

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records**



GENERAL COMMITTEE
3rd meeting
held on
Thursday, 17 September 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 3rd MEETING

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

CONTENTS

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

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/42/SR.3
21 September 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FORTY-SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued) (A/BUR/42/1)

1. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Secretary-General on his return to New York after a particularly difficult journey and wished him every success in promoting the cause of international peace and security.

Section III. Adoption of the agenda (continued)

2. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Committee 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 whether to recommend the inclusion of that item in the agenda.

Items 128 and 147

3. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 147 had been proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic in document A/42/193. Support for the proposal had been expressed by Democratic Yemen, Algeria and Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) in documents A/42/193/Add.1-3. The Committee was reminded that a decision on item 128 had been deferred so that it might be considered in conjunction with the proposal of the Syrian Arab Republic.

4. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation was aware of the international community's increasing concern over terrorism but also took note of persistent attempts to equate such terrorism with the legitimate struggle for national liberation of peoples suffering under foreign occupation and other forms of racist or colonial domination. He wished to see the role of the United Nations in confronting the challenge of terrorism strengthened and expanded through genuine co-operation leading to a definition of terrorism and the establishment of criteria by which to differentiate between terrorism and legitimate national liberation struggles. The broad positive response to his delegation's proposal had included resolutions adopted by the Fifth Islamic Summit Conference in January 1987 and the Council of the League of Arab States in April 1987, as well as the final communiqué issued at the eighth summit conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in September 1986. An international conference would provide a comprehensive framework for consideration of all aspects of the phenomenon and would thus render a service to the whole international community. The proposal was designed, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, to ensure the preservation of national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and it was the hope of his delegation that the proposed conference would be convened following careful preparations within the framework of a special preparatory committee.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that it was for the General Committee to decide, firstly, whether to include items 128 and 147 and, secondly, if both items were to be included, how they should be treated. If both were to be included, item 147 might be treated as a sub-item under item 128. The representative of Kuwait had asked to participate in the discussion. If there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

6. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) took a place at the Committee table.

7. Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, referred to the unanimous adoption of a resolution on international terrorism by the Council of the League of Arab States and expressed the Group's support for the inclusion of item 147, in addition to item 128, in view of the international community's growing concern over terrorism. The Group was guided by the principles of the Charter, as well as those of the League of Arab States, the Islamic Conference Organization, the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which guaranteed the right of all peoples to pursue legitimate national struggles for liberation from occupation and domination and to achieve self-determination. It was his delegation's belief that an international conference would provide an opportunity to examine all aspects of terrorism and to establish international criteria whereby the phenomenon might be defined. The Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, which had been hosted by his country in January 1987, had unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the convening of a conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, to examine the underlying causes of terrorism and to differentiate it from legitimate struggles for national independence.

8. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) said that terrorism constituted a threat to all mankind, undermined trust in international relations and generated instability. A decisive condemnation of terrorism by the international community could be achieved only if the world accepted a clear definition of the phenomenon while recognizing the right to national resistance and self-determination as legitimate and absolute. To equate national liberation struggles with terrorism constituted a crime against the history of peoples. His delegation's desire to combat terrorism in all its aspects and at the same time to respect the struggles of peoples to achieve liberation and self-determination led it to join other Arab States in calling for the inclusion of item 147.

9. Mr. JACOBVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands) said that his delegation recognized the right of any Member, under rule 14 of the rules of procedure, to request the inclusion of supplementary items in the agenda and it would therefore not contest such a request. However, all delegations appeared to agree that items 128 and 147 were very closely linked and he therefore suggested that the Committee should approve the original proposal made by the Syrian Arab Republic, namely that the subject of the international conference be included under item 128. If any delegation were to feel that the subject was not adequately reflected in the title of the item, a title such as "Questions relating to international terrorism" might be substituted.

10. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) expressed his delegation's full support for the proposal of the Syrian Arab Republic and the subsequent endorsement by the representative of Kuwait, on behalf of the Group of Arab States. His country had vigorously condemned terrorism and expressed its willingness to co-operate with the international community in combating the phenomenon, particularly since falling victim itself to an act of State terrorism in 1986. It was at the same time convinced that the resistance of peoples subjected to foreign domination or racism in its various forms constituted a legitimate right which was enshrined in the Charter and other international instruments.

11. Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) said that his delegation also believed it would be useful to discuss the differences between terrorism and national liberation struggles and therefore supported the proposal to include item 147.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his impression, in the light of the various interventions, that item 147 could be subsumed under item 128. Item 128 could then bear the following title: "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes: (a) Report of the Secretary-General (resolution 40/61 of 9 December 1985); (b) Convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation." He felt that it would be possible to discuss all aspects of the problem under such an item.

13. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 128, as amended, in the agenda.

Section IV. Allocation of items

Paragraph 36

14. The Committee decided to draw the General Assembly's attention to paragraph 4 of its decision 34/401.

Paragraph 37

15. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the six 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.

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

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsor of item 143 had proposed that the item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.
18. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 143 in plenary meeting.
19. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of its subject-matter, item 144 should be allocated to the Third Committee.
20. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 144 should be allocated to the Third Committee.
21. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsor of item 145 had proposed that the item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.
22. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 145 in plenary meeting.
23. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsor of item 146 had proposed that the item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.
24. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 146 in plenary meeting.
25. The CHAIRMAN, after recalling that the General Committee had decided to recommend that item 147 should be included on the agenda as item 128 (b), invited members to consider which Committee the item should be allocated to.
26. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) pointed out that, since the item was to be under item 128, it should be discussed in the same body as item 128 (a), namely, the Sixth Committee. However, if delegations wished to make general statements on the item in plenary, his delegation would not object to setting aside one meeting for that purpose.
27. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) recalled that, given the importance of the issue, his delegation had requested that the item should be discussed in plenary.
28. Mr. JACOBVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands) felt that both parts of the item should be dealt with in the same Committee. He proposed that the item should be allocated to the Sixth Committee. Main Committees did not take decisions but made recommendations. Those were then considered in plenary. Any delegations that wished to engage in a political debate would have an opportunity to do so at that time. The decision whether or not to convene a conference would in any event be taken in plenary.

29. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire) pointed out that the Fifth Committee would have to consider the financial implications of such a conference before any final decision was taken. The reports of the Fifth and Sixth Committees would be considered in plenary meeting.
30. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) and Mr. ALBUQUERQUE (Portugal) agreed that the item should be considered first in the Sixth Committee.
31. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the convening of an international conference on terrorism was an important political question. He therefore supported the Syrian proposal that item 128 (b) should be discussed in plenary. Moreover it would be quite in line with existing practice to discuss the item both in plenary and in a Main Committee. The report of the Economic and Social Council was regularly considered at plenary meetings as well as at meetings of various Main Committees.
32. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said that he, too, felt that the item should be allocated to the Sixth Committee. He was puzzled by some of the arguments advanced to the contrary. The fact that the issue was important and political did not preclude its discussion in a Main Committee. Indeed, the issue of the recently concluded International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development had been discussed initially in the First Committee. It was not normal practice to consider an agenda item in more than one Committee. The practice was justified in the case of the report of the Economic and Social Council because the Council dealt with wide-ranging issues which touched upon matters within the purview of a number of Committees.
33. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that the real issue was that, since item 128 (b) was a new item, it might be useful to devote one plenary meeting to discussing it. In his view, that would be an acceptable compromise.
34. Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore) welcomed the inclusion of item 128 (b). As pointed out in decision 34/401, substantive items should normally be discussed initially in a Main Committee. No analogy should be made between the manner in which the report of the Economic and Social Council was considered and the manner in which item 128 (b) should be considered. The Council dealt with a broad range of items, whereas terrorism was a single item.
35. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that questions pertaining to terrorism were political and should be discussed in a political body, namely, in plenary. His delegation supported the compromise proposed by the representative of Cameroon.
36. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) said that item 128 (a) should continue to be considered by the Sixth Committee. The newly added sub-item, however, was of sufficient importance to warrant its consideration in plenary meeting.

37. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said it would be appropriate to hold a brief debate on the question of an international conference during a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, since that question encompassed matters of relevance to the Special Political and Fourth Committees as well as to the Sixth Committee. At the same time, it would be incumbent upon the Sixth Committee to consider the legal aspects of the question. The proposal put forward by the representative of Cameroon appeared to provide a solution.

38. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) also expressed support for the proposal made by the representative of Cameroon. The political decision to convene an international conference must be taken by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, while the legal aspects of the question of international terrorism should be considered by the Sixth Committee.

39. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros) maintained that it would be preferable to follow established procedures. He did not believe that part of an item should be considered by the Assembly in plenary meeting while another part was considered in a Main Committee. If a general debate on the item was required, it should be held in a plenary meeting after the item had been discussed by the Sixth Committee.

40. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) pointed out that, when the item was discussed in plenary meeting after having been considered by the Sixth Committee, all delegations would have an opportunity to express their views on aspects other than the legal aspects of the question.

41. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire) noted that the Committee had agreed to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 4 of its decision 34/401; consequently, item 128 as a whole, as a substantive item, must be discussed initially in the Sixth Committee. Moreover, in the past, recommendations to convene conferences on subjects related to terrorism had always originated in the Sixth Committee.

42. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said it was clear that delegations that opposed consideration in plenary meeting were those that were opposed to the convening of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation. His delegation believed that that differentiation must be made and that the holding of a international conference for that purpose was therefore imperative; however, he would not insist on the allocation decision being put to a vote.

43. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that delegations that wished to block the holding of such a conference would attempt to do so in the Sixth Committee as well as in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. He thought it best to have item 128 (b) introduced in a plenary meeting, after which brief political statements could be made by delegations. Item 128 as a whole would then be considered by the Sixth Committee, which would report thereon to the Assembly in plenary meeting.

44. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed support for that procedure.

45. Mr. JACOBOVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands) strongly objected to the introduction of item 18 (b) in a plenary meeting of the Assembly before it had been considered by the Sixth Committee. Item 128, although composed of two sub-items, related to a single issue, and the Assembly should not seek to politicize only one part of it.

46. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire), speaking on a point of order, drew attention to rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and moved the closure of the debate.

47. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) drew attention to rule 118 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and moved the suspension of the meeting so that consultations might be held which would facilitate a compromise in the matter of the allocation of agenda item 128.

48. The motion to suspend the meeting was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 12.40 p.m.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee first had to take action on the motion by Zaire to close the debate.

50. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) inquired whether the representative of Zaire wished to withdraw his motion.

51. Mr. NZENGEYA (Zaire) said that he wished to maintain his motion since there seemed to be a consensus on the matter under consideration.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to close the debate.

53. It was so decided.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, as a result of the consultations, there seemed to be a consensus on the proposal made by the representative of Cameroon.

55. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 128 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee, on the understanding that sub-item (b) would first be introduced in a plenary meeting.

56. Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) withdrew.

Paragraph 38

57. 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, and that Monday, 12 October 1987, should be devoted to the observance of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless.

Paragraph 39

58. 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 18.

Paragraph 40

59. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly 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 41

60. 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 42

61. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 37 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 43

62. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 41 should be allocated to the Fifth Committee, on the understanding that such a decision would in no way prejudice the arrangements to be made for the future consideration of the item.

Paragraph 44

63. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 43 should be allocated to the Fifth Committee, on the understanding that such a decision would in no way prejudice the arrangements to be made for the future consideration of the item.

Paragraph 45

64. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 45 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 46 of the draft agenda (Question of Cyprus).

65. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) said that the question of Cyprus concerned an act of aggression which had been a grave violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a serious threat to international peace and security. The problem caused by the invasion of Cyprus had been compounded by the failure of Turkey to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions. His Government fully supported the procedure followed by the General Assembly since 1974 in dealing with the question of Cyprus, because that procedure made it possible to discuss the international aspects of the question in plenary and enabled representatives of the Cypriot communities to express their views on its internal aspects in the Special Political Committee.

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

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

68. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey), referring to the allocation of item 46 to the plenary, said that there was good reason why the question of Cyprus had not been discussed since the resumed thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The fact was that no progress towards a solution had resulted from previous debates; if anything, they had exacerbated tensions. The outcome would be no different in 1987. For internal political reasons, Greek Cypriots had not taken advantage of opportunities for progress, continuing to prefer a resolution to a solution.

69. The procedure suggested for the forty-second session was the same procedure that had prejudiced debate in the past. Usually, all parties to a conflict could address the General Assembly, in either the plenary or the relevant Main Committee. That was true even for States which were not Members of the United Nations, and for political movements. Turkish Cypriots had been the only exception, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus rightly resented such injustice.

70. In effect, the proposed procedure would deny participation by Turkish Cypriots in the plenary and give two voices to Greek Cypriots in the Special Political Committee. Turkish Cypriots could not be expected to recognize the moral authority of any decision taken in a forum from which they were barred.

71. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly, as at its thirty-seventh session, should consider item 46 directly in plenary meeting, on the understanding that it 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 the Assembly would then resume its consideration of the item, taking into account the report of the Special Political Committee.

72. Mr. Türkmen (Turkey) withdrew.

Paragraph 46

73. 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 63 should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee in connection with its consideration of that item.

Paragraph 47

74. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that, in accordance with a request by Canada and Norway, prior to the consideration of item 93 (e) by the Second Committee, the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development transmitted to the General Assembly by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (A/42/427) should be introduced at a plenary meeting.

Paragraph 48

75. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that, in accordance with paragraph 16 of the annex to its resolution 39/125, 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 for consideration under item 84 of the draft agenda (Operational activities for development).

Paragraph 49

76. The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 121 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 50

77. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 50 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which suggested that the Committee might wish to recommend that the Main Committees should consider inviting, on an ad hoc basis, either on their own initiative or upon request, non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the Economic and Social Council to participate in the discussion of relevant items in which they had a special competence.

78. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation supported the suggestion made in paragraph 50, it wished to propose the deletion of the phrase "having consultative status with the Economic and Social Council", so that other non-governmental organizations could also be invited to participate in the discussion of items of a political, legal or other nature not specifically related to the work of the Council.

79. Mr. ROBERTS (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to departing from the existing rules and procedures governing participation by non-governmental organizations in the work of the Main Committees. In order to avoid confusion, it would be wiser to adhere to the established practice in that regard and follow the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 50.
80. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said that, while the Soviet proposal was commendable in principle, the screening of NGOs was a very useful practice, and one which had existed for a number of years. To remove the clause on consultative status and admit all NGOs indiscriminately would be to venture into the unknown. It would also create a great deal of work for the Main Committees if they had to make the selection. As the United States representative had indicated, it would be best to abide by the Secretary-General's proposal. The Soviet proposal did deserve consideration and could be taken up later in the session or at a subsequent session.
81. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) said that many NGOs from developing countries - some of them political in nature - did not have consultative status. As the work of those organizations was very important, Mongolia supported the Soviet proposal to delete the reference to consultative status.
82. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros) said that it was best not to depart from the current system. It would be difficult indeed if the organs of the United Nations had to decide on their own whether to hear NGO representatives. Every NGO had the right to apply for consultative status. The wording of the paragraph should remain unchanged.
83. Mr. GUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that a number of large, representative NGOs, which dealt, inter alia, with disarmament, decolonization and apartheid, did not have consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. Yet they wished to participate in the work of the General Assembly, and their input would be valuable. Only recently, a great many NGOs without consultative status had taken part in the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The Main Committees could still decide for or against participation by a non-governmental organization which lacked consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. However, the General Committee could defer a decision on the matter if certain delegations were not prepared to discuss it.
84. The CHAIRMAN said that it would be preferable if the General Committee reached a consensus that day. The wording "in particular those having consultative status" might make it unnecessary to defer a decision.
85. Mr. ELDON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could appreciate the motives behind the Soviet proposal. However, a number of other delegations, particularly the United States and France, had demonstrated that the subject was not as simple as it seemed. The General Committee should not, on the spur of the moment, take any decisions that might undermine the established system for accrediting NGOs. Besides, an additional burden would be placed on the Main Committees if they had to decide on the admission of NGOs to proceedings. Of course, it would be better not to defer a decision; however, insertion of the words "in particular" did not necessarily solve the problem. It was the United Kingdom's strong preference to retain the language proposed by the Secretary-General.
- /...

86. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order not to delay the work of the General Assembly, the General Committee should adopt the Ukrainian proposal to defer a decision.

87. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that deferral was tantamount to a refusal to act on the Secretary-General's recommendation. The General Committee had a responsibility to make recommendations to the Main Committees, which were to begin their work the following Monday.

88. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the sentiment in favour of an immediate decision was surprising. In the General Assembly, which had far broader functions than the Economic and Social Council, NGOs had always been heard. For example, the Fourth Committee had heard NGOs on the questions of apartheid and colonialism, even though they did not have consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. In fact, if the procedures of one United Nations body were applied to another, then lack of consultative status with the Economic and Social Council would prevent anti-apartheid groups from addressing the Fourth Committee, and disarmament groups from participating in special sessions of the General Assembly. The wording in paragraph 50 had apparently been drafted without consulting delegations or regional groups. The Main Committees generally did not start their work by hearing NGOs; even if they did, they could follow current practice until such time as changes were made. Any changes, however, should be the result of consultations and a carefully conceived proposal.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.