

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records**



GENERAL COMMITTEE
1st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 16 September 1981
at 10:30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KITTANI (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

UN LIBRARY

OCT 30 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

* 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.
81-56622

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/36/SR.1
28 October 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(A/BUR/36/1)

Section II: Organization of the session

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to section II of the document A/BUR/36/1 relating to the organization of the session. By its decision 34/401, the General Assembly had adopted a number of provisions aimed at rationalizing its procedures and organization. Many of those provisions had already been put into practice at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions and were therefore not referred to in the document before the Committee. He suggested that the General Committee might draw the General Assembly's attention to those provisions which had not yet been implemented or which had been only partially 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. The General Committee might also wish to draw the General Assembly's attention to rules 67 and 108 of the rules of procedure, whereby the President of the General Assembly could declare a meeting open and permit a debate to proceed when at least one third of the members were present, and the Chairman of a Main Committee might do the same when at least one quarter of the members were present. He endorsed the suggestion made at the thirty-fifth session that each delegation should designate someone to be present at the scheduled time, thereby avoiding the problem of quorum. Noting that some progress had been reported but that there was still considerable room for improvement, he urged all delegations to make an extra effort 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 General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 8 (Explanation)

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 CHAIRMAN noted that, while paragraph 19 of decision 34/401 had been implemented at the current session, paragraph 18, which was intended to facilitate the organization of Assembly sessions had not. He suggested that the General Committee might wish to draw the Assembly's attention to that fact and stress the imperative need for its implementation.

12. It was so decided.

Paragraph 13 (Concluding statements)

13. 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)

14. 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 and 17 (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, and to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestion in paragraph 17 of that document.

Paragraph 18 (Resolution)

16. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provision of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 19 (Special conferences)

17. 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 19 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Section III: Adoption of the agenda

18. 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-sixth session. In accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the Committee would not discuss the substance of any item except insofar 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 134 items, 126 of which appeared in the provisional agenda and eight in the supplementary list.

Paragraph 21

19. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 21, concerning item 12 of the draft agenda (Report of the Economic and Social Council).

20. The Committee took note of the list of reports to be considered under item 12.

Paragraph 22

21. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the suggestions made in paragraph 22.

22. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a great deal of caution had to be exercised in considering the grouping of related items under a single heading or the staggering of more items over two or more years. It was essential to take account of the substance and importance of each item on the agenda and ensure that such vital matters as the limitation of the arms race and the maintenance of world peace were always at the centre of the General Assembly's

attention. The only valid criterion for deciding on the procedure for considering an item was how the problems involved could be most effectively solved. He did not, however, exclude the possibility that the consideration of individual items might be rationalized by such means as staggering them over two or more years. In so doing, however, it was essential to study each specific item and to arrive at an agreement with the countries which had proposed the item for inclusion in the agenda.

23. The Committee took note of the suggestions contained in paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Items 1 to 6

24. The CHAIRMAN said that items 1 to 6 had already been dealt with in plenary meetings.

Items 7 to 21

25. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America), referring to item 17(f), requested the Secretary-General to issue a revised list of candidates for election to the International Law Commission in order to take account of those candidatures received from Governments since the current list had been prepared in July 1981.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would see to it that a new list of candidates was issued.

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

Item 22

28. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation strongly opposed the inclusion of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session, since the consideration of a domestic situation not only without the consent but against the express request of the Government concerned would constitute a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular those of Article 2. It would be detrimental to the authority of the General Assembly if it allowed itself to be drawn into what amounted to an effort to protect the Pol Pot regime and to impose that hated regime once again on the people of Kampuchea. Previous decisions of the General Assembly on the subject not only failed to help the situation in Kampuchea and the surrounding area, but played into the hands of those who were interfering in the region in order to gain military and economic influence and who wished to set the countries of South-East Asia against one another. The Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea had stated during a visit to Moscow that his country had become a hotbed of intrigue involving United States imperialism and Chinese hegemonism aimed at halting the progress of the people of the region. The United Nations, which was designed to promote peace and ease

tensions, should not be party to such efforts but rather should seek to normalize the situation. That objective would be promoted by the proposals towards that end put forward by Viet Nam, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic which included the convening of a regional conference. He reaffirmed his Government's support for that initiative and its opposition to the inclusion of item 22.

29. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that he supported the inclusion of item 22 in the agenda. The situation in Kampuchea had been discussed at previous sessions and he saw no reason to exclude it from the agenda of the thirty-sixth session. The resolution of the situation in Kampuchea would enhance peace and security in South-East Asia and, indeed, would promote international peace and security. The situation involved Charter principles, in particular, those concerning the non-use of force in international relations and non-interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States.

30. Mr. LIANG (China) said that he supported the inclusion of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" and its allocation to plenary meetings. Viet Nam, supported by the Soviet Union, had invaded and occupied Kampuchea in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, and to the detriment of international peace and security.

31. Previous General Assembly resolutions had called for an immediate and complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea and the recent International Conference on Kampuchea had done likewise. The Vietnamese, supported by the Soviet Union, had flouted the resolutions of the international community and had also repeatedly threatened Thailand. Their actions constituted a threat to peace and security in South-East Asia and throughout the world, and it was therefore essential to include the item in the agenda and to discuss it in plenary meetings.

32. Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba) said that he opposed the inclusion of item 22 in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session, since it had not been approved by the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the only legitimate Government in the country. The hand of imperialism and international reactionary forces was behind the attempt to include it in the agenda, and it was the new mandarins of Beijing who were the main instigators of aggression in the region. His delegation felt that it would be inappropriate for the General Assembly to consider the item and thus play the game of those who had always been enemies of the Indo-Chinese people.

33. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that he supported the statements made by the representatives of China and the Philippines regarding the inclusion of the item in the agenda and its allocation to plenary meetings.

34. Mr. TARUA (Papua New Guinea) endorsed the comments made by those delegations which had supported the inclusion of item 22. He further noted that the international community had already approved the principle that the United Nations should keep a watchful eye on the situation in order to bring peace and harmony to the region.

35. Mr. MARTYNYENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the suffering endured by the people of Kampuchea under the Pol Pot regime had been brought to an end, democratic and free elections had been held in the country and a new constitution had been adopted. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea was supported by the people, and its authority in the international arena was increasing. Those facts showed the futility of efforts to use the General Assembly, as well as the so-called International Conference on Kampuchea, to intervene in the internal affairs of the country and to impose a solution contrived by hegemonistic and imperialistic forces. Such efforts, which were at variance with international law and the provisions of the Charter, were aimed at whipping up tension in the area and generally exacerbating relations between the ASEAN countries and those of Indo-China. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

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

Items 23 to 25

37. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 23 to 25 in the agenda.

Item 26

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Afghanistan had asked to participate in the discussion of item 26; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

40. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan) said that his Government resolutely opposed the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan." The Charter of the United Nations did not allow the discussion of any matter pertaining to the sovereign rights of any State or falling within its domestic jurisdiction without the explicit consent of that State. Nevertheless, the item had been included in the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session over the strong and well-founded objections of his delegation. The situation in Afghanistan would be solved by the people and Government of his country and by nobody else. To include the item would be a flagrant violation of the principles of non-interference, which formed the corner-stone of international law and the Charter. It was clear that the efforts of imperialist, reactionary and hegemonistic quarters to impose a fruitless and hollow debate on an issue outside the terms of reference of the General Assembly were aimed at diverting that body's attention from the important and topical issues facing the international community.

41. His Government had welcomed the interest shown by the Secretary-General in sending his Personal Representative to the region. Through the Personal Representative, it had assured the Secretary-General of its co-operation and goodwill.

It had striven to remove all procedural obstacles to the start of negotiations and had recently made constructive proposals for a settlement in the area and the normalization of relations between Afghanistan and the neighbouring States. By whipping up emotions about the so-called "Afghan question," imperialist quarters were attempting to aggravate still further relations between the countries of South-West Asia and create additional obstacles to a constructive dialogue between Afghanistan and its neighbours. That ran counter to the interests of the people of the region and served only those of the forces which wished to impose once again the yoke of imperialist domination on the countries of the area. It was on those grounds that his delegation called for the exclusion of item 26 from the agenda of the thirty-sixth session.

42. The CHAIRMAN appealed to members to address themselves to the question of the inclusion of the items and not to their substance.

43. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was firmly opposed to the inclusion of item 26 in the agenda. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was a sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations and of the Non-Aligned Movement. The representative of that country had clearly stated its opposition to any consideration of the trumped-up issue covered by item 26 on the ground that it would constitute inadmissible interference in its internal affairs. To include the item in the agenda over the objections of the Government concerned would violate the Charter of the United Nations and be at variance with the General Assembly's responsibility under the Charter to promote the solution of international problems. The resolution on the so-called Afghan question adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, which had been invoked as justification for including the item in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session, was not at all helpful in promoting a political settlement. On the contrary, events had shown that that resolution was being used to complicate the search for a settlement and the normalization of relations between Afghanistan and its neighbours, which could be achieved only through negotiations between the parties concerned. The Government of Afghanistan had demonstrated a constructive, realistic and flexible approach in putting forward proposals for a settlement in the region on 24 August 1981. To include the item would serve only to inflame emotions and advance the aims of the United States, some of its allies, China and sundry hangers-on. The tension thus created would be used as a pretext to justify the United States military build-up and military presence in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. The prestige and authority of the United Nations would be sacrificed to the interests of those for whom intervention in the internal affairs of other States was a regular policy. He appealed to members to display realism and to avoid succumbing to the dangerous propagandistic campaign that was being waged.

44. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that item 26 had been included in the provisional agenda in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/37, which had been adopted with the overwhelming support of 111 Member States. That resolution, together with General Assembly resolution ES-6/2, called for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and laid down the principles for a genuine political

settlement of the crisis in that country. Those resolutions remained unimplemented, the foreign military intervention persisted and the situation continued to deteriorate, thereby posing a serious threat to regional stability and international peace and security. The exodus of Afghan refugees continued unabated, with more than 2.5 million in Pakistan alone. Until the foreign military intervention came to an end, thus enabling the people once again to control their own destiny, the General Assembly should keep the situation under review. His delegation therefore strongly supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

45. Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba) said that his delegation fully supported the position outlined by the representative of Afghanistan, a country that was a full-fledged member of the Non-Aligned Movement. To do otherwise would be a violation of the Charter and an inadmissible interference in its internal affairs. The continuing attempts to subvert the Government of that country were well known, and his delegation, for its part, refused to play into the hands of the imperialists and international reactionary forces by supporting the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

46. Mr. LIANG (China) recalled that at its thirty-fifth session the General Assembly had, by an overwhelming majority, adopted a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and reaffirming the right of the Afghan people to choose their own economic, political and social system, free from outside intervention. The Soviet Union continued to flout those just demands of the international community and was stepping up its brutal oppression of the Afghan people. The Soviet Union opposed the inclusion of the item for the obvious reason that it wished to cover up its aggression against Afghanistan and impose a fait accompli upon the international community. The Soviet invasion of a non-aligned Islamic country and the violation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity posed a grave threat to peace and security in the region and in the world. In accordance with the Charter and the rules of international conduct, his delegation fully supported the inclusion of the item.

47. Mr. MARTYNYENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had at the preceding session opposed the attempts to involve the United Nations in a discussion of the so-called question of Afghanistan. Like other countries, it believed that consideration of that item was a violation of the principles of the United Nations and interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State. Inclusion of the item could only increase the tension in the area and destabilize the world situation. The organizers of the anti-Afghanistan campaign were stepping up their undeclared war on the Government of that country, including by supplying arms and ammunition to its enemies. That was the real reason for the continuance of tension in the area. What was needed was a sober-minded, realistic approach, along the lines of the new constructive programme proposed by Afghanistan on 24 August 1981, based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The Government of Afghanistan had co-operated with the Secretary-General's Personal Representative and had shown its willingness to enter into a discussion of the situation in the area with the parties concerned. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

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

49. Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) withdrew.

Item 27

50. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) said that a discussion of the question of Mayotte by the General Assembly would violate Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. The matter was, however, regularly considered in the context of periodic Franco-Comorian discussions. The forthcoming visit to Paris of the President of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros would provide a further opportunity for discussion of the matter between the parties concerned.

51. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 27 in the agenda.

Items 28 to 33

52. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 28 to 33 in the agenda.

Item 34

53. Mr. LIANG (China) said that, during the consideration of the so-called question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia at the thirty-fifth session, his delegation had pointed out that the item had been designed to confuse and distort the facts of the situation pertaining in South-East Asia in order to divert attention from the root cause of the problem, namely Vietnamese aggression and expansion. The proposal to include the item in the agenda of the current session represented an outright attempt to justify Viet Nam's aggression against Kampuchea. Events of the past year showed that responsibility for the unrest in South-East Asia lay with the Soviet Union, which, in its bid for world domination, was taking advantage of Viet Nam's aggression to further its own aims. In order to ease tension and restore stability in the area, the Vietnamese authorities must be compelled to renounce their expansionist ambitions and their plans to establish a so-called Indo-Chinese Federation and to withdraw their troops of aggression from Kampuchea. Viet Nam's attempt to cover up its aggression and avoid international censure was all too obvious to the membership of the United Nations, as evidenced by the fact that the item had been given the cold shoulder at the preceding session.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Viet Nam had asked to participate in the discussion of item 34; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

55. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Nguyen Thuong (Viet Nam) took a place at the Committee table.

56. Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam) said that the inclusion of item 34 was in keeping with the profound aspirations of the peoples of South-East Asia to live in peace and co-operation. The people of the entire world desired peace and detente, in spite of the attempts of the imperialists and hegemonists to stir up the arms race in order to further their plans for aggression and expansion in various parts of the world. In South-East Asia, events of the past three years had shown that the direct cause of the tense situation in the region was the policy of hegemonism and expansionism of China, which was hostile to the independence of the three countries of Indo-China.

57. The question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia had been discussed at the thirty-fifth session, and all the delegations which had spoken on the item had supported his country's initiative, the sole exception being the great hegemonistic and expansionist power of the region, which had merely rehearsed its sophisticated arguments. The Assembly had decided without objection at that session to include the item in the provisional agenda of its next session. Since that time, the process of regional consultation had been developing with a view to achieving peace, stability and co-operation in the region, despite the efforts of some powers to maintain an atmosphere of tension and confrontation there. He regretted that a delegation of one of those powers had seen fit to slander his own country by name during the discussion of the inclusion of item 22, which had caused the General Committee to waste precious time. His delegation rejected such slanderous charges and reaffirmed its goodwill in seeking to promote peace, co-operation and detente in South-East Asia.

58. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of item 34 in the agenda, since it would promote a constructive consideration of the tense situation existing in the area and, at the same time, make it possible to seek ways of ensuring peace, stability and co-operation there. What the situation required was dialogue and negotiations, not confrontation, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter.

59. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 34 in the agenda.

60. Mr. Nguyen Thuong (Viet Nam) withdrew.

Item 35

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Turkey had asked to participate in the discussion of item 35; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, on the basis of consultations he had carried out, he had ascertained that the positions of the delegations concerned on the question of the inclusion of item 35 in the agenda remained identical to those they had taken at the thirty-fifth session.

64. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 35 in the agenda.

65. Mr. Kirca (Turkey) withdrew.

Items 36 and 37

66. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 36 and 37 in the agenda.

Item 38

67. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) said that, at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth session, his delegation had opposed the inclusion in the agenda of items relating to the number of members of the Security Council. He himself had set forth his delegation's reasons for so doing at those sessions and he continued to consider it inappropriate for the General Assembly to deal with that question. The inclusion of item 38 in the agenda could only lead to a deadlock, and the confrontation that was certain to result from a discussion of the item would inevitably weaken the Organization.

68. A change in the composition of the Security Council, and hence in its functioning, would alter the balance established in the Charter between the principal organs of the United Nations. The Council, which was the only organ empowered by the Charter to take decisions concerning the maintenance of international peace and security that were binding on all Member States required a different approach from that applying to the General Assembly. It was therefore wrong to seek to pattern the distribution of seats in the Council on the geographical composition of the Assembly.

69. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that any increase in the size of the Security Council would weaken the ability of the United Nations to maintain peace. The issue raised by the item could most appropriately be discussed in connection with the item concerning the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. Nothing would be served by including item 38 in the agenda.

70. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, too, remained firmly opposed to the inclusion of the item, as it had been at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions. It was necessary in order to ensure the effectiveness of the Security Council in carrying out its key tasks to maintain its membership at 15. The existing composition of the Council was well-balanced, and a hearing was invariably given to non-members in accordance with the Charter. The arithmetical approach of the proponents of an enlargement of the Security Council was at variance with the requirements of Article 23 of the Charter.

71. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda. As was well-known, the aim of its supporters was to alter one of the most fundamental provisions of the Charter.

A serious difference of opinion on that question had emerged at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions and further discussion would only divert attention from truly urgent issues.

72. An increase in the membership of the Security Council was not necessary to enhance its role in maintaining international peace and security; the reasons for the Council's failure to take effective action lay not in the provisions of the Charter but in the policies of States. An arithmetical approach was not appropriate and was contrary to the Charter. Enhancing the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security required only one thing: strict compliance by all Member States with the Charter. Attempts to revise the Charter might undermine the very foundations of the Organization and his delegation would therefore vote against the inclusion of item 38.

73. Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba) said that the inclusion of the item had originally been requested by a large group of African, Asian and Latin American countries, including his own. It was in the interest of the majority of Members that the Security Council, which had primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should reflect the growth in the membership of the Organization. Obviously, the proposal to increase the Council's membership was not at odds with the Charter; if that was the case, the Council's membership would not have been increased once before in 1963. Since that time, the membership of the Organization had risen to 155 States, and it was only natural for the developing countries to desire a more equitable representation in the Council.

74. Increasing the membership of the Security Council would not weaken the Council. In fact, as had been the case with the Council's consideration of South Africa's aggression against Angola, the question of Namibia and the acts of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon and the Arab people of Palestine, the Council's inability to take effective action had had another cause entirely.

75. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia) said that when the membership of the Security Council had been increased from 11 to 15 in 1963, the membership of the General Assembly had stood at 112. The organization now had 155 Members and the time had come to discuss the question anew.

76. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that item 38 was of importance to all developing countries. The membership of the Security Council should reflect the growth in that of the United Nations itself. The proposal did not represent a challenge to the Charter but, rather, an attempt to strengthen it.

77. An increase in the size of the Security Council need not impair its effectiveness. The last increase had enriched its work by bringing to bear the broader experience of more countries, and the new members had played a constructive role in the Council. Indeed, it was the permanent members which often hampered its work. His delegation therefore supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

78. Mr. ILLEUCA (Panama) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda, since it met the wishes of many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

79. The international community was not satisfied with the way in which the Security Council operated. The Committee had heard four of the permanent members defend their position of privilege, which would be more acceptable if those members adequately discharged their responsibilities. It would be gratifying if the solidarity displayed by France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and United States of America on the issue under discussion would extend to other matters as well.

80. The Committee decided by 24 votes to 4 to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 38 in the agenda.

Items 39 to 41

81. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 39 to 41 in the agenda.

Item 42

82. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 35/144 C, in which the Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to carry out an investigation into the alleged use of chemical weapons. The request for an investigation had been motivated by a desire to exacerbate the problems of disarmament, and to divert attention from the prohibition of chemical weapons. Inclusion of the item in the agenda would not assist the General Assembly in fulfilling its role in a difficult international situation. Accordingly, his delegation proposed the deletion of item 42(b).

83. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the alleged use of chemical weapons to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, and it was thus bound to consider that report. His delegation was in favour of including item 42(b) in the agenda.

84. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia) said that his delegation, too, supported the inclusion of item 42(b) in the agenda.

85. The Committee rejected the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' proposal by 18 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.^{1/}

86. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 42 in the agenda.

Items 43 to 64

^{1/} See paras. 131-134.

87. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 43 to 64 in the agenda.

Item 65

88. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) said that his delegation regretted that the Committee had to consider the inclusion of item 65 in the agenda. France had taken possession of the islands in question, which had been uninhabited "and had not been owned by anyone," in accordance with international law. France had justified its sovereignty over the islands at prior sessions of the Assembly. His delegation thus hoped that it would be possible to avoid a discussion which would be contrary to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

89. 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.

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

91. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation had made its position known at the United Nations on several prior occasions, including at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. That position had not changed. Inclusion of the item would not prejudice consideration of substantive aspects of the matter.

92. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 65 in the agenda.

93. Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) withdrew.

Item 66

94. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was unacceptable to attempt to use the humanitarian issue of refugees for political or propaganda purposes. The United Nations had assisted refugees in many areas for a number of years, largely through the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the work of which was considered by the Third Committee. The attempt to include the item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly was merely a pretext for intervention in the internal affairs of certain States, and represented a mere exercise in polemics.

95. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 66 in the agenda.

Item 67

96. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 67 in the agenda.

Item 68

97. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to the inclusion of item 68 in the agenda of the General Assembly. It had been clear at the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions of the Assembly that a consensus existed in the regional groups with respect to the composition of United Nations bodies. Any attempt to alter the composition of those bodies without consideration of criteria such as that of balanced representation of States with different economic and social systems would only weaken them.

98. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 68 in the agenda.

Items 69 to 72

99. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden) said that the study on the relationship between disarmament and development, to be submitted under item 51(d), should also be included among the documentation for item 69. The part of that study relating to development should be taken into account by the Second Committee in its consideration of item 69.

100. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would take into account the proposal made by the representative of Sweden.

101. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 69 to 72 in the agenda.

Items 73 to 92

102. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 73 to 92 in the agenda.

Item 93

103. Mr. DJALAL (Indonesia) said that the process of decolonization in East Timor had been completed in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV), in July 1976, at which time East Timor had become the twenty-seventh province of Indonesia. Any discussion of the item by the United Nations would constitute unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign Member State. His delegation was thus opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

104. Ms. GONTHIER (Seychelles) said that her delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/27.

105. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation supported the position set forth by the representative of Indonesia. The people of East Timor had already exercised their right to self-determination.

106. Mr. TARUA (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation had reservations on the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

107. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia) said that he opposed the inclusion of item 93 based on his Government's de jure recognition of the incorporation of East Timor into Indonesia.

108. Mr. OUSMANE (Benin) said that the question of East Timor was one of decolonization. His delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

109. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) said that his delegation supported the Indonesian position.

110. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 93 in the agenda.

Items 94 to 110

111. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 94 to 110 in the agenda.

Items 111 to 127

112. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 111 to 127 in the agenda.

Item 128

113. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that it was curious that the Soviet Union had proposed the item, since that country was in the process of testing devices to destroy satellites in orbit. The United States delegation had grave doubts as to the seriousness of the proposal.

114. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had proposed the item for inclusion in the agenda because of the importance of limiting the development of new weapons which might be deployed in outer space. It had consistently attempted to ensure that space research was conducted for peaceful purposes only. Much had already been accomplished, such as the prohibition of nuclear weapons in outer space, but there were still loop-holes to be closed if the risk of the militarization of outer space was to be eliminated.

115. The question was a serious one which should be debated by the international community. Consideration of the matter could only displease those who wished to make use of outer space for their own military ends. The United Nations could not allow outer space to provide yet another setting for rivalry between States. The question was pressing, and affected all the States of the earth. The Soviet proposals would make it possible to eliminate all weapons from outer space, and pre-empt the possibility of an arms race in outer space, thus reducing the risk of nuclear war. The item should be included in the agenda of the Assembly.

116. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 128 in the agenda.

Item 129

117. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 129 in the agenda.

Item 130

118. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to the wording of the item. Terms such as "aggression" were pejorative and inappropriate, and represented an attempt to prejudge a decision of the Assembly.

119. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the item as formulated. The Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations constituted a flagrant violation of international law and threatened stability in the Middle East and the world. The international community had condemned the attack and its consequences for the system of safeguards established by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The wording of the item merely reflected those considerations and should be retained.

120. Mr. MUNOZ LEDO (Mexico) said that the Security Council had adopted a resolution condemning the Israeli attack precisely because it had been an act of aggression. During the debate in the Council the attack had been linked to the question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The resolution had also called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards and had stated that Iraq was entitled to appropriate redress from Israel. Some 50 Member States had participated in the debate, at which time it had been clear that the item would be considered by the General Assembly.

121. The wording of the item was consistent with Security Council resolution 487 (1981). The international community was rightly concerned to avoid the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to ensure that atomic energy was used for peaceful purposes. The developing countries were particularly concerned that such attacks might threaten their efforts to make scientific and technological progress. His delegation fully supported the inclusion of the item and its wording.

122. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) endorsed the views put forward by the representatives of Mexico and the Soviet Union.

123. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The Security Council had termed the Israeli attack against Iraq an act of aggression. Iraq was a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and its installations had been inspected by IAEA and found satisfactory. The attack raised the question of what protection parties to the Treaty had.

124. Mr. DJALAL (Indonesia) said that his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The wording was consistent with Security Council resolution 487 (1981). The Israeli attack clearly violated the Charter and the principles

of international law. It was all the more reprehensible since Iraq was a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The international community had to ensure the effectiveness of the Treaty and of the system of safeguards it established. Inclusion of the item would help to ensure that no such attacks occurred again.

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

126. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Al-Zahawie (Iraq) took a place at the Committee table.

127. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq) said that the Israeli premeditated armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations had been universally condemned, not only as a threat to international peace and security but as an attack on the International Atomic Energy Agency, its system of safeguards and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In resolution 487 (1981) the Security Council had expressed its deep concern at the consequences of the attack for the vital interests of all States.

128. In view of the importance and far-reaching implications of Israel's action, his delegation had, together with 40 others, requested the inclusion of item 130 in the agenda and its allocation to plenary meetings.

129. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) said that Israel's unprovoked aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations had given rise to revulsion in the international community and unanimous censure in the Security Council. His delegation therefore supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda and its allocation to plenary meetings.

130. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 130 in the agenda.

131. Mr. Al-Zahawie (Iraq) withdrew.

132. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had encountered considerable difficulty in counting votes in the meeting owing to the confused seating arrangements in the conference room. Appropriate steps would be taken to remedy the situation in time for the Committee's next meeting.

133. Mr. PETROVSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, according to the information which his delegation had, five, not four, delegations had voted for the deletion of item 42(b).

134. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he shared the Soviet representative's doubts regarding the accuracy of the results announced for the vote on item 42(b). His delegation had voted to delete that item.

Similarly, while four members had been recorded as voting against the inclusion of item 38, his delegation, too, had voted against it.

... assured the representatives of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic that their statements would be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.