



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

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

CONTENTS

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/35/SR.1
25 September 1980
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

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

Section II: Organization of the session

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/35/1) concerning the organization of the thirty-fifth session, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items. Section II of the memorandum, relating to the organization of the session, was based mainly on General Assembly decision 34/401, by which the Assembly had adopted a number of provisions aimed at rationalizing its procedures and organization. He suggested that the General Committee might draw the General Assembly's attention to those provisions which had not yet been implemented.

Paragraph 4 (General Committee)

2. The Committee decided to take note of the provisions of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 5 (Schedule of meetings)

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which referred to the schedule of meetings and the fact that meetings should begin promptly. It had been suggested that each delegation should designate a representative to be present at the scheduled time, thereby avoiding the problem of a quorum. He endorsed that suggestion and urged delegations to co-operate.

4. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 6 and 7 (General debate)

5. The CHAIRMAN urged representatives, in view of the unprecedented number of speakers on the list, to take the floor in the order in which they had been inscribed on the list. Those who were unable to speak at the scheduled time would be put at the end of the list for the following day.

6. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraph 6 and 7 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 8 (Explanations of vote)

7. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 9 (Closing date of the session)

8. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestion in paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 10 (Records of the Main Committees)

9. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 11 (Seating arrangements)

10. The Committee took note of paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 12 (Election of the Chairmen of the Main Committees)

11. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provisions of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 13 (Concluding statements)

12. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 14 and 15 (Budgetary and financial questions)

13. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provisions of decision 34/401 contained in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 16-18 (Documentation)

14. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraphs 16 to 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, concerning documentation.

15. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

16. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his view, the question of the volume of documentation required further study. If communications from Governments were to be circulated only in the languages in which they were submitted, that would create inequalities between delegations and they would have difficulty in ascertaining the views of other States. He therefore suggested that discussion of the question should be deferred so that delegations would have time to consider it.

17. Mr. LEPRETTE (France), supported by Mr. SLIM (Tunisia), endorsed the reservations expressed by the Soviet representative.

18. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said that the problem called for a solution, not for further study. The volume of documentation was a genuine and serious problem, and he agreed with the comments in paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum aimed at reducing the flow of documents.

19. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania), supported by Mr. OUMAROU (Niger) and Mr. NAIK (Pakistan), endorsed the reservations expressed by the Soviet representative.

20. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) said that the question of the volume of documentation was truly serious and merited consideration by delegations.

21. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that the Committee on Conferences and other subsidiary organs had repeatedly submitted studies on the question, and requesting a further study by the Secretary-General on the volume of documentation would produce nothing new. He therefore supported the United States representative's suggestion.

22. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) supported the Soviet representative's suggestion.

23. The Committee decided to defer to a subsequent meeting its consideration of paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum in order to allow more time for consultations and clarification.

Paragraph 19 (Resolutions)

24. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 19 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 20 (Special conferences)

25. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences, adopted by the Assembly in its decision 34/405, as contained in paragraph 20 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Planning of meetings

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, dated 16 September 1980, concerning the requests of three subsidiary organs of the General Assembly - the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Committee on Relations with the Host Country and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People - to convene further substantive meetings during the current session. In accordance with paragraph 34 of General Assembly decision 34/401, the holding of such meetings required the prior authorization of the Assembly.

27. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should authorize the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Committee on Relations with the Host Country and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the

Palestinian People to hold further substantive meetings during the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly.

Section III: Adoption of the agenda

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to turn its attention to section III of the Secretary-General's memorandum, dealing with the inclusion of items in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. In accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the Committee would not discuss the substance of any item except in so far as that bore upon the question whether or not the Committee should recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The draft agenda consisted of 121 items, 117 of which appeared in the provisional agenda and four in the supplementary list.

Paragraph 22

29. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 22, concerning item 12 of the draft agenda (Report of the Economic and Social Council). He suggested that the Committee should take note of the list of reports to be considered under that item.

30. The Committee took note of the contents of paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 23

31. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the recommendation in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's memorandum that item 85 of the provisional agenda (Question of Southern Rhodesia) should be deleted, in view of Zimbabwe's admission to membership in the United Nations.

Paragraph 24

32. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 24 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, regarding modification of the title of item 87 of the draft agenda.

33. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the recommendation in paragraph 24 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 25

34. The Committee took note of the suggestions in paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Items 1 to 6

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Assembly had already dealt with items 1 to 6 in plenary meeting.

Items 7 to 21

36. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 7 to 21 in the agenda.

Item 22

37. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, for reasons of principle, he was opposed to the inclusion of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. Interference in the internal affairs of a country without its consent, and even against its express wishes, was a violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

38. The real purpose of the campaign for the inclusion of the item was simply to cover up the crimes of the Pol Pot régime and its accomplices. The resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the question had done nothing to improve the situation, but had merely aggravated the climate of tension and violence in the region. The United Nations should concentrate on reducing tension and should resist the manoeuvring by reactionary forces to change the situation in Kampuchea, where a popular revolution had got rid of the genocidal Pol Pot régime. The Revolutionary Government was in full control throughout the country and had gained international status and recognition. The Soviet Union considered that the inclusion of the item in the agenda would divert the attention of the General Assembly from other pressing problems and would not help to improve the situation in Kampuchea.

39. Mr. LING Qing (China) said that, in its resolution 34/22, the General Assembly had called for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea and scrupulous respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Kampuchea. It had also decided to include in the provisional agenda of the thirty-fifth session the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea". The Government of Viet Nam had paid no heed to world opinion and, with the support of the Soviet Union, had ignored the terms of the resolution. It had not only failed to withdraw its troops from Kampuchea but had strengthened its military presence there and had even provoked border incidents with Thailand, going so far as to penetrate into Thai territory, thus threatening the stability of South-East Asia and seriously endangering international peace and security. The General Assembly should keep a close watch on that grave situation, and an item on the question of Kampuchea should therefore be included in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session.

40. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that he was opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. Interference in the internal affairs of a State constituted a violation of its sovereignty and was contrary to international law and to the principles set forth in the Charter. Moreover, such an item would divert the attention of the General Assembly from other problems which needed to be dealt with and solved as a matter of urgency.

41. Mr. ZAINAL (Malaysia) said his delegation believed that the item on the situation in Kampuchea was one of the most important items on the agenda, since that situation affected peace and security in the region and endangered world peace. The invasion of Kampuchea by Viet Nam had resulted in the overthrow of a government and the imposition of another government on the country, in violation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. That condemnation was not made in defence of the former Pol Pot régime, but simply in vindication of the principles of the Charter. A

(Mr. Zainal, Malaysia)

serious situation had developed in the region as a result of the constant flow of refugees leaving Kampuchea and the atmosphere of insecurity and violence which prevailed throughout the region. The General Assembly, in resolution 34/22, had called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and appealed to all States to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and to respect scrupulously the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Kampuchea. The United Nations should continue to concern itself with a question which greatly endangered the stability of South-East Asia and seriously jeopardized world peace.

42. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that he supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. As long as the principles of the Charter continued to be violated and tension persisted in Kampuchea and adjoining regions, the General Assembly could not ignore so serious a situation. The frontier incidents with Thailand during the month of June had added another tragic dimension to the problem and endangered the entire area. Some delegations had invoked the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a State to justify their attempts to keep the United Nations on the sidelines. The only interference was that of the occupation forces. Thailand, together with other countries of the area, hoped for a solution to the problem in conformity with the principles of the Charter and, consequently, was in favour of including an item on the question in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

43. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation believed that the consideration of the item constituted direct interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea and that the best way of helping the People's Revolutionary Council to make progress in the task of reconstructing the country was not to include item 22 in the agenda of the General Assembly.

44. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador), referring to rule 40 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the Committee should not discuss the substance of any item and that, in the case in question, as on all previous occasions, his delegation adhered to the principle of supporting the inclusion in the agenda and the discussion of any item proposed by a country or by a group of member States in any United Nations body.

45. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 22 in the agenda.

Item 23

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Turkey had asked to participate in the discussion of item 23; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

/...

48. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) said it was the opinion of his Government that, since conversations between the communities had recently resumed, it was essential to maintain an appropriate atmosphere for the uninterrupted course of those negotiations. He would prefer it if the item was not included in the agenda of the General Assembly but, if the Committee decided otherwise, he would readily respect that decision. The Government of Turkey had constantly stressed that it must be borne in mind that a bitter debate would only prejudice the course of the conversations, which were the only valid means of solving the problems of Cyprus.
49. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece) said that his delegation sincerely hoped that the conversations would lead to an equitable and acceptable solution to the question of Cyprus; nevertheless, until there was evidence that that result would be achieved, it was necessary to continue including the item in the agenda.
50. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Cyprus had asked to participate in the discussion of item 23; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.
51. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus) took a place at the Committee table.
52. Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus) said that all the Member States of the Organization were aware of the urgent need once again to include the item in question in the agenda; the fact that conversations aimed at solving the domestic aspect of the question were under way in Cyprus had nothing to do with the arguments in favour of including the item in the agenda. He welcomed the statement by the delegation of Turkey indicating that it would not oppose a decision to include the item in the agenda and provided an assurance that the Government of Cyprus would do everything possible to ensure that the conversations pursued a normal course.
53. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 23 in the agenda.
54. Mr. Kirca (Turkey) and Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus) withdrew.

Item 24

55. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 24 in the agenda.

Item 25

56. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) said that his Government's position, already explained on many occasions, was that the island of Mayotte was French by virtue of the principle of self-determination; in various electoral consultations, the inhabitants had freely and unequivocally expressed the desire to continue to be French. A law promulgated by the President of the French Republic on 22 December 1979 had laid down a new five-year deadline for the inhabitants of Mayotte to decide upon the status of the island.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

57. A discussion of the question of Mayotte would be a direct violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, the Government of France would continue to seek areas of agreement with the Federal and Islamic Republic of the Comoros and would try to take advantage of the possibilities of agreement which had already emerged.

58. Since the re-establishment of normal diplomatic relations between France and the Comoros in 1978, a number of contacts had been made at the presidential and ministerial levels, and in the course of those conversations various political, social and cultural measures had been studied.

59. Bearing in mind those factors and especially the legal and constitutional aspects of the question, his delegation requested that a vote should be taken on the inclusion of item 25 in the agenda and indicated that it would oppose the inclusion of that item.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Comoros had asked to participate in the discussion of item 25; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

60a. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Amini (Comoros) took a place at the Committee table.

61. Mr. AMINI (Comoros) said that, as on previous occasions, the French delegation was opposed to the inclusion in the agenda of the item concerning the island of Mayotte. Although his delegation welcomed the progress achieved on that matter, it requested that that item should be kept on the agenda.

62. The Committee decided, by 18 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 25 in the agenda.

63. Mr. Amini (Comoros) withdrew.

Items 26 to 29

64. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 26 to 29 in the agenda.

Item 30

65. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to an increase in the membership of the Security Council, because such a step would change one of the most important provisions of the Charter. Moreover, it would divert attention from other important problems. The argument that such an increase would enable the Council better to fulfil its peace-keeping role was not valid, since the deficiencies in that connexion stemmed not from the Charter, but from the specific policies of States. Accordingly, what needed to be changed was the positions adopted by States, which must be brought into line with the principles and objectives of the Charter. Nor was it possible to accept the

/...

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

argument that such an increase would result in more fair and equitable representation reflecting the rise in the number of States Members of the United Nations, because the African, Asian and Latin American States, which accounted for 70 per cent of the membership of the United Nations, occupied 70 per cent of the seats allocated to non-permanent members of the Council and no decision could be taken without their consent. Furthermore, in accordance with Article 23 of the Charter, the non-permanent members were not on the basis of arithmetical proportion, but in the manner prescribed by the Charter.

66. His delegation was convinced that the Charter contained various possibilities, which had not yet been utilized, for strengthening the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security. In order to utilize such possibilities to the full, it was necessary for all Members to comply with the principles of the Charter, not to amend the Charter, for that might weaken the basic activities of the United Nations and eventually harm the Organization itself.

67. Mr. PETREE (United States of America) said his delegation was strongly opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda, since, in its opinion, any increase in the membership of the Security Council could weaken the ability of the United Nations to maintain peace. Since the maintenance of peace was the supreme objective of the Organization, he hoped that all Members would seriously consider the damage that could be caused by any increase in membership above the number established in 1965.

68. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) noted that, during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda. For the reasons described at that time, it currently maintained the same position. The ensuing controversy would lead only to a weakening of the Organization, and any change in the composition of the Security Council would be tantamount to altering the balance between the principal organs of the United Nations. Since the Council was the organ authorized by the Charter to take decisions concerning international peace and security that were binding on Member States, it would be a mistake to seek to ensure that the Council reflected the geographical distribution of the Organization as a whole.

69. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom) observed that, although his delegation had invariably made a practice of not opposing the inclusion of items in the agenda, in the current case it had taken the difficult decision to do so, emphasizing that the number of members of organs should not be linked to the number of Members of the Organization as a whole.

70. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) said that it would be premature to include item 30 in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, if the question were put to a vote, his delegation would be obliged to vote against the inclusion of the item.

71. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana) said that, as a sponsor of the resolution in which the item had first been proposed, his delegation would vote in favour of keeping it on the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly.

/...

72. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece) said that the current membership of the Security Council ensured the appropriate and equitable representation of the different geographical areas and political tendencies of the United Nations. Any increase in the membership of the Council would reduce its flexibility and effectiveness. Accordingly, although his delegation generally felt that all important questions should be considered by the General Assembly, it would oppose the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

73. The Committee decided, by 15 votes to 7, with 1 abstention, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 30 in the agenda.

Items 31 to 51

74. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 31 to 51 in the agenda.

Items 52 to 57

75. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 52 to 57 in the agenda.

Item 58

76. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) said that, as during the thirty-fourth session, his delegation was opposed to the inclusion in the agenda of the item concerning the islands of Glorieuses, Juan de Nova, Europa and Bassas da India, since it felt that its inclusion was totally unjustified. France had taken possession of those islands, which had been uninhabited and had not been owned by anyone, in accordance with international law. Any discussion of that question would be contrary to the principle embodied in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which stated that nothing contained in the Charter would authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. He expressed the hope that the Assembly would refrain from initiating a discussion that would be unjustified, pointless and untimely from every standpoint. His delegation requested that the question should be put to the vote.

77. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) said that, although it was his understanding that bilateral conversations between the parties concerned had been planned for the near future, he did not think that that fact made it inadvisable to include the item in the agenda. Accordingly, he would vote in favour of its inclusion.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Madagascar 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.

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

80. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that, thus far, Madagascar had not noticed any signs that France was prepared to initiate negotiations for the reintegration of the islands in question with Madagascar, as requested in paragraph 3 of resolution 34/91. That lack of will on the part of France had prompted the Organization of

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

African Unity to adopt a resolution inviting France to initiate such negotiations and asking it not to take any measure that might hinder them. The 23 sponsors of resolution 34/91 had asked his delegation to explain certain viewpoints. While there was no question that the item had originally been included in the agenda of the General Assembly at the request of Madagascar, the decision to maintain the item on the agenda of the thirty-fifth session had been taken in accordance with paragraph 6 of resolution 34/91. That decision, taken by the General Assembly, must be respected. The resolution also requested the Secretary-General to follow the implementation of the resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session. Thus the Secretary-General's report would be before the Assembly, and the Assembly would need to consider it and to take a decision in that connexion. The failure to include the item in the agenda would conflict with previous United Nations practice and would be contrary to the express wishes of the 93 States that had approved resolution 34/91. Accordingly, on behalf of the 23 delegations which had sponsored resolution 34/91, his delegation requested that the item should be maintained on the agenda of the thirty-fifth session.

81. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) said that his delegation did not have enough information to be able to express an opinion. Accordingly, it would abstain in the vote and reserved the right to set forth its views on the matter during the subsequent discussions on the item.

82. The Committee decided, by 17 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 58 in the agenda.

83. Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) withdrew.

Item 59

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

Item 60

85. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to the inclusion in the agenda of item 60 (Question of the composition of the relevant organs of the United Nations). At its thirty-fourth session the General Assembly had adopted various provisions relating to the matter; it had been evident, however, that there had been no consensus among the regional groups concerning the additional steps that ought to be taken. Any alteration in the composition of the organs in question that did not take into consideration such factors as appropriate and equitable representation for States with different economic systems and actual opportunities for States to take part in the work of the various organs would be detrimental to a solution of the problems with which those organs must concern themselves. Any attempt to impose on the General Assembly proposals which did not enjoy the support of the regional groups would merely jeopardize the work and, ultimately, the authority of the United Nations. His delegation considered it inappropriate to discuss the item at the thirty-fifth session and would therefore vote against its inclusion in the agenda, if there was a vote.

86. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 60 in the agenda.

Items 61 to 64

87. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 61 to 64 in the agenda.

Items 65 to 83

88. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 65 to 83 in the agenda.

Item 84

89. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 84 in the agenda.

Item 85

90. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the Committee had already recommended the deletion of item 85 from the draft agenda.

Item 86

91. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Indonesia had asked to take part in the discussions on item 86. If he heard no objection, he would invite the representative to take a seat at the Committee table.

92. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Kamil (Indonesia) took a place at the Committee table.

93. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia) reaffirmed the position expressed by his delegation on previous occasions, namely, that the process of decolonization in East Timor had been completed in conformity with the Charter and General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). The integration of East Timor into Indonesia had been formalized on 17 July 1976, on which date East Timor had become the twenty-seventh province of Indonesia, enjoying equal rights and obligations. The discussion of the item by the United Nations would constitute interference in affairs that were within the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign Member State. His delegation therefore reiterated its firm opposition to the inclusion of the item in the agenda, and desired that opposition to be recorded.

94. Mr. ZAINAL (Malaysia) said that, in his delegation's view, item 86 related to a former colonial territory in which the decolonization process had already taken place. He had had the privilege of witnessing the exercise by the people of East Timor of their right to self-determination, and believed that the process by which East Timor had been integrated into Indonesia fully complied with the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). He therefore wished to voice serious reservations about the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session.

95. Mr. ABoul-NASR (Oman), Mr. KASEMARI (Thailand), Mr. SLIM (Tunisia), Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) and Mr. NQAYILA (Zaire) supported the position taken by the Malaysian representative.

96. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) said that, as a matter of principle, his delegation believed that Member States had the right to include or retain in the agenda any item which it was desirable for the General Assembly to discuss, since without such a discussion Member States would be unable to state their positions on the item in question. For that reason, his delegation would not oppose the inclusion or retention in the agenda of any item, particularly item 86.

97. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe) supported the inclusion of item 86 in the agenda.

98. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 86 in the agenda.

99. Mr. Kamil (Indonesia) withdrew.

Items 87 to 90

100. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 87 to 90 in the agenda.

Items 91 to 102

101. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 91 to 102 in the agenda.

Items 103 to 113

102. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 103 to 113 in the agenda.

Item 114

103. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 114 in the agenda.

Item 115

104. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Finland had asked to take part in the discussion on item 115, in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

105. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Pastinen (Finland) took a place at the Committee table.

106. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland) said that the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden had requested the inclusion of an agenda item entitled "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives" (A/35/142) because the inviolability of diplomatic agents was an indispensable prerequisite for normal international relations. Violations of standards of behaviour towards diplomatic agents were a matter of great concern. The General Assembly, and particularly its Sixth Committee, was an appropriate forum in which to discuss the matter. The item should rank high on the list allocated to the Sixth Committee - for example, in second place.

107. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 115 in the agenda.

Item 116

108. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 116 in the agenda.

Item 117

109. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation rejected the inclusion of item 117, entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security". The Soviet Union had already opposed discussion of that item in the Security Council on the ground that it constituted interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and merely served the interests of those who were slandering the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The inclusion of that item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly would be a violation of the United Nations Charter and would not promote the peaceful settlement of the situation in the region.

110. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Afghanistan had requested to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item. If he heard no objection, he would invite him to take a seat at the Committee table.

111. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) took a place at the Committee table.

112. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan) said that the inclusion of the item on the situation in Afghanistan was totally unfounded and unjustified. Events in Afghanistan during the period April 1976 to December 1979 marked the various phases of the revolution that had taken place in Afghanistan and fell entirely within the jurisdiction of

/...

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

that sovereign State. Those events did not constitute a threat to international peace and security under the terms of Article 34 of the United Nations Charter. On the other hand, the acts of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan did constitute such a threat. There was nothing in international law which forbade a sovereign State to appeal to a friendly country for assistance to protect its independence and sovereignty. On the other hand, the sending of gangs to commit sabotage in a country constituted an act of aggression according to the definition of aggression adopted by the General Assembly. The inclusion of the so-called "Afghan question" was aimed at diverting attention from such burning issues as Israeli aggression against the Arab countries and the oppressive policy of South Africa.

113. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that the fact that 32 Member States had requested the inclusion of an item on the situation in Afghanistan in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly was evidence of the interest and general concern which the present vicissitudes of that country had aroused throughout the world, as well as their possible repercussions on international peace and security. In view of the gravity of the situation, the Security Council had had to meet during the month of January. Its inability to find a practical solution because of dissension among its members had led the General Assembly to hold an emergency special session, at which it had adopted resolution ES-6/2 on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. In that resolution the General Assembly, having reaffirmed the inalienable right of all peoples to determine their own future, and recognizing the urgent need for immediate termination of foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan, appealed to all States to respect the sovereignty, integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops. In addition, it requested the Secretary-General to keep Member States and the Security Council informed on progress towards the implementation of the resolution. It was obvious that the situation had only worsened. There had been a continued build-up of the foreign military presence, and the neighbouring countries had had to contend with the serious problem created by large numbers of refugees, 1 million of whom were in Pakistan. The General Assembly should continue to concern itself with the situation, which could degenerate into a full-scale conflict affecting the whole region.

114. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Madagascar had asked to participate in the discussion on the item. If he heard no objection, he would invite him to take a seat at the Committee table.

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

116. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that the case of Afghanistan had all the typical characteristics of occupation of a non-aligned country by a super-Power. Claims in certain quarters that the situation in Afghanistan was an exclusively internal matter bore no relationship to the serious events that had occurred in that country, shocking the people of the region and alarming international public opinion. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly, the latter meeting in emergency special session, had acted to ward off a crisis the dimensions of which

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

no one with the slightest knowledge of the facts dared to deny. The Islamic Conference, reflecting international concern, had also met to discuss the question.

117. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that his country was one of the 32 Member States which had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. He believed that the only way to solve the crisis was through the intervention of the United Nations and the observance of the principles of the Charter.

118. Mr. LING Qing (China) said that the Soviet Union had disregarded the resolution of the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly calling for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and reaffirming respect for the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and social system free from outside intervention. It had sent in reinforcements to intensify its suppression of the Afghan resistance movements and to escalate its war of aggression against Afghanistan, with a view to turning the country into an outpost for aggression and expansion in south Asia and the Gulf region.

119. Under such circumstances, Pakistan and 31 other countries had found it necessary to put forward item 117, since the situation posed a grave threat to international peace and security. With a view to upholding the fundamental principles of the Charter and maintaining international peace and security, the Chinese delegation fully supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The objections of the Soviet delegation to the item and its justification of the aggression were totally indefensible and unacceptable.

120. Mr. AYACHI (Morocco) observed that the failure of his delegation to participate in the discussion or in the votes did not stem from any desire to avoid taking a stand on the issues considered at the meeting. The reason was that Ambassador Sbihi had not been able to reach New York in time for the morning meeting and, given that Mr. Sbihi had been elected Chairman of the Second Committee in his personal capacity, he (Mr. Ayachi) had not wished to breach the rules of procedure by speaking in his place.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.