

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records**



SIXTH COMMITTEE
21st meeting
held on
Monday, 16 October 1978
at 3.00 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FERRARI-BRAVO (Italy)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 117: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS
AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

* 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/C.6/33/SR.21
18 October 1978

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

78-57584

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued) (A/33/33, A/33/65, A/33/206 and Corr.1 (French only))

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, as decided at the 20th meeting, the statement made by the Chairman of the Special Committee at that meeting would be given in extenso coverage in the summary record. He hoped that the Secretariat would do its best to ensure that the record would be available on Tuesday, 17 October, in all working languages.

2. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) said his Government attached great importance to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in international affairs, as had been demonstrated by his delegation's attempts to bring that question to the attention of the General Assembly and by its active participation in the work of the Special Committee.

3. The international community currently faced problems as numerous as they were grave. It was becoming increasingly obvious that those problems could not be solved without the participation of all States, on an equal footing. Indirect approaches, or attempts to leave the solution of those problems to a few countries or to bodies with limited membership, would not be in the interest of all peoples. On the contrary, such initiatives only delayed solutions and seriously impeded the future development of international affairs. The democratization of international life was made an absolute necessity by the major changes which had occurred, and continued to occur, throughout the world. Favourable conditions must be created for the active participation of all States, particularly the small and medium-sized ones, in solving the major problems of the time. Those countries were deeply concerned with the democratic and peaceful settlement of such problems and wished to be assured that they would be able to develop in full independence and freedom. In that connexion, the increasingly active role played by the developing and non-aligned countries on the world stage could not be overlooked. That point of view had recently been emphasized by the President of Romania, Mr. Ceausescu. The strengthening of the United Nations and its role in world affairs had been a constant factor in Romanian foreign policy and in the international activities of the President.

4. Romania had always done everything in its power to make the United Nations a genuine world forum, able to reflect and adapt to changing world conditions and devoted to the promotion of new relations among States, based on the principles of international law and on respect for the sacred right of every people to determine for themselves their political orientation and the course of their economic and social development.

5. Romania was deeply concerned at the increasing tendency to assign the United Nations only a marginal role in international affairs and to make it the scene of

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

interminable debates and abstract discussions. In order to play its full role, the United Nations must be able to contribute effectively to ensuring the independence and sovereignty of all States, to help in preventing acts of aggression and the use or threat of force in international relations and in eliminating all traces of colonialism, to achieve disarmament and to build a more equitable and just new international economic order. Much remained to be done in order to achieve that end, but the basis and institutional framework already existed.

6. The discussions which had taken place over the years in the General Assembly and the Special Committee, together with the numerous proposals submitted to the Secretary-General by Member States on the strengthening of the role of the Organization, had demonstrated the necessity of making a combined effort in seeking the best means of achieving that end. The Special Committee provided the institutional framework for that search. The next step was to continue energetically the process already initiated, with the active and constructive participation of all Member States.

7. In 1975, his delegation had submitted to the General Assembly a paper (A/C.6/437) setting forth Romania's position on the improvement and democratization of the activities of the United Nations and the strengthening of its role in achieving co-operation among all States without distinction as to social systems. That paper contained a set of specific proposals relating to all the basic activities of the United Nations, pride of place being accorded to the proposals relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the establishment of the necessary instruments for that purpose. Those proposals continued to be valid and were still before the General Assembly and the Special Committee. The same was true of many other proposals made by other Member States. The crucial problem to be solved was that of finding some way of giving them concrete consideration.

8. As a member of the Special Committee, his delegation agreed with the view expressed by the Chairman of that Committee that some progress had been made by the Committee in carrying out its mandate. He welcomed the fact that the Committee had accorded priority to the proposals made by States regarding the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The preliminary list of 51 proposals contained in the Special Committee's report (A/33/33) showed clearly the importance and advisability of increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations in a field of such vital importance in preventing and settling international disputes. That list, together with the proposals and suggestions regarding the rationalization of the procedures and working methods of the General Assembly and the role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security, were of great value and constituted an appropriate basis for a full exchange of views on practical ways of increasing the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations.

9. A decision must be taken to continue the work of the Special Committee in 1979, to enable it to implement its mandate fully. In that regard, he noted with satisfaction the support expressed for the work of the Special Committee in the

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

declaration adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-aligned Countries in Belgrade in July 1978. That support demonstrated once again the interest with which the work of the Committee was followed and the confidence placed in it by numerous Member States. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania had stated in the general debate in the plenary meeting at the current session, increased efforts must be made to conclude the work of the Special Committee and to identify new practical ways and means of enabling the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities in maintaining international peace and security and in developing co-operation among all States. To that end, the General Assembly should proceed forthwith to consider proposals and action likely to lead to a consensus among Member States, such as those relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes, a field currently of such importance and one in which the United Nations could provide valuable assistance, particularly at a time when there was a growing tendency to resort to the use of force.

10. Romania was seriously concerned at the perpetuation of a number of long-standing conflicts and states of tension. In addition, a number of particularly serious situations had arisen in various parts of the world which had increased tension and culminated in military confrontation. The risk of new confrontations should not be underestimated. Prolonged colonial domination had created and left unsolved many complex problems which must be settled through negotiation, without recourse to arms. Past experience had shown that disregard of the norms of international law and the use of force by certain States was scarcely calculated to promote the settlement of disputes. On the contrary, military operations and wars only complicated matters, poisoned relations between States, accentuated mistrust and conflict, and created new sources of tensions. Moreover, such a policy placed additional burdens on the economies of the countries involved by prompting them to spend a significant portion of their national income on military needs. Such a situation seriously jeopardized the independence of countries by opening the way to foreign intervention and endangering the national security and economic progress of the peoples concerned. The events of recent years had shown that it was genuinely possible to resolve the most complex situations by peaceful means. That fact was bound to have particularly beneficial effects with regard to the strengthening of international confidence and co-operation and the establishment of lasting and universal peace.

11. It was the deep conviction of his Government that every effort should be made to achieve international détente. It was the duty of every Member State and of the United Nations to work for the negotiated solution of all disputes. No effort should be spared to put an end to the policy of force and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and the use of military means to settle disputes. All Member States must increase their efforts to promote a policy of détente, peace, co-operation and security throughout the world.

12. The peaceful settlement of international disputes and the prevention of international conflicts was an area in which the United Nations should play a leading role, with the support of all States. To achieve that end, the instruments available to the United Nations must be examined and evaluated, with a view to

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

improving and supplementing existing procedures, making them more effective and encouraging their more frequent use by States.

13. Concerns of that type had existed in the past within the United Nations as was shown by the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the peaceful settlement of disputes (A/10289). Neither the attempts of the General Assembly over the years to strengthen United Nations machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, nor the activities of the International Law Commission and the relevant studies conducted under the auspices of UNITAR had yet received the international attention that had been hoped for. That observation only strengthened his delegation's conviction that the General Assembly must tackle more resolutely the question of the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

14. It had been in that spirit that Romania had proposed the conclusion of a general treaty under which all States would undertake to settle their disputes, of whatever type, exclusively by peaceful means. That proposal had been submitted by the Romanian Prime Minister on instructions from the President of Romania, at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and had been reiterated by the Romanian Minister for Foreign Affairs in the course of the general debate in the plenary meeting at the current session. The conclusion of such a treaty would ensure the exercise by each State of its right to develop in full security, with firm guarantees against interference in its internal affairs and against the danger of armed aggression. At the same time, such a treaty would have a highly positive influence on the world political climate, facilitate the prevention and rapid elimination of hotbeds of war and create favourable conditions for the adoption of effective disarmament measures.

15. Moreover, in order to guarantee international peace and security, the institutional framework should be enlarged and the instruments available to the United Nations for the settlement of international disputes should be improved. To that end, it would be particularly useful to set up a body for good offices and conciliation, which would be responsible to the General Assembly and play an active role in preventing tension and conflicts and in seeking solutions consistent with the spirit of good neighbourliness and peaceful coexistence. In 1975, Romania had made a proposal to that effect. That proposal had been put forward again in the Special Committee, at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and at the current session. The establishment of such a body would provide an appropriate framework within which to seek practical ways and means of settling disputes peacefully. It would enable the United Nations to play a more active and effective role in preventing states of tension from developing, intensifying and deteriorating into armed conflicts. Such a body could also help to strengthen the confidence of States in the United Nations ability to fulfil its role in maintaining peace and security. In that way, recourse by Member States to the framework provided by the United Nations for the peaceful settlement of disputes could become the general rule.

16. His delegation noted with satisfaction that similar proposals had been made by other States in the Special Committee and the General Assembly. Moreover, many

/...

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

other States had, both within and outside the Special Committee, submitted interesting proposals designed to ensure the better use and improvement of United Nations machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes. His delegation understood the concerns of the non-aligned countries which attached particular importance to that problem.

17. The best means of dealing with the proposals submitted by Member States would be to include a separate item on the peaceful settlement of disputes in the agenda of the General Assembly for the following session. A proposal to that effect had been made by 18 Member States, including Romania, at the 1977 session of the Special Committee and had been reiterated by a number of States at the 1978 session. Unfortunately, no concrete action had been taken on it. The inclusion of such an item in the agenda of the Sixth Committee would have considerable political significance and would enrich the substance of the work of that Committee. Accordingly, his delegation had held consultations with others with a view to adopting a draft resolution calling for the inclusion of such an item in the agenda of the following session of the General Assembly. He invited all interested delegations to join in formulating a proposal which would command the widest possible acceptance in the Committee.

18. He reiterated the special importance attached by his delegation to the work of the Special Committee and its sincere desire to co-operate actively with all delegations in solving the problems relating to the work of the Special Committee, in order to enable it to fulfil its mandate as rapidly as possible.

19. Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said the report of the Special Committee (A/33/33) was both confused and confusing. For example, in paragraph 26 of the Chairman's statement at the 27th meeting of the Special Committee (A/33/33, para. 12), it was stated that the Committee Secretary had said that there was absolutely no possibility of having précis-writers work with the Committee as they had done at the previous session. However, General Assembly resolution 32/45, paragraph 6, requested the Secretary-General to render all assistance to the Special Committee, including the preparation of summary records of its meetings. Moreover, at the 21st meeting of the Special Committee, the Legal Counsel had given the assurance that the Secretariat would do everything in its power to provide the necessary assistance. In spite of that, the pleas by Tunisia at the 26th meeting to the effect that during its first two sessions the Committee had encountered great difficulty in drafting its reports because of the lack of records of many of its meetings had gone unheard. As a result, it had been left to the Chairman, with one or two of the younger secretaries, to take notes of the meetings of the Working Group, in addition to presiding over the meetings. It was small wonder, therefore, that the resulting report was unco-ordinated and confused.

20. In reporting on the discussions in the Working Group, the Chairman had attempted to avoid attributing statements to specific delegations. However, it did not take long to discover who the speakers had been. For example, on page 30, paragraph 2 referred to the "first speaker", who could later be identified as the representative of Romania, by the reference made to the working paper submitted by

(Mr. Kateka, Tanzania)

his delegation. Similarly, the second speaker, referred to on page 35, paragraph 12, was identified on page 36, paragraph 15, as the representative of the United Kingdom, while the "third speaker" referred to on page 38, paragraph 16, was identified on page 39, paragraph 18, as the representative of France. However, the reader was left to imagine who the other speakers had been, although the views expressed on pages 41 to 45 could be identified as those of a member of the Socialist bloc, and those on pages 33 to 35 as those of a representative of one of the four big Powers. Given such a situation, he wondered why the Chairman had not attributed the rest of the statements to their respective speakers.

21. Furthermore, working papers had been mixed up with the Chairman's "summary records", instead of forming a separate annex for easy reference. For example, reference was made on page 41, paragraph 26, to the useful proposals contained in the Egyptian working paper; but the reader only encountered the working paper concerned on page 48, paragraph 58. In addition, the two main topics dealt with in the Chairman's statements - the peaceful settlement of disputes and the rationalization of existing United Nations procedures - were treated as if they were interchangeable. For example, from the question of the maintenance of international peace and security, dealt with on page 17, a sudden switch was made on page 20 to the peaceful settlement of disputes; the Chairman's statement at the 29th meeting began with the rationalization of United Nations procedures and then changed to settlement of disputes on page 50. An addendum to the Philippines working paper appeared on page 51, whereas the original proposal was on page 29.

22. Nevertheless, one of the four big Powers opposed to review of the Charter had stated, according to the summary records annexed to the Committee's report, that "the Chairman's exhaustive summary of the discussions in the Working Group was a satisfactory substitute for summary records" (A/AC.182/SR.27, para. 27). The Chairman's summary was again praised in paragraph 43 of the same record by another of the four big Powers. That was no coincidence; those Powers would be happy with an obscure document, which would help them to thwart attempts to review the Charter.

23. When the Chairman of the Special Committee was introducing the Committee's report, his delegation had been surprised to hear him say that the Special Committee had made good progress, had not needed to have recourse to voting, and had not engaged in any controversy regarding its mandate. The record hardly warranted such assertions. Paragraph 3 of resolution 32/45, inserted at the insistence of the four big Powers, requested the Special Committee "to be mindful of the importance of reaching general agreement whenever it has significance for the outcome of its work". That provision ensured that the Special Committee, consisting of 47 Member States, could not do anything without the approval of the four big Powers. A consensus provision was one of the many devices used by the four big Powers to obstruct international negotiations, for example the Conference on the Law of the Sea. A similar tactic had been used in the North-South dialogue, and the current stalemate in the efforts to establish a new international economic order was partly due to consensus procedures. Similarly, a provision had been included in the final document of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament requiring the Disarmament Commission to apply the consensus rule.

(Mr. Kateka, Tanzania)

24. The record on substance was no better than that on procedure. According to paragraph 8 of the report (A/33/33), first priority was to be given to the topic concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes. The wishes of the four big Powers had thus prevailed in the choice of subjects, and they had stifled any attempt to discuss the maintenance of international peace and security. The summary record of the 28th meeting of the Special Committee showed that the representative of Mexico had been allowed to speak on that question only as a personal courtesy. No attention had been paid to the request of the representative of Sierra Leone at that meeting that the sound recording of the 5th meeting of the Working Group should be consulted in order to ascertain what understanding had been reached regarding the consideration of the question of the maintenance of international peace and security (A/AC.182/SR.28, para. 39).

25. The four big Powers had concentrated on the topics of settlement of disputes and rationalization of United Nations procedures in order to obstruct any genuine attempts to review the Charter. They had forgotten that, according to paragraph 1 (a) of General Assembly resolution 3499 (XXX), the Special Committee was to "examine in detail the observations received from Governments concerning (i) suggestions and proposals regarding the Charter of the United Nations and (ii) the strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security". The four big Powers had thus diverted the Special Committee from the order of priorities established by the Assembly to the peripheral topics of settlement of disputes and rationalization of United Nations procedures.

26. With regard to the first of those topics, there were already many instruments dealing with the settlement of disputes, the most important being Chapter VI, and especially Article 33, of the Charter. There was also the International Court of Justice with its compulsory jurisdiction under the optional clause. There were regional arrangements such as the OAU Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration, and there were the dispute settlement clauses contained in bilateral and multilateral treaties. Yet the Special Committee had submitted to the diktat of the four big Powers in giving special priority to that topic.

27. Similarly, there was sufficient machinery for the rationalization of United Nations procedures. For example, the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly had agreed that the existing rules of procedure were generally satisfactory and that most improvements would be achieved not through changes in the rules of procedure but through better application of the existing rules. Furthermore, the Secretary-General pointed out existing short-comings in United Nations procedures in his report to the General Assembly at its thirty-third session on the work of the Organization.

28. His delegation contended that the Special Committee had failed to make any progress and agreed with the representative of Sierra Leone that paragraph 10 of the report should be deleted, because it was both trivial and misleading. Paragraph 15 of the report contained a list of 51 items that supposedly represented the result of the work at the current stage. That list consisted merely of a reproduction of all the proposals submitted as working papers by various delegations,

/...

(Mr. Kateka, Tanzania)

which were included in the report. That incoherent and undigested compilation made it impossible to say that the Committee had made progress. Only the United States delegation had attempted, in its working paper, to implement paragraph 2 (a) of General Assembly resolution 32/45. Yet, as a result, it was left to the United States to say what had or had not awakened special interest. The Special Committee had neglected its duty, solely to the benefit of the four big Powers.

29. In the past quarter of a century, the four big Powers had adopted contradictory positions with regard to the Charter. In 1955, two of them had sponsored a draft resolution calling for a review conference of the Charter in accordance with Article 109 of the Charter, to enable Governments which had not participated in drafting the Charter to give their views. In 1969, two of the big Four had still favoured re-examination of the Charter, opposed by the one dissenting Power which had consistently maintained that the Charter was fully adequate for its purpose. However, three of the four big Powers had abstained from voting on General Assembly resolution 2552 (XXIV), with the fourth voting against. By 1970, two of the four Powers were urging caution with respect to a review of the Charter. Three had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2697 (XXV), because it merely called for the suggestions and views of Member States on the review of the Charter. In 1972, two of the four big Powers had opposed a general review of the Charter, and together with the one Power which had consistently opposed any review of the Charter, they had maintained that it was a flexible instrument capable of keeping abreast of changing international realities. All four Powers had voted for General Assembly resolution 2968 (XXVII), the fourth preambular paragraph of which stated that "a review of the Charter which was not generally supported would militate against the desired result, that is, the strengthening of the effectiveness of the United Nations". Since 1974 and the setting up of the short-lived Ad Hoc Committee on the Charter of the United Nations, the four big Powers had used all possible tactics to oppose any suggestion of reviewing the Charter. They paid mere lip service to the work of the Special Committee. In those circumstances, the Sixth Committee should adopt a resolution urging that priority be given to consideration of the question of the maintenance of international peace and security. It should also remove the unanimity procedures referred to in paragraph 3 of resolution 32/45. At its next session, the Special Committee must also be requested to complete its listing of items.

30. The international community should not allow those who held a static view of the Charter to frustrate efforts to improve United Nations machinery. If the Charter were not formally reviewed, it would undergo de facto amendment, as had already occurred in relation to decolonization and the maintenance of international peace and security. The majority of mankind, as represented in the General Assembly, could not remain indifferent while the four big Powers used their veto to frustrate the Security Council. If those Powers joined forces with the only permanent member of the Security Council which had consistently advocated review of the Charter, the rest of the United Nations membership would reciprocate by calling for only essential amendments to the Charter.

/...

31. Mr. MAGNAVITA (Brazil) said that, as in previous years, the report of the Special Committee (A/33/33) portrayed the intensive work done by that body. It gave comprehensive coverage of the debate that had taken place in the open-ended Working Group established at the outset of the 1978 session. That was a convenient procedural device to allow delegations to express their views rather more freely. That device was usually adopted with the objective of obtaining results, but as far as the Special Committee was concerned it seemed that the idea was precisely the opposite.

32. The report also incorporated the working papers introduced during the course of the 1978 session, 22 in all, 14 of which dealt with the pacific settlement of disputes, 6 with the rationalization of existing procedures and a modest 2 with a rather more difficult issue namely, the maintenance of peace and security.

33. The working papers on the pacific settlement of disputes and the ensuing debates repeated what had either been printed or said on other occasions. All the 51 proposals contained in the working papers had been incorporated into the report under the heading "compilation", once the word "list" had been turned down by certain delegations, since it might be inferred from the latter designation that the Committee was about to wind up the mandate given it by General Assembly resolution 32/45. Of course, the compilation contained in the report fell lamentably short of being the list requested in paragraph 2 (a) of General Assembly resolution 32/45, despite the attempt made by the delegation of the United States in its working paper (A/AC.182/WG/21), which clearly indicated the areas in which there was special interest as well as the areas in which there was no widespread special interest. The proposals contained in the United States working paper although in large part a repetition of existing provisions of the Charter, could be incorporated into the body of an extensive document, possibly a treaty on the pacific settlement of disputes. The United States delegation in its working paper had shown a decided preference for a declaration instead of a treaty, but it had also shown itself favourably disposed towards working for achievements in the field of the pacific settlement of disputes.

34. On the other hand, the General Assembly, inspired by a Soviet proposal, had created a committee which had been assigned, among other tasks, the goal of drafting a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes or such other recommendations as the Committee deemed appropriate. In that connexion, the Soviet delegation had produced a draft world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations (A/31/243). It was stated in article II of that document that the high contracting parties reaffirmed their undertaking to settle disputes among them by peaceful means in such a manner as not to endanger international peace and security and that for that purpose they should use, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, such means as negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement or other peaceful means of their own choice, including any settlement procedure agreed to by them.

35. It would be difficult to establish which took precedence, the pacific settlement of disputes or the non-use of force in international relations. However,

(Mr. Magnavita, Brazil)

the latter was embodied in the Charter in an absolutely unequivocal and all-embracing way, and the former, although quite explicit, nevertheless apparently required further elaboration. Since there seemed, moreover, to be general agreement on the need for expanding and elaborating on the principle contained in Article 33 of the Charter, his delegation would favour an exercise for that purpose to take place in the Special Committee on the Charter. That would, indeed, be of use in strengthening the role of the Organization.

36. His delegation believed that, with regard to the topic of peaceful settlement of disputes, despite the fact that differences of opinion still existed, concrete results could be achieved in the not-too-distant future. He would pass over other topics in connexion with which concrete results were equally likely to be attained, although they would require a longer period of work, since his delegation was convinced that the General Assembly should each year reassess the extension of the mandate of the Special Committee on the Charter in order to ascertain whether it was compatible with practical political or other results. With that in mind, the next session of that Committee should be dedicated to exhaustive consideration of the topic of pacific settlement of disputes, which could possibly be followed by a discussion of the maintenance of peace and security.

37. The report (A/33/33) contained six documents dealing with the rationalization of existing procedures. Those documents confirmed his view that that topic had little bearing on the Charter review or on the strengthening of the role of the Organization, although it could eventually lead to the enhancement of the Special Committee's own internal efficiency.

38. The report also incorporated two documents on the maintenance of peace and security. A few delegations had made attempts to deal with that subject in a more extensive way, but their efforts had been frustrated by the obstinacy of certain delegations in not allowing the Special Committee to get involved, even in an informal way, in the discussion of that sensitive topic.

39. He would not repeat the arguments put forth by his delegation in defence of the mechanism for revision of the Charter clearly established in Articles 108 and 109 thereof. Revision would certainly be forthcoming if combined political will met the long-felt need for revision. The procrastination in the adoption of changes that were more and more obviously needed as time went by did little service to the Organization. He hoped that a more constructive spirit would inspire the continuation of the work entrusted to the Special Committee.

40. Mr. BROMS (Finland), speaking as Chairman of the Special Committee, expressed appreciation to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his critical comments. Such comments were often more needed and perhaps more useful than favourable ones. However, while he had no desire to defend the "four big Powers" or the "43 small Powers", he wished to correct certain points concerning his own statements on the work carried out by the Working Group.

41. It had been said that speakers had not been identified in the report. He had explained two years earlier that the names of speakers in working groups were

/...

(Mr. Broms, Finland)

normally withheld in reports. Accordingly, no exception had been made in the current report (A/33/33). Again, it was customary to mention the names of those delegations which had submitted working papers, and that had been done.

42. With regard to the scheme of his statements, they had followed the chronological order of developments. Some members of the Working Group had submitted papers on the first topic discussed after the debate had already been initiated on the second topic, and the working papers appeared in the chronological order in which they had been submitted. It had been agreed that, after the closure of the list of speakers on a given topic, it would be possible for any delegation to submit a working paper on that topic at a later date.

43. With regard to the proposal made by the representative of Sierra Leone at the 28th meeting of the Special Committee, that the sound recording of the 5th meeting of the Working Group should be consulted in order to ascertain what understanding had been reached regarding the consideration of the question of the maintenance of international peace and security, the sound recording had been checked and the point had been clarified. It would, moreover, have been useful for the purposes of the discussion at the beginning of the current meeting to have consulted the sound recording of the 20th meeting of the Sixth Committee, in order to save time.

44. Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed appreciation to the Chairman of the Special Committee. Nevertheless, there was one area where his clarifications were inexact, namely, the question of attribution of views to some delegations and not to others. If the working papers submitted had been placed together in a separate section of the Special Committee's report, no confusion would have arisen. Unless all those who had expressed views were identified or, alternatively none were identified, equal treatment could not be ensured.

45. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) said his delegation stood by its position, expressed at the 28th meeting of the Special Committee, regarding the Mexican representative's understanding of the agreement reached by the Special Committee to the effect that the question of the maintenance of international peace and security would be given the same priority as that of the peaceful settlement of disputes.

46. Mr. EL GHARBI (Morocco), speaking on a point of order, said that, with regard to the English-language press releases concerning meetings, especially those issued after the debates in the Main Committees of the General Assembly, his delegation had, at the thirty-second session, regularly taken issue with the Office of Public Information because its statements had been cut short and distorted. At the current session, he noted with regret that that same discrimination among States with regard to the adequate reflection of their views in the press releases continued. The role of the Press Section of the Secretariat could not be one of censorship. The United Nations was the guarantor of the right of States to free expression.

47. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Morocco that his comments would be brought to the attention of those responsible for press services and that explanations would be given, as necessary.