

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-THIRD SESSION
*Official Records**



GENERAL COMMITTEE
1st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 20 September 1978
at 4 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

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

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-THIRD 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 incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/33/SR.1
26 September 1978

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-THIRD REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-
GENERAL (A/BUR/33/1, A/BUR/33/2)

Section II: Organization of the session

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the observations and proposals relating to the organization of the thirty-third regular session contained in section II of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/33/1).
2. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Secretary-General's memorandum
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, as President of the General Assembly, he would do all that was humanly possible to start plenary meetings promptly, and he urged the Chairmen of the Main Committees to do the same. He appealed to delegations to co-operate.
4. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the conclusions of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly reproduced in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
5. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions contained in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
6. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, out of consideration for other speakers and in order to preserve the dignity of the general debate, delegations should refrain from expressing their congratulations in the General Assembly Hall after a speech had been delivered.
7. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the Chairman's suggestion.
8. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 6 to 8 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
9. The CHAIRMAN, referring to paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, recalled that, in accordance with rule 58 of the rules of procedure, the First Committee would be provided with verbatim records, which would be the official records of that Committee, and that summary records would remain the official records of all other Main Committees. However, he suggested that the General Committee should maintain for the thirty-third session the option that had traditionally been approved for the Special Political Committee to obtain, on specific request, transcriptions of the debates of some of its meetings, or portions thereof, taking into account General Assembly resolution 2538 (XXIV), paragraph 10 (e).

/...

10. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the Chairman's suggestion.

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

12. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 11 to 15 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Section III: Adoption of the agenda

13. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to section III of the Secretary-General's memorandum, concerning the inclusion of items in the agenda of the thirty-third session. In accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the General Committee would not be considering the substance of any item except in so far as it bore upon the question whether the Committee should recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

14. The draft agenda consisted of 132 items: 129 appeared in the provisional agenda, one appeared in the supplementary list, and there were two additional items.

15. He drew attention to paragraph 17, concerning item 12 of the draft agenda (Report of the Economic and Social Council), and suggested that the Committee should take note of the reports that were to be considered under that item.

16. The Committee took note of the contents of paragraph 17 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the inclusion in the agenda of the items set forth in paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum. Where appropriate, items might be considered in groups.

Items 1 to 6

18. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the General Assembly had already dealt with items 1 to 6 in plenary meeting.

Items 7 to 25

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

Item 26

20. Mr. HUSSON (France) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of item 26 in the agenda and requested that the question should be put to a vote. By the freely expressed will of its people, the island of Mayotte was an integral part of the French Republic. As members of the Committee were aware, the people of Mayotte had, in the course of several popular consultations, confirmed by large

/...

(Mr. Husson, France)

majorities and in complete freedom their desire to remain within the French Republic. Moreover, discussion in the General Assembly of the status and future of Mayotte would be a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter.

21. As he had stated in the General Committee at the thirty-second session (see A/BUR.32/SR.1, para. 48), the French Government had consistently shown its willingness to find a basis for an understanding with the Comoros. The status approved by the French parliament for the island of Mayotte was of an evolutionary nature and would allow the people of Mayotte a further opportunity to express in a referendum their views on their future, including, if they so wished, the possibility of joining the Comoros. The Government of the Comoros, with which France maintained diplomatic relations, had indicated that, so far as it was concerned, the island of Mayotte in no way constituted a pre-condition for the normalization of relations and co-operation between the two countries. There was therefore every reason to think that the policy of accommodation and dialogue which the French Government had constantly sought was becoming a reality. That being so, and in view of the legal reasons he had stated his delegation could only reaffirm its opposition to the inclusion of item 26 in the agenda as being both untimely and contrary to the Charter.

22. The Committee decided, by 18 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 26 in the agenda.

23. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Finland had voted in favour of the inclusion of item 26 in the agenda in accordance with its traditional position that any Government wishing to bring a grievance before the United Nations should be permitted to do so. However, that did not prejudice the position his delegation might take on the substance of the item.

24. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the inclusion of item 26 because of its firm belief that all Member States had the right to request that any question should be discussed by the General Assembly. No decision concerning the substance of an item should be taken either in the General Committee or through any other preliminary procedure.

Item 27

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

Item 28

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the representatives of Cyprus and Turkey had asked to participate in the discussion of item 28. If there was no objection, he would invite them to take a place at the Committee table.

27. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Rossides (Cyprus) and Mr. Eralp (Turkey) took places at the Committee table.

/...

28. Mr. ERALP (Turkey) said that the question of the inclusion of the item in the agenda and the question of its allocation were closely interconnected, and it would therefore be difficult not to refer to the question of allocation.

29. Past experience had amply demonstrated that the annual debates in the General Assembly on the question of Cyprus since 1974 had not been useful exercises. In fact, the procedure followed at the last four sessions in discussing the question had totally failed to uphold the principle of intercommunal equality. Accordingly, if the General Assembly's discussions of the question of Cyprus were to contribute to the search for a just and lasting solution, it was vital that the two Cypriot communities should participate in the debate on an equal footing. For that reason, if the Assembly was to have a meaningful and constructive debate, item 28 must be allocated at the current session to an appropriate body, preferably the Special Political Committee, where the two Cypriot communities could fully participate in the debate on the basis of equality. His delegation would therefore like the opportunity to refer to the question of the allocation of the item at a later stage in the work of the General Committee.

30. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order, said that the remarks made by the representative of Turkey were out of order because they referred to the allocation of item 28 rather than its inclusion in the agenda. He would reply to those remarks at the appropriate time.

31. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 28 in the agenda.

32. Mr. Rossides (Cyprus) and Mr. Eralp (Turkey) withdrew.

Items 29 to 90

33. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 29 to 90 in the agenda.

Item 91

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Tunisia had asked to participate in the discussion of item 91. If there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

35. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) took a place at the Committee table.

36. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) noted that the draft agenda included three items relating to information, two of which were traditionally dealt with by the Third Committee and the other, paradoxically by the Fifth Committee. Item 104 (United Nations public information policies and activities) had been included in the provisional agenda of the thirty-third session in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3535 (XXX), adopted on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee. His delegation, among others, had insisted that the question

/...

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

should be considered separately and not, as previously, solely from the budgetary standpoint in the Fifth Committee. Since that time, problems relating to information had assumed great political importance and had aroused growing interest among developing and non-aligned countries. The latter had taken a number of initiatives in that field, including the creation of pools of press agencies and of television and radio stations and the establishment of an intergovernmental council entrusted with co-ordination in the field of information. There was a very definite demand and need for a new world information order which would promote a better balance between supplies and recipients of information, between developed and developing countries. There had thus far been in the field of information a fundamental qualitative and quantitative imbalance which reflected the general imbalance in international relations. The political dimension of the problem must be apparent to everyone.

37. The draft agenda also included item 77 (Co-operation and assistance in the application and improvement of national information and mass communication systems for social progress and development) and item 91 (Freedom of information). It was clear that the purpose of the proponents of item 77 had been to ensure that considerations relating to economic and social development should predominate in the information media available to developing countries. That should certainly be one of the objectives of the new world information order. Item 91 had a long history in the United Nations, and he would mention only two points. The first was the demand of the third world for a more effective right of correction, a question with which the item was already linked. The second was that the "freedom of information" which had been discussed in the past in fact related only to the freedom of the supplier of information and not that of the recipient, which was another cause of concern to many third world countries.

38. Accordingly, in view of the common thread which ran through the three items, he proposed that they should be considered jointly by the Special Political Committee under the over-all heading "Questions relating to information". The three items need not be merged into one; rather, the Special Political Committee should be permitted to organize its discussion of them as it saw fit.

39. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) supported the proposal of the representative of Tunisia that items 77, 91 and 104 should be grouped together and discussed in the Special Political Committee. Furthermore, it might be better to make them three subitems of a general agenda item entitled "Question relating to information".

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the statements of the representatives of Tunisia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would be taken into account when the Committee came to consider the allocation of items.

41. Mr. FALL (Senegal) and Mr. LOVO CASTELAR (El Salvador) agreed with the Libyan representative that the three items could be merged into one.

42. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago) and Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) supported the Tunisian proposal that the three items should be grouped together.

/...

43. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) said that, while he favoured grouping items if that assisted the Assembly's work, he felt that the only thing common to the three items was the word "information". Item 77 concerned the spread of information, item 91 concerned freedom of information and item 104 dealt with the Secretary-General's report on the activities of the Office of Public Information. Not much purpose would be served by grouping them together.

44. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that he had no objection to a grouping of items that would permit a general debate on the philosophy of information, which he presumed was one of the purposes of the proposal. In the case of item 104, however, only the Fifth Committee was competent to consider the Secretary-General's report on the Office of Public Information.

45. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Burundi) said he supported the substance of the statement by the representative of Tunisia. The various aspects of information should not be isolated from each other. In his view, the question of information should be treated as a whole and should be allocated to the Special Political Committee.

46. Mr. FALL (Senegal), supported by Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), proposed that items 77, 91 and 104 should become subitems (a), (b) and (c) of a consolidated agenda item.

47. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) said that he would have no insuperable objection to merging items 77 and 91. With respect to item 104, however, he reminded the Committee that the Secretary-General's report was submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3535 (XXX), in which the Assembly had decided to consider the question at its thirty-third session as a separate item. The General Committee had no power to override a decision of the Assembly.

48. Mr. SEKYI (Ghana), referring to General Assembly resolution 3535 (XXX), observed that the Fifth Committee, as an organ dealing with financial and budgetary questions, proceeded slightly differently from the Special Political Committee.

49. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) pointed out that his proposal simply to group items 77, 91 and 104 together would not violate Assembly resolution 3535 (XXX).

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Senegalese proposal that items 77, 91 and 104 should become subitems (a), (b) and (c) of an item entitled "Questions relating to information". He drew attention to the fact that individual subitems of an agenda item could, if desired, be allocated to different committees.

51. The Committee decided, by 15 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should combine items 77, 91 and 104 as three subitems of an agenda item 77 entitled "Questions relating to information".

52. Mr. BARTON (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, while he had no objection to a co-ordinated discussion on information, he maintained that the financial and administrative aspects of the question could be effectively

/...

(Mr. Barton, Canada)

discussed only in the Fifth Committee. He had therefore voted against the Senegalese proposal.

53. Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) withdrew.

Items 93 and 94

54. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 93 and 94 in the agenda.

Item 95

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Indonesia had asked to participate in the discussion of item 95; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

56. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Anwar Sani (Indonesia) took a place at the Committee table.

57. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of item 95, entitled "Question of East Timor", as it had at the thirty-second session. The people of East Timor had exercised their right of self-determination and the process of decolonization had been carried out in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). In conformity with the expressed wish of the people, East Timor had become an integral part of Indonesia in July 1976. Any further discussion of the question in the United Nations constituted unacceptable interference in the internal affairs of a Member State.

58. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that the statement by the representative of Indonesia merited the Committee's serious consideration, and she hoped that his view would receive support.

59. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) said that, with regard to the question of East Timor, the General Assembly and the Security Council had adopted a number of resolutions explicitly providing for the inalienable right of the people of East Timor to self-determination and independence. However, those resolutions had thus far remained unimplemented. General Assembly resolution 32/34 had clearly stipulated that the item entitled "Question of East Timor" should be included in the provisional agenda of the thirty-third session. Consequently, his delegation held that the Assembly should continue its consideration of the question at the current session and that there was no reason why it should be deleted from the agenda.

60. The Committee decided, by 11 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 95 in the agenda.

61. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of including item 95 in the agenda for the reasons given in his statement concerning item 26.

/...

62. Mr. Anwar Sani (Indonesia) withdrew.

Items 96 to 128

63. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 96 to 128 in the agenda.

Item 129

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Saudi Arabia had asked to participate in the discussion of item 129; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

65. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Committee table.

66. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, while he agreed that every delegation had the right to request the inclusion of an item in the agenda, he felt that it would be a waste of time to discuss the possibility of creating a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, especially in view of the fact that the Committee had already decided to recommend the inclusion of item 86 (Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms). It was generally felt by Member States that the creation of such a post would not be in the best interests of the Organization, since alleged victims of violations of human rights would number in the millions and no high commissioner could hope to be sufficiently familiar with the culture and legal system of every country to deal effectively with the multitude of complaints which would be received from all over the world. He therefore appealed to the Committee not to resurrect a proposal which had already been buried by the Assembly.

67. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation also fully shared the view that any Member State was entitled to propose any question it wished for inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly, in accordance with rule 13 of the rules of procedure. With regard to the proposed item 129, however, the General Assembly at its preceding session had adopted resolution 32/130, requesting the Commission on Human Rights to undertake an over-all analysis of the alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In discharging that task, the Commission was to take into account all the proposals and opinions put forward in the Third Committee's discussion of alternative approaches at the thirty-second session, including the Costa Rican proposal for the creation of a post of High Commissioner for Human Rights, and to submit a final report on the matter to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of item 129 in the agenda of the thirty-third session, since that would be tantamount to withdrawing from the Commission on

/...

(Mr. Khlestov, USSR)

Human Rights a question which had been referred to it and which it had under study, and might be construed as indicating a lack of confidence in the Commission on the part of the General Assembly.

68. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had proposed the inclusion of item 129 in the agenda because of its belief that the General Assembly had a duty constantly to seek effective ways and means of strengthening respect for human rights throughout the world. Costa Rica had consistently supported the inclusion in the agenda of any item proposed by Member States because, in its view, every State was entitled to have matters which it deemed important discussed by the General Assembly and no committee with only limited membership should abridge that right.

69. As to the argument that item 129 should not be considered because it had been referred to the Commission on Human Rights, he did not believe that General Assembly resolution 32/130 precluded consideration of the question at the thirty-third session. A number of delegations had expressed concern about his delegation's proposal, and the best course would therefore be to allow a full discussion at the current session.

70. Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that the statements made by the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Soviet Union were very much to the point. His delegation did not question the right of any delegation to request the inclusion of new items or to propose the reconsideration of old ones. However, in the case of the item under consideration, there were relevant decisions and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly which limited the action of the General Committee. In the interests of consistency, the Assembly should allow the Commission on Human Rights to examine the subject as requested in its resolution 32/130. The item could then be resurrected for consideration at the thirty-fifth or thirty-sixth session, after the Commission had completed its analysis and submitted its report. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of the proposed item.

71. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) said that the item was extremely important and had been proposed by his delegation for a number of years, but the General Assembly had not yet taken a substantive decision on the matter. At the thirty-second session, discussion of the item had been terminated by a procedural decision in the Third Committee. His delegation was well aware of the fact that the Commission on Human Rights had been charged with examining the broad spectrum of human rights problems under General Assembly resolution 32/130, but that resolution did not specifically refer to the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. It was important, therefore, that the item should be included in the agenda of the current session so that all aspects of the question could be discussed and examined. His delegation was flexible and was willing to consider alternative approaches. It was aware of the technical and legal authority of the Commission on Human Rights but felt that the United Nations must make a commitment at the highest level to the promotion of human rights. Furthermore, all Member States had the right to propose agenda items, and they

/...

(Mr. Piza Escalante, Costa Rica)

assumed responsibility for the inclusion of those items; the General Committee should not, therefore, take upon itself the responsibility for excluding an item which had been proposed by a Member State.

72. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was sympathetic to the desire of all Member States to be heard and to propose items for inclusion in the agenda. It was well known that the Soviet Union attached great importance to the respect for human rights; in particular, it had acceded to the International Covenants on Human Rights. However, from a procedural point of view, there was no argument which could be advanced in favour of including the proposed item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly, especially in view of the fact that to do so would hinder the implementation of decisions already taken by the Assembly and would appear to undermine the authority of a competent body of the United Nations to which the matter had been referred. The inclusion in the agenda of item 86 made it possible for any delegation to present its views on the work of the Commission on Human Rights and even on the question proposed by Costa Rica.

73. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America) said that the United States supported the request of Costa Rica for the inclusion of the proposed item in the agenda of the thirty-third session. His delegation had consistently supported the right of Member States to propose the inclusion of serious agenda items to which they attached importance. He noted that at least one of the other new items proposed for inclusion in the agenda did not seem likely to make a positive contribution to the work of the General Assembly; nevertheless, his delegation had not objected to its inclusion. The Costa Rican proposal was very positive and had considerable political and humanitarian significance. Furthermore, consideration of the matter would in no way interfere with the General Assembly's significant decision requesting the Commission on Human Rights to report on ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. At the 1978 session of the Commission, many members had stated that the Commission's work should in no way preclude delegations from raising in the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council any of the human rights issues related to the Commission's study and report. There was therefore no valid basis for objecting to the inclusion of the proposed item.

74. Mr. FALL (Senegal) felt that a middle course must be sought between the valid request of Costa Rica for inclusion of the proposed item, which was important and could not be ignored, and the objections of other Member States, which were also valid in view of the fact that the General Assembly had adopted resolution 32/130. It should be borne in mind, however, that that resolution did not state that the Assembly had abandoned consideration of human rights issues or that the inclusion of items on the subject in its agenda was precluded. He therefore proposed that item 129 should not be included separately in the agenda but should be combined with item 86 through the addition to the latter of the words "including the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights". It was important that the General Committee should not appear to reject the item.

/...

75. The CHAIRMAN said he was informed that the representative of Costa Rica accepted the proposal made by the representative of Senegal. If there was no objection, he would take it that the General Committee decided to adopt that proposal.

76. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should not include item 129 as a separate item in the agenda and that item 86 should be amended through the addition of the phrase "including the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights".

77. Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) withdrew.

Item 130

78. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there was no formal reason to include item 130 in the agenda, since the subject-matter was already fully covered by the mandate given to the Commission on Human Rights under General Assembly resolution 32/130, which requested the Commission to undertake a study of the whole subject of human rights in conjunction with other bodies of the United Nations system. It was clear that the Commission, in accordance with its mandate, was in close contact with the relevant specialized agencies and other bodies concerned and that it should be allowed to perform its task. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

79. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America) said that the item had been proposed by Ecuador, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United States with the object of promoting a greater exchange of information on human rights work within the United Nations system and encouraging co-operation with bodies outside the system. The item was in no way inconsistent with General Assembly resolution 32/130, which did not refer to work being done by the specialized agencies, the regional commissions or intergovernmental bodies outside the United Nations system. In the interest of promoting the cause of human rights and achieving greater awareness and co-operation among the various bodies working in the field, and since the subject-matter was not specifically being dealt with by the Commission on Human Rights, the proponents of the item urged its inclusion in the agenda.

80. The Committee decided, by 15 votes to 3, with 1 abstention, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 130 in the agenda.

Item 131

81. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 131 had been requested by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/33/241).

82. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) said that, as usual, the Soviet representative, under the guise of maintaining world peace and eliminating the danger of a nuclear war, had again concocted a fraud of sham disarmament by putting forward a new item entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of

(Mr. Chen Chu, China)

guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States". A cursory analysis would suffice to reveal that the new Soviet item, couched in fine-sounding terms, was designed to use the hypocritical "guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States" as a means to bind the non-nuclear countries hand and foot and to peddle the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in a disguised form so as to legalize its nuclear monopoly and facilitate its rivalry with the other super-Power for world hegemony. His delegation reserved the right to comment further on that Soviet item on an appropriate occasion later.

83. Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that, in his letter to the Secretary-General annexed to document A/33/241, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR had offered convincing arguments in favour of the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States. Poland welcomed that initiative as an important disarmament proposal and as part and parcel of the consistent policies of the USSR and the other States of the socialist community. It was a response to the direct appeal embodied in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, reproduced in Assembly resolution S-10-2, for further collective efforts aimed at strengthening international peace and security and eliminating the threat of war, particularly nuclear war. Indeed, the initiative made an important contribution to the promotion of general and complete disarmament. It met the numerous postulates laid down by non-nuclear States and went a long way towards meeting the request formulated by the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Conference, mostly at the insistence of the non-aligned countries, had urged the non-nuclear States parties to the Treaty to make determined efforts to ensure the security of all non-nuclear weapon States parties. Thus, the inclusion of the item enjoyed general support.

84. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America) said that his delegation had considerable substantive reservations to the proposal for the inclusion of item 131. However, in the light of its consistent policy of not seeking pretexts for opposing such requests, it would not oppose the Soviet proposal.

85. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 131 in the agenda.

Item 132

86. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 132 had been requested by 21 countries in document A/33/242.

87. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 132 in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.