

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records *



GENERAL COMMITTEE
1st meeting
held on
Thursday, 23 September 1976
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka)

UN LIBRARY
SEP 29 1976

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FIRST 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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/BUR/31/SR.1
28 September 1976
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:
MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/BUR/31/1, sect. II)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the observations and proposals relating to the organization of the thirty-first regular session contained in section II of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/31/1).
2. The General 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 General 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.
4. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 5 of the memorandum, in which the Secretary-General had suggested, *inter alia*, that the general debate should end on Wednesday, 13 October 1976. However, in view of the large number of speakers already inscribed, the Secretary-General wished to alter that date and to suggest that the duration of the general debate should be extended by one day.
5. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt, as amended, 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 after a speech had been delivered in the General Assembly Hall.
7. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the Chairman's suggestion.
8. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
9. The General Committee took note of paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
10. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions in paragraphs 11 to 14 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.
11. The CHAIRMAN further suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should urge delegations to refrain from repeating in plenary meetings reservations which they had already expressed in the Main Committees in connexion with the adoption of draft resolutions. He suggested that all

(The Chairman)

all reservations expressed at meetings of the Main Committees should be reproduced as fully as possible in the summary records of Committees for which there were no verbatim records and should be reproduced in the Committees' reports - and therefore in the proceedings of the General Assembly - in the form in which they had appeared in the summary records or verbatim records of the Main Committees.

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

13. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestion in paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/BUR/31/1, sect. III)

14. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to section III of the Secretary-General's memorandum, on the inclusion of items in the agenda of the thirty-first session. In accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the General Committee was not considering the substance of any item except in so far as it bore on whether or not the Committee should recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

15. The draft agenda consisted of 125 items: 119 appeared in the provisional agenda and 5 in the supplementary list, and the General Assembly had before it a request for the inclusion of a further item.

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

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

18. Mr. HARRY (Australia) pointed out that the sponsors of the requests for the inclusion of item 121 and item 123 of the agenda had withdrawn those requests.

19. The General Committee took note of the fact that the sponsors of the requests for the inclusion of items 121 and 123 had withdrawn those requests, and decided to recommend that the General Assembly should delete item (116) (Amendment to Article 22 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (Seat of the Court) and consequential amendments to Articles 23 and 28), in accordance with the suggestion in paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

20. The Committee took note of the content of paragraph 19 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

21. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the inclusion in the agenda of the items set forth in paragraph 20. He suggested that, where appropriate, the items should be considered in groups.

/...

Items 1 to 6

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

Items 7 to 26

23. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 7 to 26 in the agenda.

Item 27

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

Items 28 and 29

25. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 28 and 29 in the agenda.

Items 30 to 50

26. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 30 to 50 in the agenda.

Items 51 to 55

27. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 51 to 55 in the agenda.

Items 56 to 68

28. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 56 to 68 in the agenda.

Items 69 to 83

29. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 69 to 83 in the agenda.

Items 84 to 90

30. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 84 to 90 in the agenda.

Items 91 to 105

31. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 91 to 105 in the agenda.

Items 106 to 115

32. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 106 to 115 in the agenda.

Item 116

33. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had already decided to recommend the deletion of item 116.

Item 117

34. The CHAIRMAN observed that the inclusion of item 117 had been requested by Sweden.

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

Item 118

36. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the inclusion of item 118 had been requested by the Dominican Republic on behalf of the Group of Latin American States and that the subject had already been considered by the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

37. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 118 in the agenda.

Item 119

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 119 had been requested by Cyprus and that the representative of that country had asked to be allowed to participate in the discussion on the item in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure. If the representative of Cyprus wished to speak, he would be given the floor immediately, since it was his country that had requested the inclusion of the item.

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

40. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that the question of Cyprus had been considered by the General Assembly in plenary at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions, when the Assembly had adopted resolution 3212 (XXIX) - which had been endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 365 (1974) - and resolution 3395 (XXX). The provisions of those resolutions had not been implemented in any way whatever and the situation was continuing to worsen. Aggression and invasion were continuing in the form of the expulsion of Greek Cypriots and settlement by population from Turkey. Furthermore, all attempts at negotiation between Turkish and Greek Cypriots had failed, and the recent effort by the Secretary-General, just a few days before the opening of the current session, had shown that Turkey remained intractable in the search for a solution.

41. He believed that the item was of concern to both the Republic of Cyprus and Turkey. Cyprus had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the thirty-first session in the hope that the General Assembly would take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of resolutions 3212 (XXIX) and 3395 (XXX). He pointed out that, in any event, under the terms of paragraph 10 of resolution 3395 (XXX), the General Assembly had decided to remain seized of the question.

42. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) said that a reasoned debate on the question of Cyprus in the General Assembly was impossible as the discussions at the thirtieth session had demonstrated. The feelings of bitterness and frustration created by those discussions had made the resumption of negotiations between the two communities almost impossible.

43. The delegation that had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda did not represent the State of Cyprus but only the Greek Cypriot community, in other words, the administration in the south of the island. From the constitutional angle, even when the Constitution had been in force, foreign policy decisions had had to be taken jointly by the two communities. The existing situation, however, was quite different. There were two separate administrations, one in the north and the other in the south of the island. The dispute in Cyprus was between those two administrations, and all United Nations resolutions were addressed to both. It therefore followed that any valid discussion on the question had to take place with the participation of both parties, whether at the United Nations or elsewhere. In the United Nations, the right of equal participation should be upheld to the maximum extent within the rules of procedure.

44. His delegation did not intend to oppose the inclusion of the item on Cyprus in the agenda, provided that the other interested party, the Turkish Cypriot community, was able to participate in the discussion. It reserved the right to revert to the matter during the discussion of allocation of items and would therefore not request that the inclusion of the item in the agenda should be put to the vote; if, however, the General Committee was requested to make a decision on the matter, his delegation would abstain for the reasons it had stated.

45. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic), recalling that in its resolution 3395 (XXX) the General Assembly had decided to remain seized of the question, said that his delegation supported the inclusion of item 119 since it felt the request of Cyprus to be well founded. Most States Members of the United Nations regarded the situation in Cyprus as a source of tension which should be eliminated. As far as his delegation was concerned, that question was linked to the maintenance of international peace and security and therefore fell within the competence of the General Assembly, as defined in the United Nations Charter.

46. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 119 in the agenda.

Item 120

47. The CHAIRMAN noted that the inclusion of item 120 had been requested by Papua New Guinea on behalf of the Commonwealth countries.

48. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 120 in the agenda.

Items 121 and 123

49. The CHAIRMAN recalled that items 121 and 123 had been deleted.

Item 122

50. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the inclusion of item 122 had been requested by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.

51. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 122 in the agenda.

Item 124

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the inclusion of item 124 had been requested by Bangladesh and that the representative of that country had asked to participate in the debate in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

53. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. M.H. Khan (Bangladesh) took a place at the Committee table.

54. Mr. M. H. KHAN (Bangladesh), referring to the question of the admissibility of his country's request, said that, although the request had been made under Article 14 of the Charter, Articles 10, 11, 13 and 35 also empowered the General Assembly to include the question in its agenda.

(Mr. M. H. Khan, Bangladesh)

55. As far as his delegation was concerned, the question did not simply relate to the legal aspects of the construction and operation of the Farakka barrage but also bore a wide range of adverse consequences for peace and security, economic development and humanitarian and social concerns. It jeopardized the welfare of 25 million people and seriously impaired relations between the parties directly concerned.

56. The construction of the barrage constituted a direct threat to the economic sovereignty of Bangladesh and could lead to political strife. As one of the least developed countries, Bangladesh was struggling with all its resources for its rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the additional burden imposed on its economy by the unilateral decision of its neighbour could seriously jeopardize those efforts. Environmentally and ecologically, the diversion of waters could have disastrous consequences which, by their very nature, would have a multiplier effect. From the legal point of view, the implications of the construction of the barrage constituted a violation of the solemn assurances on the part of the neighbouring country not to divert waters without first coming to a mutually acceptable agreement with regard to their distribution.

57. Bangladesh's request for the inclusion of the question in the agenda had not been made in a spirit of confrontation or for propaganda purposes. The sole aim was to obtain an impartial and just hearing for the question, and the General Assembly was the only forum in which a small country could make its voice heard.

58. The bilateral negotiations on the question had produced no result in spite of 25 years of efforts to reach a peaceful settlement. Interdependent relations in the world were currently such that any dispute between two countries took on universal dimensions. It was therefore clearly the responsibility of the General Assembly to recommend objective guidelines which would enable the parties concerned to reach an amicable, expeditious and satisfactory solution in the interests of maintaining peace not only in the region but throughout the world.

59. The equitable and rational use of scarce water resources was not a problem unique to Asia but a universal one affecting millions of people throughout the world and carrying with it the seeds of tension and conflict. The General Assembly should therefore give serious consideration to the question and define approaches for possible peaceful solutions. Failure to consider the problem would have fateful repercussions for the United Nations, the principal tasks of which were to maintain peace and security and to promote the economic and social welfare of mankind.

60. The problems involved called for technical and material assistance from the United Nations and, in particular, from its major financial organs. The projects required to solve those problems were of such a scale as to be beyond the means of the countries concerned.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of India had asked to take part in the discussion on item 124 and that, if heard no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.
62. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Jaipal (India) took a place at the Committee table.
63. Mr. JAIPAL (India) expressed regret that the Government of Bangladesh had seen fit to bring before the General Assembly a question which it entitled "Situation arising out of the unilateral withdrawal of Ganges waters at Farakka" and said he was surprised at the completely unfounded allegations levelled by Bangladesh against India. The problem which Bangladesh sought to bring before the General Assembly was essentially a bilateral one relating to the distribution between India and Bangladesh of the waters of the Ganges during the dry season, with due respect for the legitimate interests and reasonable claims of the two countries. Without going into the substance of the question, he felt bound to clarify the main aspects of it so as to enable the Committee to determine whether or not the proposed item should be included in the agenda. In the view of his delegation, there were a number of reasons why such action should not be taken.
64. The construction of the Farakka barrage had been given careful consideration, and the numerous commissions and experts that had examined the question since 1853 had all agreed that it was the only way to save the port of Calcutta. Furthermore, the operation of the barrage was closely linked with the economic future of eastern India and was of paramount importance for the whole region and its 100 million inhabitants. The Indian Government had held very intensive consultations with the then Government of Pakistan, and subsequently with the Government of Bangladesh, in order to ensure that the legitimate needs of what was now Bangladesh were taken into consideration. Furthermore, during the planning of the barrage, steps had been taken to ensure that the reasonable needs of that country were met.
65. Although the Ganges was mainly an Indian river which, with its main tributaries, extended over 8,000 kilometres of Indian territory and 95 per cent of its irrigation potential was situated in India, the latter had always been ready to take account of the reasonable needs of Bangladesh during the dry season. If the withdrawals of water during the dry period caused difficulties for Bangladesh, remedial measures would of course have to be considered, and India had offered to co-operate fully with Bangladesh to that end. It was in the interests of the two countries to co-operate in the joint development of the water resources of the region. That question had in fact been taken up by their Prime Ministers in May 1974.
66. The withdrawal carried out during the 1975 dry season had been conducted in accordance with an agreement concluded with Bangladesh, and subsequent withdrawals had not violated any existing agreement. In any event, except during the dry season the river contained sufficient water to meet the needs of both countries.

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

67. By its very nature, the problem could be solved only by bilateral discussions conducted in a spirit of friendship and co-operation; the intervention of third parties could only complicate the situation and delay a solution.

68. The question of the equitable distribution of water was above all a legal and technical one which did not lend itself to political discussion; at present, general international law contained no rules accepted by all States on that subject. Accordingly, it would be wiser for the General Assembly to permit the two countries concerned to solve the problems themselves. In the past, the Assembly had always interpreted Article 14 of the Charter in a narrow sense and had never taken up questions that were essentially bilateral. If it changed its approach now, it would establish a precedent and might, in the future, be obliged to discuss a whole series of questions "likely to impair ... friendly relations among nations".

69. His country had always been ready to join Bangladesh in seeking a solution which was in the interests of both States, and any attempt to internationalize the question or to impose multilateral negotiations on a matter that was essentially bilateral could only complicate the situation and might poison relations between the two countries.

70. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation was convinced that discussion of the question at the present session would only create additional difficulties and complicate relations between two non-aligned States; it would not be in the interests of India or Bangladesh and would hinder normalization of the situation on the subcontinent.

71. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 124 in the agenda.

Item 125

72. The CHAIRMAN noted that the inclusion of item 125 had been proposed by Madagascar on behalf of the Group of African States.

73. Mr. LECOMPT (France) requested that the proposal with which item 125 was concerned should be put to the vote and said that his delegation was against including in the agenda of the General Assembly a question the discussion of which would be contrary to the United Nations Charter. Since by the freely expressed will of its population, the island of Mayotte was an integral part of the French Republic, to discuss its status and future in the General Assembly would be contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

74. His delegation wished to emphasize that in several referenda the people of Mayotte had, by large majorities and in complete freedom, reaffirmed their desire to remain part of the French Republic. France, for its part, wished to reaffirm its views concerning the obligations incumbent upon it under its constitution.

(Mr. Lecompt, France)

75. Aware that the ties of friendship between France and the Comoros represented a valuable asset, his Government was still prepared to seek common ground but did not wish to enter into polemics. That was another reason why his delegation considered it inadvisable to include item 125 in the agenda.
76. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Comoros had asked to participate in the discussion of item 125; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.
77. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mouzawar (Comoros) took a place at the Committee table.
78. Mr. MOUZAWAR (Comoros) said that the question of the Comoros had been before international bodies for a number of years, particularly OAU and the United Nations, and had always been a source of concern to the international community. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had confirmed the inalienable right of the people of the Comoro Archipelago to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which called upon the administering Power to take all steps necessary to ensure that the Comoros became independent as quickly as possible and maintained its national unity and territorial integrity. The Special Committee had also condemned any attempt to destroy, whether partially or totally, the territorial integrity of the Comoros.
79. In a resolution of 26 August 1974, the Special Committee had taken note of the statement by the French Government to the effect that an "archipelago-wide" consultation concerning the independence of the Archipelago would be organized, that the Territory would retain the frontiers it had had as a colony and that for the French Government a multiplicity of different statuses for the various islands of the Archipelago was inconceivable.
80. In its resolution 3291 (XXIX), the General Assembly had also taken note of the statement by the representative of France that the French Government had affirmed "the readiness of the Comoro Archipelago for independence" and its intention to respond faithfully to the aspiration of the Comorian people.
81. In the referendum on self-determination held on 22 December 1974, 94.56 per cent of the votes had been cast in favour of independence. Despite that, new legislative measures had reopened questions settled by the referendum. The Comorian people had then declared its independence on 6 July 1975.
82. On 18 July 1975, the Comorian State had been admitted to OAU within the frontiers inherited from the colonial régime, and on 12 November 1975 the General Assembly had admitted a Comorian State, of which the island of Mayotte was an integral part.

(Mr. Mouzawar, Comoros)

83. By continuing to occupy the island, France was violating the principles of the Charter and was going against the wishes of the vast majority of the Comorian people, which could only place its complete confidence in the General Assembly.

84. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that it was paradoxical for the representative of France to invoke the provisions of the Charter in order to oppose the inclusion of the proposed item in the agenda since France, by intervening on the island of Mayotte, which was an integral part of the Comorian State - as had been recognized by the General Assembly itself at its previous session - was clearly violating the provision of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. The United Nations had a duty to protect the independence and territorial integrity of the Comoros, and it was therefore vital for the General Assembly to discuss the question.

85. Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Republic) said that the United Nations had a duty to ensure the implementation of the resolutions it had already adopted with respect to the territorial integrity of the Comoros. The presence of foreign forces on Mayotte, which was an integral part of the Comoros, was contrary to the provisions of the Charter and to those of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation therefore associated itself with the United Republic of Tanzania in supporting the request for inclusion of the item on the Comoros.

86. Mr. KONDE (Guinea) said that, when the General Assembly had admitted the Comoros, it had admitted an indivisible entity. The question of Mayotte should be discussed in depth, firstly to prevent it from setting a dangerous precedent with regard to decolonization, particularly in connexion with southern Africa, and secondly, because it had a profound impact on the future of the Comoros themselves.

87. Mr. LECOMPT (France) said that, in explaining his reasons for requesting a vote on the inclusion of the item in the agenda, he had tried to limit himself to procedural matters. The problem was complex, and its various aspects had been set out by the representative of France in the Security Council. However, if it became necessary his country did not rule out the possibility of making further statements to present its position in greater detail; its request for a vote did not in any sense mean that it was not prepared to enter into a dialogue.

88. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal recommending that the General Assembly should include item 125 in the agenda.

89. The Committee decided, by 18 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 125 in the agenda.

ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/BUR/31/1, sect. IV)

90. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to examine the proposals concerning the allocation of items which had not previously been discussed by the General Assembly and which were listed in paragraph 22 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/31/1).

91. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider item 118 in plenary.
92. Mr. HARRY (Australia) suggested that the Assembly should consider item 120 as quickly as possible in order that the Commonwealth Secretariat might participate in the Assembly's work without delay.
93. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 120 should be given priority consideration in plenary.
94. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 122 should be allocated to the Third Committee.
95. Mr. M. H. KHAN (Bangladesh) said with regard to item 124 that the General Committee's decision should be based on considerations which related both to procedure and to the actual substance of the question. He stressed, firstly, that the agendas of the Main Committees of the General Assembly, particularly the Second and Sixth, were always extremely heavy. Secondly, since it was very difficult to modify certain priorities which had already been set, new items almost always appeared at the end of the agenda and there was a strong likelihood that consideration of them would be deferred to the next session, which would truly be a disaster in the present case in view of the urgency of the question.
96. In the light of the foregoing, and of the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 28 of his memorandum (A/BUR/31/1), on the recommendation of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, he proposed that item 124 should be allocated to the Special Political Committee. Such a decision would, moreover, make it possible to solve the substantive problem posed by the fact that the question had many aspects which would have to be taken into account. The problem was, of course, a political one and was of crucial importance from the point of view of international peace and security, but it also had implications at the socio-economic development, environmental, legal and humanitarian levels. If the item was allocated to the Second Committee, for example, or to the Sixth, those Committees would be able to consider only those aspects of the question which came within their respective spheres of competence.
97. Bangladesh had requested the inclusion of that question in the context of Article 14 of the Charter. Since the General Committee had agreed to recommend that the question should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly, it could not recommend allocating it to a Committee whose sphere of competence was limited: that would be contrary to the objective sought in requesting the inclusion of the question. His delegation would, for its part, have preferred that the Assembly should consider the item in plenary, but in order to take account of the Secretary-General's recommendation, it would agree to its being allocated to the Special Political Committee, whose agenda was relatively light and whose sphere of competence was sufficiently broad to enable it to take account of all aspects of the problem. It was also in favour of transferring one or more other items to that Committee.

98. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation deeply regretted the problem which had arisen between India and Pakistan; it was perfectly aware of the importance of the item to the peoples of the two countries but felt that it would be more reasonable to allocate the item to the Second Committee in order to avoid interjecting elements which might aggravate the problem and make it even more difficult to solve. Moreover, the choice of the Second Committee would be entirely rational in view of its experience in matters concerning economic relations between States.

99. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) said he hoped that the two countries would be able to settle their dispute amicably and thought that the Special Political Committee was the most appropriate forum for consideration of the item.

100. Mr. LECOMPT (France) said that his delegation was prepared to support the allocation of the item to the Special Political Committee. It stressed, however, that the rather special technical nature of the question should be taken into account and hoped that the problem could be settled bilaterally by the two countries, with which France had friendly relations.

101. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that, in view of the statements which had just been made, he would not press for a vote.

102. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 124 should be allocated to the Special Political Committee.

103. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 125 should be considered in plenary.

104. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the General Committee to take a decision on the recommendations in paragraphs 23 to 28 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/31/1).

105. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the proposals in paragraph 23 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 12, should be adopted.

106. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the proposal in paragraph 24 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 25, should be adopted.

107. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the proposal in paragraph 25 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 49, should be adopted.

108. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the proposal in paragraph 26 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, which related to item 56, should be adopted.

109. The General Committee decided to take note of paragraph 27 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General concerning the allocation of item 115 to the Sixth Committee.

110. The General Committee decided to take note of the suggestions in paragraph 28 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

111. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the General Committee to take a decision on the allocation of the items as proposed in paragraph 29 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General.

QUESTIONS PROPOSED FOR INCLUSION IN THE AGENDA OF THE PLENARY

112. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 1 to 34 of the list contained in paragraph 29 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/31/1) should be included in the agenda of the plenary.

113. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) proposed that item 35 of the list (item 119 of the draft agenda) should be considered in plenary, as had been done at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly and as proposed in the memorandum by the Secretary-General. He recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3395 (XXX), had decided to remain seized of the question.

114. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) said that, while the item had been allocated to the plenary at the thirtieth session, it had also been decided that the General Assembly should invite the Special Political Committee to meet for the purpose of affording the representatives of the Cypriot communities an opportunity to express their views. That procedure had proved to be totally inadequate, since it had denied to the Turkish Cypriot community the opportunity to present its views on an issue in which it was one of the two parties. The Turkish community had therefore rejected the resolution adopted by the General Assembly, and that had created an atmosphere of distrust and animosity detrimental to a constructive dialogue.

115. Since the dispute had not been solved, there were today in Cyprus two distinct administrations representing the two national communities. The United Nations had repeatedly stated that the Cyprus question could be solved only by an agreement between those two administrations; it was therefore essential that the two parties should be able to participate in the debates on an equal footing. That was what the Turkish Cypriot community requested.

116. So far as his delegation was concerned, that position was in conformity with justice, equality, the realities of Cyprus and the prerequisites of a peaceful settlement. It therefore proposed a compromise formula which, while short of attaining equality between the two communities, would nevertheless redress the gross inequality suffered by the Turkish community at the preceding session. That

/...

(Mr. Türkmen, Turkey)

proposal called for the allocation of the item to the Special Political Committee and the adoption of a decision enabling the Turkish Cypriot community to participate in the debates of that Committee. That formal proposal by his delegation, whose adoption would certainly help to promote the resumption of negotiations between the two communities, was in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which had reiterated the principle of equality between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities. It was also in keeping with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In that regard, he drew attention to the last subparagraph of paragraph 23 of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Methods and Procedures of the General Assembly approved by the Assembly in its resolution 362 (IV) and reproduced in annex I to the rules of procedure; he stressed that the question of Cyprus was indisputably in the category of items which should not be considered in plenary.

117. He invited the members of the General Committee to give due consideration, when taking the decision, to the views expressed by the Turkish Cypriot community in document S/12204, and he hoped that they would endorse the adoption of a procedure fully in keeping with the resolutions which they had supported thus far.

118. The CHAIRMAN, in reply to questions raised by Mr. HARRY (Australia) and Mr. ABE (Japan), stated that the procedure proposed was the one which had been adopted for two years in succession, namely, that the General Assembly should consider the question in plenary, while calling upon the Special Political Committee to meet in order to hear the representatives of the two Cypriot communities, and that it should resume consideration of the question after receiving the Special Political Committee's report.

119. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said he considered it inconceivable that the General Committee might not recommend the General Assembly to consider the question of Cyprus in plenary. It was a question relating to an act of aggression and was of fundamental importance, like the question of the Middle East. He therefore urged that it should be considered in plenary.

120. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) requested that his proposal should be put to the vote.

121. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Committee should first vote on the proposal of the delegation which had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda, that is to say, the Cypriot delegation. If that delegation's proposal was rejected, the General Committee could vote on the Turkish proposal.

122. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) pointed out that Cyprus was not a member of the General Committee and wondered whether its proposal could be put to the vote. In his view, the General Committee had before it only one proposal, namely, that of Turkey. If there was another proposal, the Turkish proposal should be regarded as an amendment and be put to the vote first.

123. The CHAIRMAN said that in the present case the Turkish proposal could not be regarded as an amendment.

/...

124. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation favoured consideration of the question of Cyprus in plenary, as the Secretary-General had proposed and as the delegation which had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda wished. There was no need to change a practice which had already been followed for two sessions.

125. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) urged that his proposal should be put to the vote.

126. The CHAIRMAN said that he had taken a decision in the matter and that the General Committee should vote first on the proposal, made by the Secretary-General and by the delegation which had requested inclusion in the agenda, to follow the procedure applied during the two preceding sessions.

127. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) agreed with the Chairman. He pointed out that the Cypriot delegation was present in the General Committee under rule 43 of the rules of procedure, according to which it had the right to participate in the work of the Committee without the right to vote. It could therefore make a proposal, and the decision taken by the Chairman in that matter was perfectly correct.

128. The CHAIRMAN called upon the General Committee to vote on the decision he had taken, since the representative of Turkey contested that decision.

129. The Committee approved the Chairman's decision that it should vote first on the proposal made by the Secretary-General and the Cypriot delegation by 15 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

130. The CHAIRMAN then invited the Committee to vote on the proposal itself.

131. The General Committee decided, by 12 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions, to recommend that the question of Cyprus should be considered directly in plenary on the understanding that the General Assembly would, when considering the item, invite the Special Political Committee to meet for the purpose of affording representatives of the Cypriot communities an opportunity to speak in the Committee in order to express their views, and that the General Assembly would then resume its consideration of the item, taking into account the report of the Special Political Committee.

132. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania), supported by Mr. KONDE (Guinea), proposed that the question of the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa (agenda item 52), which had heretofore been considered by the Special Political Committee, should be considered by the General Assembly in plenary.

133. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America) said that he did not object to the proposal but thought that a problem would certainly arise with respect to hearing speakers who did not represent Member States. He pointed out that only Member States could take part in debates in plenary, while all parties concerned could be heard in the Main Committees. He therefore suggested that consultations should be held on that question, and he reserved the right to return to the subject later.

134. Mr. THOMAS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation favoured considering the question in plenary, but that in no way implied that it had changed its position with respect to the status of observers.

135. Mr. LECOMPT (France) said that his delegation also supported the consideration of the question in plenary, on the understanding that the decision which would be taken in the matter would not involve any change of procedure with respect to hearing the representatives of liberation movements as observers.

136. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 52 should be considered in plenary, on the understanding that questions which might arise in that connexion would be subsequently settled through consultations.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE FIRST COMMITTEE

137. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the First Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of items 22 and 23, which had been withdrawn by the delegations that had requested their inclusion, should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

138. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Special Political Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of item 2, which it had recommended the Assembly to consider in plenary, should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SECOND COMMITTEE

139. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Second Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE THIRD COMMITTEE

140. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Third Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the addition of item 122 of the draft agenda, the allocation of which to the Third Committee had already been recommended, should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

141. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Fourth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

142. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Fifth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SIXTH COMMITTEE

143. The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration by the Sixth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of item 11, which the Committee had recommended the Assembly to omit, should be allocated to that Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.