to agree to its inclusion in the agenda as it stood. He therefore suggested that the Committee should either postpone the discussion until a later stage or amend the wording of the item to read "Question concerning the implementation of human rights through appropriate international machinery". Such a wording would not prejudice the issue.

61. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) thought that the discussion of the question covered by item 62 should be continued in the General Assembly, especially as it was closely connected with items 57, 58, 59, 60 and 61, and with other items. His delegation would have no objection to the wording proposed by the United Arab Republic, since it did not alter the substance of the question. Moreover, the General Committee's function was simply to make recommendations to the Assembly.

62. Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) supported the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic. The topic was a very controversial one and should not be discussed in the absence of the objective conditions necessary for a successful solution.

63. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said that, as the representative of Dahomey had pointed out, the topic had been fully discussed at successive stages, and specific reference had been made to a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights throughout. One could hardly prevent controversial matters from coming before the General Assembly, and his delegation considered that the General Committee should respect the work that had been accomplished on the question by other bodies and allow the item to remain as it stood.

64. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in the course of discussions on the controversial issue in question, a number of views had been put forward, and it would be unfair to emphasize only one aspect of it. In view of the importance of questions relating to human rights, the Committee should seek a wording for the item that would enable all Members of the General Assembly to support a decision concerning it. The wording proposed by the representative of the United Arab Republic provided a wider framework for discussion than that originally proposed.

65. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) proposed that further discussion concerning the inclusion of item 62 should be postponed.

It was so decided.

ITEMS 63 TO 70

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 63 to 70 in the agenda.

ITEM 71

66. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had a reservation to make concerning item 71. It had consistently stated at previous sessions of the General Assembly that the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was a sovereign and independent State. Contrary to assertions which had been made, there was

no colonial relationship between the United Kingdom and the Sultanate. His delegation could therefore not accept that the affairs of the Sultanate could be examined by the United Nations. Accordingly, it continued to deny the competence of the Organization to consider the so-called question of Oman and wished to enter an express reservation on the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

67. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) remarked that the General Assembly had already disposed of the point raised by the United Kingdom representative when it had decided at previous sessions that the question of

Oman came within the jurisdiction of the United Nations and particularly of the Fourth Committee. The item should therefore be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 71 in the agenda.

ITEMS 72 TO 91

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 72 to 91 in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.