



Wednesday, 28 September 1960,  
 at 8.50 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the fifteenth session and allocation of items (continued)</i>	
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fifteenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (concluded) . . . . .</i>	21
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fifteenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .</i>	21
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fifteenth session: item proposed by the United States of America . . . . .</i>	22
<i>Allocation of items . . . . .</i>	22

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

Consideration of the agenda of the fifteenth session and allocation of items (A/BUR/152 and Add.1; A/4495, A/4501, A/4515) (continued)

**REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/4495) (concluded)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its discussion of the inclusion in the agenda of the additional item entitled "Threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of the Congo", which had been proposed by the USSR (A/4495).
2. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) urged that the item, which concerned one of the most burning questions of the day, should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.
3. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that the debate had shown that most members of the Committee saw no need for any new discussion of the situation in the Congo so soon after the subject had been fully debated at the fourth emergency special session and a resolution had been adopted (resolution 1474 (ES-IV)) without dissent.
4. He had, however, indicated at the preceding meeting that, although the United Kingdom was opposed to the inclusion of the item proposed by the USSR delegation, he would have no objection to the inclusion of an item in the terms suggested by the delegation of Ceylon (129th meeting), which would enable the General Assembly to discuss the subject at a proper time and under an appropriate title. Accordingly, if it was the general desire of the members of the Committee that the item should be included, and on the understanding that a substantive debate was not immediately desirable or necessary, he would be willing to agree to that procedure.

5. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the preceding meeting, the representative of Ceylon had proposed that the item should be entitled "The situation in the Republic of the Congo". Since the USSR representative had raised no objection to that wording, that would be the title of the item.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item, with that title, should be included in the agenda.*

6. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that his delegation had consented to the inclusion of the item because of the new wording suggested by the representative of Ceylon. That change made it clear that the intention of the Committee was that the item no longer carried with it the connotation of the explanatory memorandum submitted by the USSR (A/4495). He wished to dissociate his delegation from any approval of the contents of that memorandum.

7. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) maintained that the change in the attitude of the United States delegation had not been due to the change in the title of the item. The wording had been changed at the very outset of the discussion at the preceding meeting but at that time neither the United States nor the United Kingdom delegations had wished the item to be included in the agenda. Since then, those delegations had obviously come to the conclusion that since the great majority of delegations were in favour of including the item in the agenda it would not be worth their while to object.

8. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) recalled that he had spoken on the subject of the inclusion of the item only once, before the representative of Ceylon had suggested the new wording. He had never opposed the inclusion of the item but had merely said that his delegation would prefer to postpone a final decision on the matter.

9. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) associated himself with those remarks.

**REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/4501, A/4502)**

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the proposal by the USSR (A/4501) for the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples".

11. Mr. DAUGE (France) wished to make it clear that, while not objecting to the inclusion of the item, his delegation did not accept the terms of the explanatory memorandum which accompanied the letter from the USSR delegation (4502). In particular, he protested against the manner in which the text of the Declaration

attached to the explanatory memorandum referred to the situation in Algeria.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be included in the agenda.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/4515)

12. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the United States request for the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Africa: a United Nations programme for independence and development" (A/4515).

13. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that the request was the natural outcome of his Government's desire, expressed by President Eisenhower in the General Assembly on 22 September 1960 (868th plenary meeting), to achieve the objectives of the United Nations Charter in the African continent. In the opinion of the United States of America a broad programme of assistance was needed in which all Members of the United Nations could participate for the benefit of human progress in Africa.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be included in the agenda.*

ALLOCATION OF AGENDA ITEMS

14. The CHAIRMAN called attention to paragraph 8 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/152). He observed that the recommendation that section I of chapter VII of the report of the Economic and Social Council should be referred to the Fifth Committee did not, of course, imply that the whole of chapter VII would not also be available to that Committee.

*The Committee took note of paragraph 8 of document A/BUR/152.*

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the proposed allocation of items to the plenary Assembly.

16. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in conformity with its expressed opposition to the inclusion of the question of Tibet and the question of Hungary in the Assembly's agenda, his delegation proposed that those items should not be allocated to plenary meetings.

17. However, the USSR proposed that certain items which the Secretary-General suggested for allocation to Committees (A/BUR/152 and Add.1) should be allocated to the plenary Assembly, for the following reasons. Item 67, dealing with disarmament, should be so allocated in order to give the highly authoritative representatives heading certain delegations an opportunity to express their views on it, as that was largely the reason for their presence in New York. Furthermore, disarmament, as the most important political question of the day, should not be treated as a routine matter and referred to a Committee but should be dealt with in the principal forum of the United Nations.

18. The item entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" (A/

4501) should be allocated to the plenary Assembly because it raised a major international problem, which possessed great political significance to all peoples and countries and in the discussion of which the eminent representatives he had mentioned should take part, especially since they included statesmen from many newly independent African Republics.

19. The item entitled "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" was of interest not only to the two Powers named but to all countries because it affected the maintenance of international peace, and should likewise be allocated to the plenary Assembly.

20. Lastly, the item entitled "The situation in the Republic of the Congo" had already been discussed at plenary meetings during the fourth emergency special session of the General Assembly, and there was no reason to downgrade it by referring it to a Committee; it too should be discussed at the highest level.

21. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had no strong views regarding the allocation of the items mentioned by the USSR representative, except for the question of disarmament. As the members of the Committee were aware, in addition to that particular item there were a number of other closely connected items to be allocated to the First Committee. In his delegation's view all those items should be discussed together.

22. Furthermore, to the best of his memory, the question of disarmament had always been dealt with by the First Committee and he could see no reason why that practice should not be continued at the current session.

23. The USSR representative had urged that the matter should be discussed in plenary meeting because a number of Heads of State were taking part in the work of the session. He was unable to follow that argument; there was nothing to prevent the distinguished persons in question from participating in the work of any Committee that was debating a subject of interest to them.

24. A further point was that the question of disarmament was already being discussed in the general debate and what was needed was an opportunity to go into more detail and to formulate definite proposals. A Committee was better fitted than the plenary Assembly to perform such work.

25. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) entirely agreed with the representative of Ceylon. All the items connected with the question of disarmament ought undoubtedly to be taken together, and the proper place for them to be discussed in the first instance was unquestionably the First Committee, where they could be given the careful attention their difficult character required, before a decision was taken on them by the General Assembly itself. He was not convinced by the USSR representative's arguments in favour of a departure from the usual practice with respect to those matters, nor did he find anything in the USSR memorandum on the subject of disarmament to support those arguments. Experience had shown that the only hope for progress in disarmament lay in the serious and detailed discussion of the question in substance and not in wide-ranging general speeches.

26. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) supported the USSR representative's proposal that the items mentioned by that representative should be allocated to the plenary Assembly. All those questions were of vital importance and it would hardly create a good impression on the general public if such cold war items as the questions of Tibet and Hungary were given prominence by being sent direct to plenary meetings, while others of far greater intrinsic importance were relegated to Committees. Furthermore, the General Committee should try to help the Heads of Government and other eminent personalities attending the session to accomplish the tasks they had come to perform, and it would be easier for them to deal with such important questions as disarmament in plenary meetings, although they would not, of course, refuse to attend Committee meetings. Nor was it necessary to take all questions connected with disarmament together. The item on general and complete disarmament concerned the problem as a whole and envisaged radical solutions. The other items concerned particular, and therefore partial, aspects of the problem and could very well be dealt with in committee.

27. Mr. GREEN (Canada) pointed out that all Heads of Government present would have ample opportunity to express their views on any item on the agenda during the general debate which was currently going on in plenary and would certainly continue well into October. In any case, the fact of their presence was no argument for disrupting the entire procedure of the United Nations. He therefore agreed with the representative of Ceylon that all the items connected with disarmament should be dealt with together and in the First Committee. What the world wanted was not more speech-making and propaganda but real negotiations and effective action before it was too late.

28. The USSR delegation wilfully ignored the fact that the Disarmament Commission had discussed the whole subject of disarmament with great thoroughness in August of the current year, and had adopted a resolution<sup>1/</sup> urging that continued efforts should be made for the earliest possible continuation of international negotiations to achieve a constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

29. Accordingly, it was the task of the General Assembly at its current session to make the nuclear Powers realize that they must negotiate, and not to encourage empty discussions. The representatives of the USSR and Romania also made light of the related items, such as the peaceful uses of outer space, the prevention of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons. In fact, those matters were among the most important problems confronting mankind today. Along with the general question of disarmament they merited serious and practical discussion at once in an appropriate forum, namely, the First Committee of the General Assembly.

30. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America), referring to the USSR representative's remarks, said that the questions of Tibet and Hungary had always been discussed in plenary meetings; nothing had happened to justify a change in their allocation at the current session, and he therefore opposed their removal from the list of items to be considered in plenary meeting. The

various items connected with disarmament called for careful consideration and a workmanlike approach. Their discussion in the First Committee was the most likely to produce good results. He therefore opposed their allocation to the plenary Assembly. He was also opposed to the discussion of the item on the granting of independence to colonial peoples in plenary meeting. The question of bringing Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories to independence was not new: the Fourth Committee had been dealing with it successfully for many years and could do so still. His delegation believed that the item entitled "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" should be allocated to the First Committee as had been done with similar items in the past to ensure their receiving careful, quiet and studious consideration. He had no objection to the tentative placing of the item on the situation in the Congo on the list of items to be considered by the plenary Assembly, where it could remain until such time as it seemed necessary for the General Assembly to consider it.

31. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) felt that there was every reason for allocating the item on general and complete disarmament to the plenary Assembly, where the Heads of Government present at the session could elucidate the problems involved, enlighten public opinion and offer broad solutions, opening the way for detailed discussions later. The other items connected with disarmament represented particular aspects of the topic as a whole, and could suitably be discussed in the First Committee. There was no reason, of course, why the Heads of Government could not go to that Committee to participate in such discussions.

32. The question of the situation in the Republic of the Congo merited the utmost attention: it had already been discussed by the Security Council at various times and had been the subject of a special session of the General Assembly. The question of the granting of independence to colonial peoples was a vital one, and should be dealt with as soon as possible. The question of the threat to world peace created by the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union was daily acquiring greater importance and urgency—the United States did not deny that there had been such actions and, indeed, had made them its declared policy. All three items should therefore be discussed by the plenary Assembly.

33. His delegation's views on the items concerning Tibet and Hungary were well known; it believed that they did not merit the attention of the General Assembly and in fact should not be on its agenda at all.

34. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) felt that the Canadian representative failed to appreciate the comprehensiveness which made the item concerning general and complete disarmament transcend in importance all other related items. It covered the elimination of nuclear weapons; the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons; the cessation of their manufacture; the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests; the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; the elimination of all means of delivering them; the prohibition of the use of outer space for other than peaceful purposes; and the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons. The plenary Assembly should therefore concentrate on that item and give the Heads of

<sup>1/</sup> DC/182.

Government present an opportunity to discuss it. If the Committee felt that the item should not be separated in discussion from the other items relating to disarmament, his delegation would have no objection to the allocation of those items to the plenary meetings as well.

35. He could not endorse the Canadian representative's contention that the presence of some Heads of Government should not be permitted to upset the procedure of the United Nations. The present occasion was without precedent, and there was no excuse for any arrangement, however hallowed by tradition, which allowed those Heads of Government to leave New York without embarking on the examination of the most important problems on the Assembly's agenda and providing a basis for negotiations.

36. Mr. NAJOLI (Italy) associated himself with the remarks of the Canadian and Ceylonese representatives. The prominent personalities attending the current session had every opportunity to expound broad lines of thought during the general debate; it was necessary, however, for the General Assembly to proceed with its practical task as quickly as possible, for the world was anxiously awaiting results. Disarmament questions had many interrelated aspects, and it was accordingly important for the First Committee to consider them together. That Committee provided a better forum than the plenary Assembly for an exchange of views yielding quick results.

37. His delegation also considered that the item entitled "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics", which was on the list of items for the First Committee, should be allocated to that Committee.

38. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) felt that the choice between the plenary Assembly and a Main Committee as the forum for discussion of a particular item was not a vital issue, and should be decided on practical grounds. The practical considerations which had guided the General Committee in the past, and which were still applicable, included the following. First, all items were ultimately laid before the plenary Assembly; allocation directly to the plenary Assembly thus obviated duplication. Secondly, time would be saved by allocating an urgent item to the plenary Assembly. Thirdly, discussion of an item at plenary meetings attracted more publicity, and gave greater weight to the proceedings, than did discussion in a Committee.

39. There appeared to be general agreement that the item entitled "The situation in the Republic of the Congo" should be allocated to the plenary Assembly; the timing of consideration of that item would be decided in due course.

40. For the third of the reasons he had given, his delegation felt that the item entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" should be allocated to the plenary Assembly. Considerable progress has been made in recent years in implementing the relevant principles of the United Nations Charter; the subject was of overwhelming importance, and the eyes of the whole world were on the proceedings of the plenary Assembly.

41. Disarmament was the most important problem the General Assembly had to consider, and there was wis-

dom in the argument that at the current session, when representation in the plenary Assembly was on a very high level, the relevant items should be allocated for examination at plenary meetings.

42. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that, in view of the conviction expressed by the Romanian and Bulgarian representatives that Heads of Government would be willing to attend a Main Committee it could be assumed that, if the disarmament question was allocated to a Committee, the Heads of Government would participate in its discussion.

43. He failed to see that item to the plenary Assembly would provide the Heads of Government with a better opportunity for negotiation than allocation to a Committee. Moreover, since most of the Heads of Government in question had been in New York since the session began, the presumption was that they were already negotiating, and the allocation of a given item to a Committee would not impede that process.

44. The Romanian representative had argued that failure to allocate the disarmament question to the plenary Assembly would disappoint the public. But the public would be better served by practical negotiation at close quarters in the First Committee. If the public wanted speeches alone, the plenary Assembly was the appropriate place; but speeches alone would not solve the problem of disarmament.

45. The Romanian representative had urged the General Committee do discard its traditional practice. In the case in point, however, there was nothing to be gained by doing so.

46. The Romanian representative saw no objection to the allocation to the plenary Assembly of all items relating to disarmament, whereas the Bulgarian representative did not consider that necessary. In the Ceylonese delegation's view all those items should be dealt with together, as they had been in the past and as was implied in General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV).

47. The Romanian representative had argued that, if such items as the question of Tibet and the question of Hungary were allocated to the plenary Assembly, the question of disarmament should also be so allocated. Disarmament, however, was a more complicated question than the other two and required different treatment. Its allocation to the plenary Assembly would prejudice the precise and detailed discussion which the subject demanded.

48. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) observed that in accordance with past practice, items allocated directly to the plenary Assembly were confined to procedural matters such as appointments, elections, and the noting of reports which did not require discussion. Exceptions had been made to that rule only in the case of items that could be disposed of quickly or that were of such an urgent nature that they called for prompt attention by the General Assembly. That being so, his delegation would not object to the item relating to the situation in the Republic of the Congo being considered by the plenary Assembly, since the element of urgency was still there, the situation was fluid and the General Assembly should keep a constant watch on developments in that country.

49. His delegation having abstained in the vote on the inclusion of the questions of Tibet and Hungary, he did

not feel entitled to give any views about the allocation of those items.

50. As far as the problem of disarmament was concerned, his delegation felt that the question of the relative importance of items was not applicable. The main criterion was not whether any particular question was more or less important but whether it could be disposed of quickly and whether it was urgent. The problem of disarmament could not be dealt with quickly; it was a highly complex question which needed further discussion and he therefore agreed with the representative of Ceylon that it should be considered in the First Committee. In that connexion he drew attention to rule 99 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provided that items relating to the same category of subjects should be referred to the Committee or Committees dealing with that category of subjects, and to rule 101, which specifically laid down that the regulation of arguments was one of the questions to be dealt with by the First Committee.

51. Similarly, his delegation felt that the item relating to the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples should be considered by the Fourth Committee. During the current session there would be extensive discussion in that Committee on the final stages through which several Trust Territories would have to go before attaining independence. The item to which he had referred clearly belonged to the same category of subjects.

52. Mr. FIKINI (Libya) said that his delegation had no very strong views except with regard to two items— that entitled "Africa: a United Nations programme for independence and development" and that entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". In view of the great importance of those two questions, his delegation felt that they should be discussed in the plenary Assembly.

53. Mr. TSIANG (China) agreed with the representative of Ceylon regarding the allocation of the items relating to disarmament and with the representative of Iraq regarding the allocation of the item on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The significance of the allocation of items to one or another organ of the General Assembly should not be exaggerated. There seemed to be an impression among the members of the Committee that the most important items were referred direct to the plenary session and that items of secondary importance were referred to Committees. That was not so; in fact, in some respects the contrary was true. The intention of the authors of the Charter had been that very important and intricate matters should be debated in two stages: first in committee and then in plenary session. An exception was made to that rule only in the case of an emergency where speed was essential.

54. Some delegations would prefer certain questions to be dealt with in plenary session because that provided greater opportunities for propaganda. That did not, however, necessitate sacrificing the practice of holding the debate in two stages.

55. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania), in reply to the representative of Ceylon, said that his point had been that it was the duty of the General Committee to facilitate the work of Heads of Government who were attending the session and not to oblige them to take part in the routine work of the United Nations. Every effort

should be made to give the general public a favourable impression of the United Nations by placing the most important problems of the day on the agenda of the plenary Assembly.

56. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that in considering the allocation of items account should be taken of both the political and the practical aspects of the matter. In the eyes of the world, questions debated in plenary session were more important than those debated in committee. The United Kingdom representative himself had felt that the question of disarmament should be discussed in committee before being submitted to a higher instance, and the United States representative had pressed for the items concerning Tibet and Hungary to be discussed in plenary session because of their alleged importance, despite the fact that they were within the domestic jurisdiction of the States concerned and that no specific measures had been proposed for their solution. If such questions as those were to be discussed in plenary session, how much more did the problem of disarmament deserve consideration by the highest organ of the United Nations.

57. The representatives of Ceylon and Canada and others had urged, for practical reasons, that all the items relating to disarmament should be discussed together. The General Committee, however, had already decided that the agenda should include five individual items relating to disarmament and he could see no reason for reconsidering that decision. His delegation was strongly of the opinion that the main item relating to disarmament, which was one of the vital problems of the day, should be discussed in plenary session. It had already been the subject of previous discussions and the General Assembly could decide what further work could be done towards the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Once the General Assembly had given its directives, the ten-Power disarmament committee, enlarged in accordance with the proposal made by his delegation (A/4509), could proceed to negotiate.

58. He could see no reason why the item relating to the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests should be considered in conjunction with that relating to general and complete disarmament. Negotiations on the former subject had been in process for some time; a number of problems were involved which should be considered separately, either in the plenary Assembly or in the First Committee according to the wishes of the majority. In his view, to discuss that item in conjunction with the item relating to general and complete disarmament would merely hinder the achievement of a solution of the latter.

59. His delegation was perfectly prepared to discuss the item relating to the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, but it felt that that could better be done in the First Committee, where it could be gone into in greater detail. There was no good reason for discussing the report of the Disarmament Commission in plenary meeting. As regards the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, his delegation had no objection to discussing it in plenary, but in effect there was nothing to discuss, for the Committee had not done any real work yet. It would be far better to leave it to the First Committee to formulate recommendations to help that Committee in its work.

60. Discussion of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) was quite a different matter. The broad plans for disarmament which that called for ought to be discussed in plenary meeting, and such discussion would facilitate the desired negotiations, if only because it would take place earlier than discussion in committee. There was no reason why such a discussion should not run parallel to the general debate and simultaneously with it. That was perfectly practicable and it would mean that the disarmament question could be broached before Heads of Government departed. The question was, in his delegation's view, the most important one on the whole agenda. The Assembly must try to solve the disarmament problem: it could not do so by going into limited technical aspects, but only by sketching bold and broad plans at the highest possible level, with the participation of the most authoritative representatives of States.

61. The representative of Iraq had suggested that the item on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples ought to be discussed in the Fourth Committee, but he should know from the experience of his own country that the question of liquidating colonialism was a political one. Moreover, the agenda of the fifteenth session as a whole showed how important that question was becoming. It ought therefore to be allocated to the plenary Assembly.

62. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) felt that there was not in fact any very great divergence between his view and that of the USSR representative. They were agreed that the question of disarmament was important and should be discussed, that means should be sought of implementing General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) and that the fullest opportunity should be given for negotiations. They disagreed only on the place where such negotiations and discussions should be held. The USSR representative's argument appeared to be that disarmament should be discussed in the highest forum—the plenary Assembly. But it was already being discussed there in the course of the general debate, and it would come back there after being deliberated upon in committee. The USSR representative's suggestion that the debate on disarmament in plenary meeting should take place simultaneously with the general debate was contrary to the entire General Assembly practice and procedure. Moreover, if the USSR delegation was prepared to start such a discussion now, and separately, there was no reason why that should not be done in committee; arrangements could very easily be made for alternating sessions of the plenary Assembly and the First Committee.

63. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) could not agree with the USSR representative that the discussion of an item in the plenary Assembly automatically endowed it with greater importance. In suggesting that for the sake of consistency the question of colonialism ought to be discussed in the Fourth Committee he had not been, as it were, down-grading it. On the contrary, since the birth of the Organization, questions which the USSR representative would himself recognize as the most important in the world—including disarmament—had been discussed in committee first.

64. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) observed that various objections had been raised to any disruption of the established procedures of the General Assembly. Perhaps the reason why a number of questions had remained unsolved was that they had been persistently

buried under routine. He agreed that a question was not necessarily important simply because it was discussed in the plenary Assembly. On the other hand, surely important questions ought to be discussed there. In the matter of disarmament, it would be immensely valuable if the Heads of Government attending the current session could come to the Assembly and give general directives to those who would be called upon to work out disarmament plans in detail later.

*The Committee decided by 11 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly that the two items entitled "Question of Tibet" and "Question of Hungary", respectively, should be allocated to plenary meetings.*

*The USSR proposal that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the allocation to the plenary Assembly of the item entitled "Disarmament and the situation with regard to the fulfilment of General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 on the question of disarmament" was rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.*

*The USSR proposal that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the allocation to plenary meetings of the item entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" was rejected by 10 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.*

*The USSR proposal that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the allocation to plenary meetings of the item entitled "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "The situation in the Republic of the Congo" should be allocated to plenary meetings.*

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission" should be allocated to the First Committee.*

65. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should recommend that the item entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" should be allocated to the First Committee.

66. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that the reasons his delegation had advanced against the allocation of that item to the plenary Assembly applied equally to the proposal to allocate it to the First Committee.

*The proposal by the representative of the United States was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.*

67. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) proposed that the item entitled "Africa: a United Nations programme for independence and development" should also be recommended for allocation to the First Committee.

*It was so agreed.*

68. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his delegation's view, the items relating respectively to general and complete disarmament and

to the USSR complaint, which were on the list of items which the Secretary-General suggested for allocation to the First Committee, should be allocated, not to the First Committee, but to the plenary Assembly.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it allocate the items on the agenda in*

*accordance with the suggestions set forth in the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/152 and Add.1), as amended and supplemented.*

The meeting rose on Thursday,  
29 September, at 12.30 a.m.