



OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

GENERAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORDS OF MEETINGS
19 SEPTEMBER – 19 NOVEMBER 1974

UNITED NATIONS



OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

GENERAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORDS OF MEETINGS
19 SEPTEMBER – 19 NOVEMBER 1974

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1975

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The *Official Records of the General Assembly* for a given session consist of records of meetings, annexes to those records, supplements, the *List of Delegations* and the *Check List of Documents*. Information on other documents is given in the *Check List* and in the relevant annex fascicles.

*
* * *

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Composition of the General Committee	v	Items proposed for allocation to plenary meetings	17
218th meeting		Items proposed for allocation to the First Committee	18
<i>Thursday, 19 September 1974, at 11.05 a.m.</i>		Items proposed for allocation to the Special Political Committee	18
Organization of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General	1	Items proposed for allocation to the Second Committee	18
Adoption of the agenda: memorandum by the Secretary-General	1	Items proposed for allocation to the Third Committee	18
Items 1 to 6	1	Items proposed for allocation to the Fourth Committee	18
Items 7 to 25	1	Items proposed for allocation to the Fifth Committee	18
Item 26	1	Items proposed for allocation to the Sixth Committee	18
Items 27 to 93	2		
Items 94 to 96	2	221st meeting	
219th meeting		<i>Tuesday, 8 October 1974, at 10.20 a.m.</i>	
<i>Thursday, 19 September 1974, at 3.35 p.m.</i>		Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session: item proposed by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	19
Adoption of the agenda: memorandum by the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	5	222nd meeting	
Items 97 and 98	5	<i>Friday, 8 November 1974, at 11.05 a.m.</i>	
Item 99	5	Organization of work of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly	21
Item 100	5	223rd meeting	
Item 101	5	<i>Tuesday, 19 November 1974, at 10.25 a.m.</i>	
Items 102 and 103	5	Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	24
Item 104	5		
Item 105	6		
Item 106	6		
Items 106 and 110	6		
Items 107 to 109	11		
Item 111	11		
Item 112	13		
Item 113	13		
220th meeting			
<i>Friday, 20 September 1974, at 11 a.m.</i>			
Allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General	16		

COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

The General Committee of the General Assembly for the twenty-ninth session was constituted as follows:

President of the General Assembly:

Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika (Algeria).

Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly:

The representatives of the following Member States:

Austria, Central African Republic, China, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Haiti, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Philippines, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Chairmen of the Main Committees of the General Assembly:

First Committee: Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina);

Special Political Committee: Mr. Per Lind (Sweden);

Second Committee: Mr. Jihad Karam (Iraq);

Third Committee: Mrs. Aminata Marico (Mali);

Fourth Committee: Mr. Buyantyn Dashtseren (Mongolia);

Fifth Committee: Mr. Costa P. Caranicas (Greece);

Sixth Committee: Mr. Milan Šahović (Yugoslavia).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Summary records of the 218th to 223rd meetings held at Headquarters, New York,
from 19 September to 19 November 1974

218th meeting

Thursday, 19 September 1974, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.218

Organization of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/182, sect. II, and A/BUR/182/Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the observations and proposals in the Secretary-General's memorandum on the organization of the twenty-ninth session (A/BUR/182, sect. II).

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the suggestions in paragraphs 2 to 15 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Adoption of the agenda: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/182, sect. III, and A/BUR/182/Add.1)

2. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to section III of the memorandum by the Secretary-General concerning the inclusion of items in the agenda of the session. Under rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the General Committee did not discuss the substance of any item except in so far as its substance bore upon the decision to recommend the inclusion or rejection of the item. Paragraph 16 listed the documents containing proposals for the inclusion of items in the agenda.

3. He drew attention to paragraph 17 concerning item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council) and suggested that the Committee should take note of the questions to be considered under the item.

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

4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve the revised wording of item 85 suggested in paragraph 18.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the suggestion in paragraph 18 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the inclusion in the agenda of the items listed in paragraph 19. He suggested that, where appropriate, the items should be considered in groups.

ITEMS 1 TO 6

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

ITEMS 7 TO 25

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

ITEM 26

7. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) observed that the item had been overtaken by events, since the Republic of Guinea-Bissau had just been admitted to membership in the United Nations. He suggested that the item should not be included in the agenda.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 26 should not be included in the agenda.

ITEMS 27 TO 93

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 27 to 93 should be included in the agenda.

ITEMS 94 TO 96

8. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to item 94, said that the role of the International Court of Justice depended primarily on the extent to which its decisions corresponded to the basic task of the United Nations—the maintenance of international peace and security. The authority of the Court was also determined by the extent to which its activities contributed to observance of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the generally recognized principles and norms of international law. The Court's role, as defined in the Charter, reflected the position which judicial proceedings occupied among the means for the pacific settlement of disputes. In defining the Court's competence the Charter took account of the competence of other United Nations bodies, primarily of the principal organs—the Security Council and the General Assembly, and it was in that context that the effectiveness of the Court and its activities should be assessed. It would be a dangerous simplification to assess the Court by the number of cases it handled or the number of advisory opinions it handed down. The Court indisputably had serious shortcomings, but the approach to the item had to be based on the tasks entrusted to the Court under the Charter.

9. The problem of enhancing the role of the Court was really the problem of how to make greater use of the possibilities provided by the Charter and by the Court's Statute. Experience showed that those possibilities had not been fully used. That was the fault neither of the Court nor of its Statute. The real need, in fact, was to improve the Court's functioning by making its consideration of cases quicker, simplifying its procedure and reducing its costs. None of those requirements affected the constitutional foundation of the Court and they should all be decided by the Court itself.

10. The problems facing the Court were a reflection of the state of contemporary international relations. If the Court's role was to be enhanced, then the international legal order would have to be strengthened and a decisive effort made to combat any violations of it and to consolidate its foundations. Any attempt to expand the jurisdiction of the Court and make it compulsory would merely undermine the Court's status in the eyes of those who might be willing to make use of it.

11. His delegation saw no need for further discussion of the role of the Court and proposed that the item should not be included in the agenda.

12. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America) said that the world situation was such that the United Nations could not ignore any means available within the system for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The International Court of Justice was the linchpin of the system. It was true that States were not using the Court sufficiently. In section XII of the introduction to his report (A/9601/Add.1) the

Secretary-General appealed to member States to review the possibility of referring to the Court legal disputes in which they might be involved. His delegation endorsed that appeal. It would be a disappointing response to the world situation and the Secretary-General's appeal if the General Committee decided to recommend rejection of the item.

13. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation opposed the deletion of item 94. According to Article 1 of the Court's Statute, the Court was the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and, according to Article 10 of the Charter, the General Assembly was competent to discuss any matters relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter. It was strange that the Soviet Union should suggest that the main legislative organ of the United Nations should not discuss the Organization's main judicial organ. The very matters to which the representative of the Soviet Union had referred—speeding the Court's work, simplifying its procedure and reducing its costs—were proper matters for discussion by the General Assembly. The judicial settlement of disputes was something to which his delegation attached great importance, and it thought that the General Committee and the General Assembly should seek to consider ways of increasing the authority and effectiveness of the Court.

14. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had said nothing to persuade his delegation to change its view. Any State which was contemplating recourse to the Court would take the Secretary-General's appeal into account. There was no need for the General Assembly to discuss the appeal or to consider improvements in the functioning of the Court, which the Court itself could decide on. If the Court ever found that it could not solve its own problems, it could turn to the General Assembly.

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the USSR proposal.

The USSR, proposal was rejected by 17 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

16. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to item 96, said that the Soviet Union considered the Charter to be the paramount international document serving the cause of strengthening peace and developing co-operation among States with different social systems. It advocated increasing the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations on the basis of strict observance of the Charter. It considered attempts to have the Charter reviewed to be incompatible with the basic purpose of the Charter—the strengthening of peace and international security. Such attempts did nothing to solve the serious problems facing the United Nations.

17. Changes in the world situation and progressive trends in international relations had been reflected in a series of documents, such as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which amplified the provisions of the Charter. Amendments of substance had been made in the Charter itself in order to take account of the interests of all countries, in particular

the newly-independent States of the third world; examples were the enlargement of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

18. Efforts to undermine the fundamental principle of the Charter—the principle of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council—were inadmissible. That principle remained the most realistic and best option, and to weaken or abrogate it would destroy the very basis of the existence of the United Nations, because, in the nuclear age, for some permanent members of the Security Council to try, in the name of the United Nations, to coerce other permanent members would lead to serious confrontation or even world war.

19. The causes of existing shortcomings in the activities of the United Nations lay not in the Charter but in the policies of the imperialist and colonial Powers, which sought to turn the United Nations into an instrument of their own plans. If the United Nations was to become more effective, the decisions of the Security Council and other United Nations bodies must be scrupulously observed. Unless States fulfilled their obligations under the Charter, it would be impossible to solve the problems confronting the United Nations or to achieve its purposes.

20. The relaxation of tension and the improvement in the international situation were creating favourable conditions for more active efforts by the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and for making greater use of the possibilities provided by the Charter. The Soviet Union believed that the United Nations should be strengthened and that its authority in international affairs should be increased. The attempts to review the Charter, however, would inevitably further complicate the work of the United Nations. The General Assembly should give no further consideration to suggestions on the review of the Charter but rather concentrate on specific problems of maintaining peace and strengthening international security. His delegation proposed that the item should not be included in the agenda.

21. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) said that tremendous changes had taken place in the world situation and in the United Nations itself since the Charter had been drawn up. Of particular importance had been the emergence of the third world and the increasingly important role it was playing in international affairs. However, as a result of domination and obstruction by the super-Powers, the United Nations had failed to take account of the just demands and the position of the many third world countries. It was entirely reasonable and proper for many of those countries to demand a change in the current state of affairs within the United Nations and the necessary revision of the Charter. His Government firmly supported that demand and was ready to participate in a serious examination of the question of such a review. The Charter was no holy writ and should be revised in the light of historical developments in order to meet the needs of the times.

22. The unreasonable Soviet objection to the inclusion of item 96 in the agenda clearly showed that the Soviet Union wished to impose its will on the majority of other Member States and stubbornly opposed the principle of equality

among all States, in order to preserve its privileges both within and outside the United Nations. The United Nations Charter itself provided for its own revision, so that the Soviet Union's position in opposing the inclusion of the item was not only absurd but unconstitutional.

23. His delegation strongly favoured the inclusion of item 96 in the agenda of the General Assembly.

24. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that his delegation opposed the proposal to delete item 96. The question of the review of the Charter had been under consideration since 1969, and he saw no reason why the General Assembly should not consider the views and suggestions of Member States, as provided for in resolution 2968 (XXVII) of 14 December 1972. His Government was firmly of the opinion that modernization of the United Nations Charter was long overdue. The founders of the United Nations had realized the need to provide for change in the light of experience. His delegation, while recognizing that the Charter as a whole had amply withstood the test of time, felt that the individual and specific suggestions of States concerning revision of the Charter and other reforms within the United Nations should be considered by a special committee established for that purpose. He therefore urged that the General Committee should respect General Assembly resolution 2968 (XXVII) by including item 96 in the agenda of the current session.

25. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that, in the view of his delegation, the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter were fully in accordance with the needs of the current international situation and with the interests of those countries concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security. The maintenance of the Charter as it stood had been justified by events. His delegation therefore supported the Soviet proposal.

26. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that, while he respected the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union, it had to be recognized that the Charter was 30 years old and that in that time the number of Member States had more than doubled. Many countries had joined the Organization after the adoption of the Charter, and it seemed only logical that the General Assembly should have the opportunity to consider their views and suggestions, and all others submitted by Member States, concerning a possible review of the Charter. The concern expressed by the Soviet representative was to a certain extent unfounded since Article 108 of the Charter stipulated, *inter alia*, that amendments to the Charter had to be ratified by all the permanent members of the Security Council. He therefore urged the Soviet representative to withdraw his proposal.

27. Mr. VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation was opposed to the deletion of item 96. In deciding to delete the item, the General Committee would be taking a decision on the substance of the question which, in principle, it should refrain from doing. Since the twenty-seventh session many Member States had submitted suggestions regarding the review of the Charter, and it was clear that the question should be considered by the General Assembly. His delegation would therefore support the inclusion of item 96.

28. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the obstructionism of the Chinese delegation, to which all USSR proposals were automatically unacceptable, was reminiscent of the behaviour of Mr. Dulles during the worst days of the cold war. The suggestion that the super-Powers were obstructing the work of the United Nations was untrue. The USSR had striven constantly to make the United Nations more effective, whereas China had not made a single constructive proposal, or even supported any proposal in the interests of world peace or disarmament. It had even opposed the principle of equality of all States in the debate on participation in the World Disarmament Conference. It would be interesting to learn its position on the abolition of the veto of the permanent members of the Security Council.

29. It was known to all that there were two social systems in the world. The Soviet delegation had endured the pressures of the capitalist group on the socialist minority in the United Nations throughout the period when the People's Republic of China had been excluded precisely because of those pressures. Indeed, it was the efforts of the socialist group which had made it possible for China to be present at all. Having for so long endured the tyranny of the capitalist group and its automatic majority, the USSR would never allow a similar situation to arise.

30. He was grateful to the representative of Argentina for his understanding of that position. Without the veto, the socialist minority would be unable to defend itself, and the United Nations could not exist. Only the veto had made it possible for a number of socialist states which had applied for membership in 1946 finally to become Members in 1957.

31. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) pointed out that the representative of the USSR had made a speech on the merits of the question. The debate should be confined to whether the General Assembly should be allowed to discuss the item. If a number of Members believed strongly that the subject should be discussed, then they had the right so to propose, in the interests of free and full discussion.

32. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) said that the true intent of the Soviet position of unreasonably opposing the discussion of the item had been revealed. The Soviet representative had unabashedly talked about the so-called socialist camp and capitalist camp. In fact, the Soviet Union had long since restored capitalism and become a super-Power following a policy of expansionism everywhere. Its talk about socialism could deceive no one.

33. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America) said that he regretted that the Committee had strayed from its proper task, and that not even the agenda could be discussed

without recriminations. His delegation would make known its views at the proper time. Members should concentrate on the issues and avoid polemics.

34. The PRESIDENT invited Members to vote on the USSR proposal.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 19 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

35. Mr. LECOMPT (France), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in order to remain faithful to the principle of not opposing any discussion which countries might consider desirable, and because a revision of the Charter was neither urgent nor opportune. The Charter represented a delicate balance which had weathered many crises, but its scope was far from being fully exploited. Efforts should therefore be concentrated on achieving better application of and respect for the Charter. His delegation would have supported a motion to postpone the item until a later session.

36. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he shared some of the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. In the past, his delegation had often expressed the view that the Charter itself was a good instrument, but that what was lacking was good faith in applying it. A number of instruments adopted over the years represented useful additions to the provisions of the Charter, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on decolonization, and declarations on certain principles of international law, such as non-intervention, which was not properly covered in the Charter.

37. His delegation had voted against the Soviet proposal for three reasons. First, the inclusion of item 96 in the agenda did not imply that the General Assembly would adopt decisions at the current session concerning the revision of the Charter. Secondly, the examination of suggestions regarding the review of the Charter could have useful results, as had happened when the membership of the Economic and Social Council and of the Security Council had been increased. Thirdly, it was the invariable policy of his delegation that any Member had the right to propose the inclusion in the agenda of any item which it considered essential, especially when the item derived from an earlier resolution of the General Assembly.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 94 to 96 should be included in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

219th meeting

Thursday, 19 September 1974, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.219

Adoption of the agenda: memorandum by the Secretary-General (continued) (A/BUR/182, sect. III, and A/BUR/182/Add.1)

ITEMS 97 AND 98

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 97 and 98 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 99

1. Mr. ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, in his capacity as Chairman of the Sixth Committee, he had made an inquiry into the consideration of item 99 which had been on the agenda of the Assembly for several years. The previous year the General Committee had recommended that it be included in the agenda of the current session. However, since the time was not yet ripe for the consideration of that item, it would be preferable to postpone its consideration to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 99 should be included in the provisional agenda of the thirty-first session.

ITEM 100

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 100 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 101

2. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had serious doubts regarding the proposal to include item 101 in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session. Under the generally accepted rules of international law and international agreements, the provisions of a convention applied only to the parties to that convention, without imposing any obligation on third States. Consequently, it was obvious that the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness¹ was binding only on the six States which were parties to it and that it was for them to take up the matter; there was therefore no reason to include the item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

3. He also drew the attention of members to the note by the Secretary-General in document A/9691. Article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness gave no reason for the inclusion of that question in the agenda since it merely stipulated that the Secretary-General of the United Nations "shall . . . bring to the attention of the General Assembly" the question of the establishment of such a body as therein mentioned. The

¹ A/CONF.9/15.

need to include that item in the agenda did not therefore stem from the 1961 Convention and, consequently, the Soviet Union proposed that it not be included in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session.

4. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) pointed out that, in requesting the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly of the item entitled "Question of the establishment, in accordance with the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, of a body to which persons claiming the benefit of the Convention may apply", the Secretary-General had only been carrying out his obligation under article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, which provided that "the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall, after the deposit of the sixth instrument of ratification or accession at the latest, bring to the attention of the General Assembly the question of the establishment, in accordance with article 11, of such a body as therein mentioned." His delegation therefore believed that the item should be included in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session.

5. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that item 101 should not be included in the agenda.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 16 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 101 should be included in the agenda.

ITEMS 102 AND 103

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 102 and 103 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 104

6. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) said that he would not repeat the reasons that had led the European Economic Community (EEC) to request the status of observer to the General Assembly; those reasons were stated in the explanatory memorandum annexed to the request for the inclusion of the items in the agenda. He would like the item to be considered directly by the General Assembly; furthermore, in order that the co-operation between the Assembly and EEC might be put into effect from the twenty-ninth session, it would be useful to request the General Assembly to give a high priority to the consideration of item 104.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 104 should be included in the agenda as a matter of high priority.

ITEM 105

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 105 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 106

7. The CHAIRMAN, observing that item 106 was related to item 110, suggested that the Committee consider them together.

8. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to follow that procedure.

It was so decided.

ITEMS 106 AND 110

9. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 43 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Algeria had asked to participate in the discussion of the items relating to Korea.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Rahal (Algeria) took a place at the Committee table.

10. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) said he hoped that the decision taken by the Committee to consider items 106 and 110 together would in no way prejudice the final inclusion of those two items in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session.

11. The question of Korea, which had been on the agenda of the General Assembly for many years, had finally been considered only at the twenty-eighth session. Despite pessimistic predictions by those who had feared that the consideration of that question would lead to sharp confrontations, it had been possible to allow the representatives of the two parts of Korea to participate in the consideration of the question, and the consensus adopted by the General Assembly² had confirmed that frank discussion and straightforward confrontation of the arguments in question could only help to clarify the situation and make a solution possible. However, the consensus by itself, even if it was scrupulously respected by all parties, could not resolve all the problems; it was therefore not surprising that 34 countries, including Algeria, had requested the inclusion of item 106 entitled "Withdrawal of all the foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" (A/9703 and Add.1 and 2) in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

12. The Assembly should consider the problem anew in order to ensure the continuity of its action and attempt to complete the results obtained at the twenty-eighth session. Without retracing what had been regarded as progress on the road to the unification of Korea, it had a duty to measure the distance already travelled and to contemplate the next stages and determine and weigh the difficulties which could impede the implementation of the decisions taken.

13. Without going into the substance of the question, he would confine himself to pointing out that the item was

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 30 (A/9030)*, Resolutions adopted on the reports of the First Committee, Other decisions, item 41.

timely and responded to the concerns of the Korean people and the delegations which had stated their position throughout the debates devoted to the issue.

14. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) recalled that Algeria and 33 other countries had requested the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly of item 106 and had submitted a draft resolution to that effect (A/9703/Add.3) accompanying the request. That proposal was entirely just and proper.

15. The North and the South of Korea had originally formed a unified country, and the Korean people had belonged to a single nation. It was only towards the end of the Second World War that Korea had been artificially divided into two parts, the North and the South. It was the burning desire and unanimous demand of the entire Korean people to reunify their fatherland at an early date. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been making unremitting efforts to terminate the interference of outside forces and bring about the independent and peaceful reunification of its fatherland and had therefore put forward a series of positive and reasonable proposals. Those proposals reflected the greatest national aspiration and the basic interests of the entire Korean people. They had inspired the entire Korean people and had won the sympathy and support of all justice-upholding countries and peoples throughout the world.

16. In 1973, the General Assembly had adopted at its twenty-eighth session a "consensus" which was designed to promote the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea; in it the Assembly had affirmed the three principles on the reunification of Korea provided for in the North-South joint communiqué of 4 July 1972 and had decided to dissolve immediately the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". That was a positive result of the concerted efforts made by the Korean people and all justice-upholding countries to terminate the interference of outside forces in the internal affairs of Korea. In the past year, however, the Park Chung Hee clique in South Korea had repeatedly trampled upon the North-South joint communiqué and the spirit of the "consensus" by carrying out armed provocations, continuously worsening the relations between the North and the South, and causing a stalemate in the talks between the two parties. It was attempting to perpetuate and consolidate the division of Korea with the help of outside forces. To that end, it was taking ruthless repressive measures against those South Korean political parties, organizations and people desiring democracy and the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea.

17. It was solely the interference and connivance by the United States which had encouraged the South Korean authorities to act in that way. Not only had the United States kept tens of thousands of troops in South Korea but it had also continued to pour in large quantities of military aid to strengthen the war machinery of South Korea and sustain the fascist rule of the South Korean authorities. The facts were crystal clear: to attain a genuine settlement of the question of the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea, it was imperative to put an end to United States aggression and interference in Korea and withdraw the United States troops stationed under the United Nations flag. That was the key to the realization of the Korean

people's desire for the independent and peaceful reunification of the fatherland as well as a completely necessary and unavoidable step in the implementation of the decision on the Korean question adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. The prolonged military intervention in Korea by a great Power in the name of the United Nations was a disgrace to the Organization. As a matter of fact, that had long become intolerable to the great majority of Member States, which were demanding a speedy end to that absurd situation. The item and draft resolution proposed by Algeria and 33 other countries pointed to the crux of the matter and contained correct and reasonable propositions. Their just propositions constituted a further action which the United Nations must take as a follow-up to the relevant decision adopted at the twenty-eighth session.

18. Item 110 on the so-called "Urgent need to implement fully the consensus of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the Korean question and to maintain peace and security on the Korean peninsula" and the draft resolution proposed by the United States and other delegations, accompanying the request for inclusion of the item (A/9741 and Add.1-5) were obviously designed to delay the settlement of the question and to obstruct the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea so as to perpetuate and consolidate the division of the country. They were by no means "the most realistic and constructive step" they claimed to be. The truth was quite to the contrary.

19. The item whose inclusion the United States was requesting referred to the "urgent need to implement fully the consensus of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the Korean question". As was known to all, it was precisely that "consensus" that had clearly and unequivocally reaffirmed the three principles on the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea as embodied in the North-South joint communiqué. The first principle stressed that the reunification of Korea "should be achieved independently, without reliance upon outside force or its interference". It might be asked: Did the tens of thousands of United States troops stationed in South Korea not constitute "outside force"? Was there a true desire to "implement fully" the "consensus"? If so, the "outside force" must be removed, for otherwise the full implementation of the consensus would be mere empty talk and the independent reunification of the Korean nation would be out of the question. Whether one proceeded on the basis of the purposes and spirit of the United Nations Charter or on the basis of the "consensus" adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, it was evident that the aggression and interference against Korea by outside force must be terminated immediately.

20. The United States, in requesting the inclusion of its item, proposed referring to the Security Council the consideration of the question of the "United Nations Command". As was known to all, the adoption by the Security Council in the past of so-called "resolutions" for the dispatch of "United Nations forces" in connexion with the Korean question had been in direct violation of the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter and had therefore been entirely illegal. Now, the insistence on referring the question to the Security Council was designed,

to put it bluntly, to drag out the settlement of the question by invoking the veto of a great Power. It was definitely impermissible to repeat during the 1970s the same old tactics of the 1950s. The employment of those tactics showed, to say the least, the lack of a minimum sense of reality, and still less could they be called a "constructive step".

21. In their draft resolution, the United States and other countries dragged in the question of the Armistice Agreement of July 1953 in an attempt to create a pretext for delaying the withdrawal of United States troops. That was also utterly absurd. The Armistice Agreement itself provided for the holding of a high-level political conference within three months after the Armistice Agreement had been signed and had become effective in order to settle the question of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea. As a result of the obstruction by the United States and the South Korean authorities, that provision had thus far failed to materialize. Sixteen years had elapsed since the unilateral withdrawal of the Chinese People's Volunteers, while United States troops were still in South Korea. Did that not prove that while talking about adherence to the Armistice Agreement, the United States all along had actually been violating the provisions of the Armistice Agreement concerning the withdrawal of troops? Had the United States had any sincere desire to abide by the Armistice Agreement, it would long since have responded positively to the initiative taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the question, and the matter would long ago have been settled. Hence, it was entirely unjustified to use the question now as a pretext to delay a solution.

22. As one of the sponsors, the Chinese delegation firmly maintained that the item proposed by Algeria and other countries should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly. However, as the item and draft resolution proposed by the United States and other countries totally contradicted the principles of the Charter and the spirit of the relevant decision adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, they were not acceptable. As the objectives of items 106 and 110 were diametrically opposed, there was no reason whatever to combine them. Consequently, his delegation was firmly opposed to the erroneous idea of combining the two items.

23. Mr. ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation considered the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda of the General Assembly to be timely and necessary. The question should not present any difficulties in view of the responsibility of the United Nations with respect to the situation in Korea. On several occasions, the General Assembly had endeavoured to promote the unification of Korea and establish peace and security in the region. The Organization not only had a moral and material commitment; it also bore direct political responsibility for seeking a solution to the problem of the division of Korea. At its twenty-eighth session, the General Assembly had decided to dissolve immediately the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and at the same time had expressed the hope that the South and the North of Korea would be urged to continue their dialogue and widen their exchanges and co-operation in the spirit of their joint communiqué of 4 July 1972. Although progress certainly had been made, it could only be regretted that the

dialogue had not been continued. The constant interference of outside forces in South Korea was the major obstacle to a solution to the problem; it constituted a threat to peace in that part of the world and to the independence of the Korean people and had slowed down the process of unification of the country.

24. The explanatory memorandum submitted by 34 countries, including Yugoslavia (A/9703 and Add.1 and 2), provided explanations amply justifying the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda of the General Assembly. It was high time that the United Nations came to grips with reality and contributed, through the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, to an equitable solution of the problem.

25. Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania) said that his delegation, which was eager to participate in the efforts to create the essential conditions for the peaceful reunification of Korea by the Koreans themselves, had been one of those requesting the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda of the General Assembly. Romania, dedicated to the ideals of freedom and national unity, had always championed the right of the Korean people freely to determine their own future and had supported their legitimate aspirations to independence free from all outside interference. The agreements reached between the North and South had opened up encouraging prospects, and the United Nations could not simply adopt a wait-and-see policy, taking no part in the efforts being made. It was in that spirit that the General Assembly had at its twenty-eighth session decided to dissolve the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The joint communiqué issued by the North and the South of Korea on 4 July 1972 proclaiming the principles for the reunification of Korea was also a source of satisfaction. Under those principles, the reunification of the country should be achieved independently, by peaceful means, without reliance upon outside force or its interference and without recourse to the use of arms against the other side. In accordance with those principles, the General Assembly must take the necessary steps to put an end to all outside interference in the affairs of the Korean people. The presence of foreign troops in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations was a form of interference in the affairs of the Korean people. It was for the United Nations to find a solution to that problem, since the troops had been sent to Korea under the auspices of the United Nations. In view of the positive nature of developments in the situation between the two parts of Korea, the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea was a matter of extreme urgency. The United Nations must encourage the parties directly involved to take the appropriate steps to solve the problem so as to speed up the process of peace and détente, not only in that region but throughout the world. Those delegations which had requested the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda hoped that the debate on that question would contribute to a rapid solution of the problem, since avoidance of the issue could only be harmful to the interests of the Korean people, and would help to strengthen peace and security in Asia.

26. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as the representative of Algeria had emphasized, simultaneous consideration of the inclusion of

items 106 and 110 in the agenda of the General Assembly in no way prejudged any decision which might be taken on those two items. While reserving the right to revert later to item 110, he first addressed himself to the question of the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda.

27. He pointed out that for 25 years foreign military intervention had continued in Korea under the flag of the United Nations and that the attention of Member States was once again being drawn to that question. Korea remained an area of tension which threatened world peace and security. The military occupation of South Korea continued to prevent the attainment of the basic objective – the peaceful unification of Korea. Primary responsibility for that fact rested with the United States of America, whose armed forces continued to occupy South Korea. The imperialist forces and the Seoul régime were responsible for that situation, to which the United Nations could not remain indifferent. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, for its part, was working patiently and persistently for the unification of Korea without outside interference. It had proposed a realistic programme for the unification of the North and South which provided for the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea, the organization of democratic elections and the establishment of a single government on the basis of those elections. It had also proposed, as a transitional measure, the establishment of a confederation uniting North and South Korea, with the existing political systems remaining unchanged in each of the two parts of the country. However, the leaders in Seoul stubbornly rejected that proposal, citing an imaginary threat from the North. The military clique in Seoul was continuing its provocations along the demarcation line and its defamatory press campaigns against North Korea. The Soviet Union, for its part, had always unreservedly supported the measures taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to create favourable conditions for settling the Korean problem in the interests of the entire Korean people and of the strengthening of peace and security in Asia. As a result of the untiring efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, supported by the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and progressive forces throughout the world, it had been possible to guide the situation on the Korean peninsula towards a peaceful solution by reducing the confrontation between the parties and making possible the first discussions between representatives of the North and South.

28. His delegation hoped that the General Committee, conscious of its responsibilities, would recommend the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda of the General Assembly. The United Nations must abandon the position it had adopted in the past and address itself directly to the problem; it could and must help the Korean people to work for the reunification of their country and the establishment of a lasting peace.

29. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) expressed regret at the fact that some delegations were not confining their remarks strictly to the topic under discussion, namely the advisability of including the items under consideration in the agenda. Most representatives had spoken on the substance of the question, and the representative of the Soviet Union, in particular, had just given a lengthy

explanation of his views on item 106, while reserving the right to do the same in respect of item 110. The representative of China, too, had explained at length the views of his delegation. Those statements seemed to confirm the need to include both items in the agenda. His delegation shared the views expressed by the Algerian delegation with regard to the need for the General Assembly to debate the question of Korea. However, that was not the problem under consideration; the question was whether there should be a single debate or two separate debates on the substance of items 106 and 110. His delegation felt that the two items were closely related. Combining them would in no way prejudice any future decision of the General Assembly on the question. It was simply a question of facilitating the work of the Assembly, and, on purely practical grounds, it would seem more logical to deal with the two items at the same time. He therefore proposed that the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of a single item entitled "Question of Korea". Such a decision would also be in accordance with the conclusion of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, as contained in annex V, paragraph 21, of the General Assembly's rules of procedure (A/520/Rev.12).

30. Mr. LANG (Nicaragua) supported the proposal made by the United Kingdom representative, which seemed completely appropriate from a procedural standpoint.

31. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that he also supported the proposal, since items 106 and 110 were so closely related. Item 106 could, in fact, be regarded as one aspect of the broader question raised by item 110. Whereas item 106 dealt with the withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, item 110 concerned the implementation of the consensus reached at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly regarding continuation of the dialogue between the North and South of Korea with a view to the reunification of the country. The consideration of all aspects of the reunification of Korea was part of the consensus. That was implicit in the two draft resolutions submitted on the two items. It would therefore be useful to consider both items at the same time. In item 110, it was rightly emphasized that one of the aspects of the question of Korea which the sponsors of the request for the inclusion of item 110 felt should be considered by the Security Council was "the future of the United Nations Command". Item 106 was but one facet of the broader issue of the future of the United Nations Command. He recalled that the United Nations Command had been established by the Security Council in its resolution 84 (1950) of 7 July 1950; consequently, only the Security Council could take a decision concerning the dissolution of the United Nations Command or the withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag.

32. Although the two items differed in that item 106 concerned the withdrawal of the troops in question whereas, according to the sponsors of the request for the inclusion of item 110, the presence of United Nations troops was necessary to ensure continued adherence to the Armistice Agreement, the two items were intimately related

and could not be dissociated from one another. He emphasized the importance of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted on item 110 (A/9741), since it was essential that the dialogue between the representatives of North and South Korea should continue with a view to achieving the peaceful reunification of the country.

33. Mr. SICLAIT (Haiti) said he felt that the United Kingdom proposal to combine the two items should not give rise to any objection since it would enable the Korean question to be considered as a single issue. He therefore urged the members of the General Committee to adopt the proposal, which seemed in fact, to correspond to the view of the Chairman, who had himself suggested that the two items in question should be considered at the same time.

34. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that his delegation, which had been one of those proposing the inclusion of item 106 in the agenda, wished the question to receive high priority. His delegation was opposed to the combining of items 106 and 110, since they differed completely in substance; item 106 concerned a decision which would bring lasting peace to the Korean peninsula, whereas item 110 related to the dialogue between the two parts of Korea, a question which concerned the Korean people themselves. Consequently, his delegation wished the two items to be included separately in the agenda of the General Assembly.

35. Mr. VON WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany) pointed out that item 110 was based on the consensus adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session; its wording did not prejudice the substance of the matter in any way. He was surprised that anyone could propose the exclusion of the item from the agenda of the twenty-ninth session. The suggestion to combine items 106 and 110 seemed logical because they dealt with two aspects of the same question; in the past, the General Committee had already followed an identical procedure. Moreover, such a decision would be in accordance with conclusion 21 of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly already mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom. Such a decision would be useful in that it would save the General Assembly two debates on the same issue.

36. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America) said that his delegation would refrain from speaking about the reasons that had led some delegations to request the inclusion of item 106 on the agenda, despite its doubts on the subject. It would also refrain from replying to the unfounded accusations made against the United States, because a meeting of the General Committee was not the place to do so; the job of the General Committee was not to discuss the substance of items but simply to decide whether they would be included on the agenda or not.

37. His delegation was in favour of the United Kingdom proposal to combine the two items following the practice at previous sessions of the General Assembly and in accordance with conclusion 21 of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly. Items 106 and 110 reflected two different ways of looking at one problem—the question of Korea. If the two items were considered separately, there

would be duplication and the General Assembly would also run the risk of adopting incompatible draft resolutions. The question of Korea had been the subject of a single item at the previous session of the General Assembly; nothing had happened during the previous year to justify a change of procedure. His delegation would vote for the merging of the two items and urged the other members of the General Committee to do the same.

38. The CHAIRMAN urged all representatives, particularly those who had already spoken, to be as brief as possible. He said that he shared the opinion expressed earlier by the representative of the United Kingdom.

39. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed, in reply to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, that when he had mentioned item 106 in his previous statement, he had done so for the first time and that his proposals were therefore not a repetition. He stressed that the request for the inclusion of item 110 proposed by the United States and other countries on the subject of Korea had only one purpose—to divert the attention of member States from what lay at the heart of the issue, namely the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea. Korea could be peacefully reunited only if that withdrawal was made. The dilatory manoeuvres which members were witnessing and which were intended to put aside that essential element of the question proved that some countries had not given up the idea of perpetuating the current situation.

40. As things stood, the United Nations could play a useful role by putting an end to the presence of all foreign forces on the territory of South Korea. That was a necessary and fundamental condition for the peaceful reunification of Korea; the Organization would be acting legitimately and reasonably if it worked to that end.

41. His delegation was also totally opposed to the inclusion of item 110 on the agenda and to the merging of items 106 and 110.

42. Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania) said he was astonished by the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He understood that the idea of combining the two items might be very attractive to some delegations because it would save time and simplify discussion. Nevertheless, it would be preferable for the First Committee to consider the problem of the organization of its own work; that Committee alone could find appropriate solutions and decide on the way to begin the consideration of items 106 and 110.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, logically, the Committee should have considered in order the inclusion of items 106, 107, 108, 109 and 110. Members had decided, however, not to use that method and to consider the inclusion of the two items together, in order to facilitate the task of the General Assembly. That initiative did not mean in any way that the General Committee was prejudging the manner in which the Assembly would decide to approach the complicated question of Korea.

44. He reminded members that the sponsors of the request to include item 106 and those of the request to include

item 110 were members of the General Committee; he felt that the Committee must work towards a compromise that would take into account the opinions of both. But the moment of choice had arrived: he requested the General Committee to decide whether or not to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 106 on the agenda.

45. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that he had submitted a proposal to combine items 106 and 110. The proposal was in good and due form and must be put to the vote.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, as a matter of procedure, the General Committee must first decide on item 106, then on item 110 and, finally, on whether the two items should be combined or not.

47. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) said he was satisfied with the explanation given by the Chairman; in the spirit of co-operation he accepted the procedure suggested.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 106 on the agenda.

The General Committee decided by 16 votes to none, with 7 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly that item 106 should be included in the agenda.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 110 on the agenda.

The General Committee decided by 16 votes to 6, with 1 abstention, to recommend to the General Assembly that item 110 should be included in the agenda.

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the General Committee to decide how items 106 and 110 could be submitted to the General Assembly.

51. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that he had not withdrawn his proposal to combine the two items; that proposal must therefore be put to the vote.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that he was bound to respect the decisions that had just been taken democratically on the inclusion of each of items 106 and 110. In view of the proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom, who had raised a point of order, he said that in order to combine the two items, there could be a new item entitled "Question of Korea" consisting of two subitems. Subitem (a) would take the heading of item 106; subitem (b) would take the heading of item 110.

53. Unless there were any objections, he would take it that the General Committee had agreed that the items should be submitted in that way.

It was so decided.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom in the form he had just suggested.

The General Committee decided by 9 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Question of Korea" consisting of a subitem (a) reproducing the heading of item 106 and a subitem (b) reproducing the heading of item 110.

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Saudi Arabia had asked to take part in the debate on the item; unless there were any objections, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

56. Mr. BAROODY said that, because of the collusion between the great Powers, the question of Korea was put on the agenda year after year without anything being done to bring an end to the division of the Korean people. The item was always put at the end of the agenda so that it would not have the importance that it should. Unfortunately, the Korean people and the Korean people alone were the victims of those manoeuvres. The great Powers had come to an agreement that served their strategic and economic interests; the small countries must raise their voices so as not to suffer the effects of that arrangement.

57. Prior to the vote which had just been taken, his delegation had wished to submit an amendment to the heading of item 106. It had not been able to do so, but it wished its text to be considered as an anticipated amendment to the text which would ultimately be submitted to the First Committee for adoption. Its proposal was that subitem (a), which reproduced the heading of old item 106, should be amended to read:

"Reconsideration of the status of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag, taking into account (1) that 16 countries which participated in the Korean war have withdrawn their troops from South Korea; (2) that the number of States which have been admitted to the United Nations since the Armistice Agreement of 27 July 1953 was signed, has increased to such an extent as to make the reconsideration of the status of the said troops appropriate."

58. When his delegation had submitted draft resolution A/C.1/L.664 to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the representatives of the great Powers had urged it not to submit that text as an amendment to the one which had been adopted by consensus, and had given the assurance that the Korean question would be settled shortly. He had consented to withdraw his proposed text in spite of his doubts about the imminence of a satisfactory settlement of the Korean problem. He could not but note now that his fears had been justified; the Korean people were bearing the brunt of the agreement and continuing to suffer from the ideological clash between the great Powers.

59. On behalf of the Korean people, therefore, he would resubmit his draft resolution, which appeared in paragraph 15 of the report of the First Committee of 27 November 1973.³ He then read out the text of the draft resolution.

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 41, document A/9341.

60. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Saudi Arabia for his valuable contribution. He observed that the decision which had just been taken by the Committee was only a recommendation, and that the final decision would be taken by the General Assembly.

61. Mr. KARAM (Iraq) said that his delegation had intended to vote against the proposal to combine items 106 and 110, but had inadvertently abstained when the vote had been taken. He requested that his delegation's real intention should be recorded in the summary record of the meeting.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that note would be taken of the Iraqi representative's rectification, which would not, however, modify the result of the vote and had, furthermore, been made too late. The Iraqi delegation would be able to vote in the way it desired when the question was brought up in the General Assembly.

Mr. Rahal (Algeria) and Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) withdrew.

ITEMS 107 TO 109

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 107 to 109 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 111

63. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that at its meeting at the beginning of the month the Council of the League of Arab States had adopted a resolution calling for the inclusion of an additional item entitled "Question of Palestine" in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, and recommending the recognition and reaffirmation of Palestine's right to national independence and of the Palestinians' right to return to their homes. In conformity with rule 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Arab States and some non-Arab States, which were to be thanked for their spirit of solidarity, had accordingly submitted a request for the inclusion of that new item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session (A/9742 and Add.1-4). It was essential that the question, which was of fundamental importance not only for Palestine but also for all Arab peoples and for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, should be considered separately in a political context. Since 1970 the General Assembly had been adopting resolutions which, while recognizing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, related only to the refugee problem. The time had come for the General Assembly to fulfil its duty under the Charter of the United Nations by approaching the Palestinian issue from the political standpoint, with a view to restoring a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Israel had requested to take part in the discussion. If there was no objection, he would invite that representative to take a seat at the Committee table.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Tekoah (Israel) took a seat at the Committee table.

65. Mr. TEKOA (Israel) stressed that the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Question of Palestine" would be prejudicial to the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and to the efforts to restore peace in the Middle East.

66. The decision to request the inclusion of that item in the General Assembly's agenda had been initiated by the so-called "Palestinian Liberation Organization", which was the umbrella organization of the Arab terrorist groups and whose stated goal was the destruction of a Member State of the United Nations and the denial to the Jewish people of their right to self-determination and independence. It was to serve that criminal objective that attempts were being made to raise the Palestine question at the General Assembly; no secret had been made of that fact at the Cairo discussions. Furthermore, the Palestine Liberation Organization representatives at the meeting of the Council of the League of Arab States had made it clear that, by means of the debate on the question, the organization would be seeking some form of international recognition. Such recognition would deal a death blow to the repeated United Nations efforts to combat international terrorism.

67. The inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Question of Palestine" would be a serious setback to the peace-making process in the Middle East. After decades of stalemate and stagnation, resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) of the Security Council had defined the principles of a just and lasting peace in the region and had set in motion the process of negotiation between Israel and the Arab States with a view to attaining that peace. Those negotiations, of course, included also a dialogue between Israel and the Arab Palestinian State of Jordan. It was obvious to all that a debate on the Palestine question and its foregone conclusions would introduce new elements and new considerations into the Middle East situation and would hamper, delay and possibly undermine the entire Middle East peace-making effort.

68. Those acquainted with the handling of the Israel-Arab conflict by the deliberative bodies of the United Nations knew that it would not be the first time that the General Assembly, with its built-in majority, would be creating obstacles to a peaceful understanding and agreement in the Middle East. His delegation had found it necessary to make the present statement in the General Committee in order that there might be no illusions about the grave and foreseeable consequences of including the Palestine question in the agenda of the General Assembly.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Egypt had requested to take part in the discussion.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) took a seat at the Committee table.

70. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) said that the Israeli representative ought to have complied with the provisions of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly by limiting his comments to procedural questions.

71. The request to include the item entitled "Question of Palestine" in the agenda had been made by both Arab and

non-Arab States and was a direct outcome of the work of the Council of the League of Arab States, which was indignant at Israel's persistent defiance of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, of which it was a Member.

72. All the efforts which had long been made to restore peace in the Middle East had demonstrated that recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence was the very basis for the restoration of peace and order in the region. Consequently, there was ample justification for the inclusion in the agenda of an item relating to the Palestine question, which should be dealt with in a political context and not as a refugee problem, as had been the case up to the present. It was not necessary to enlarge further upon the need to include that item in the agenda as a first step towards the solution of the Palestinian problem and the establishment of peace in the region.

73. The international community had repeatedly stated its view that the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to self-determination must be respected in conformity with Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. Now that the Organization was about to give practical expression to the international will to ensure respect for that right, Israel was once again defying world opinion by proclaiming that inclusion of the Palestine question in the agenda would hamper peace-making efforts in the Middle East. The Arab States had no reason to wish to hamper those efforts and the time had come for Israel to harken to world opinion.

74. Mr. ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking as a member of the General Committee and as a sponsor of the request to include the question of Palestine in the agenda, said that his delegation deplored the fact that the question of Palestine was regarded as a refugee problem rather than as a problem of the usurpation of a people's right to liberty and independence. The time had come for the United Nations and the international community to examine the true causes of the problem and to ensure respect for the rights to which Palestine, like all members of the international community, was entitled by virtue of the Charter of the United Nations.

75. He stressed that until the Palestinian people had recovered their legitimate rights, there could be no just solution to the crisis in the Middle East. The support of the Yugoslav people for the just struggle being waged by the Arab people, and in particular by the Palestine Liberation Organization, with the object of regaining those rights, was well known, as was its condemnation of imperialism and all forms of foreign domination. It was in that spirit that his delegation had associated itself with all those delegations which had requested the inclusion of the question of Palestine in the agenda.

76. He was convinced that the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly would mark a great step forward in the search for a just solution to the Middle East problem and in the recognition of the right of Palestine to self-determination and independence.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Algeria had requested to take part in the discussion.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Rahal (Algeria) took a place at the Committee table.

78. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) said that the arguments which had been adduced to persuade the General Committee to recommend to the General Assembly that the question of Palestine should not be included in the agenda fell into three categories.

79. The first line of argument was based on allegations defaming the Palestinian movements, which were described as terrorist, accused of committing acts of violence and murder and depicted as associations of evil-doers which the international community should condemn without a hearing. It was not the first time that Israel had pronounced such judgements, which in point of fact were more applicable to its own case, since its régime was based on the use of such methods. Such arguments should therefore not be taken into consideration in determining whether the question of Palestine should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

80. The second argument consisted in impressing upon the General Committee the responsibility which would fall upon the General Assembly if it included that question in its agenda. Such an argument could not discourage the members of the Assembly from shouldering their responsibilities and examining the question of Palestine.

81. As to the third argument, the representative of Israel had claimed that a discussion of the question of Palestine would serve to nullify the results which had already been achieved with great difficulty in seeking a settlement of the Middle East crisis and would hamper any further efforts in that direction. In reality, the entire international community recognized that the settlement of the Palestinian problem lay at the very heart of a solution to the Middle East crisis, and it could not be unaware that, so far from impeding the search for a settlement of the Middle East conflict, a discussion of that question was the only possible means of discovering a solution to the problem of the Middle East. Furthermore, the United Nations was the most appropriate forum in which to embark on such a discussion, since the United Nations had created the problem of Palestine and was therefore responsible for it. It was at the United Nations that the case of Palestine should be reopened and the matter be treated not as a social problem caused by the Palestinian refugees but as a political problem. The time had come for the United Nations to rectify its mistake and focus its efforts on settling a crisis with which it had been encumbered almost since its creation.

82. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the request by the group of States which desired the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Palestine" in the General Assembly's agenda.

83. It had been over 25 years ago that, as a result of the policy pursued by Israel, the Arab people of Palestine had been deprived of the opportunity to exercise their inalienable right of self-determination. The United Nations, which had affirmed that right in numerous resolutions, could not now be a silent witness to the injustice done to the Palestinians; it must rather help to right that wrong and,

by so doing, to promote the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

84. His delegation was convinced that a discussion by the General Assembly of the question of Palestine in all its aspects, with the participation of a representative of the Arab people of Palestine, would further the settlement of that question at the Geneva peace talks.

85. Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania) felt, like the representatives of many other States who believed in the effectiveness of the United Nations, that inclusion of the question of Palestine in the agenda was justified. The reasons and arguments in favour of such a course had been set out in the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request (A/9742). The United Nations had from the outset assumed responsibilities in that part of the world, and it was high time that it discharged them. Admittedly, the question was very complex, and it had remained unsolved even though the United Nations had been dealing with it in various guises for nearly 30 years. The inclusion of the item in the agenda should enable the General Assembly to reaffirm the right of peoples to self-determination and to contribute towards a peaceful settlement which would guarantee security in that region and would promote economic and social development.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee had decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 111 should be included in the agenda.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 111 should be included in the agenda.

Mr. Tekoah (Israel), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) and Mr. Rahal (Algeria) withdrew.

ITEM 112

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 112 should be included in the agenda.

ITEM 113

87. The CHAIRMAN said that the Turkish representative had asked to participate in the debate on the item; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

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

88. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) said that in accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, he would refrain from going into the substance of the slanderous accusations and unabashed lies contained in the explanatory memorandum which had accompanied the request for the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Question of Cyprus" (A/9743). He would confine his observations to the specific request for inclusion. His delegation wished to state categorically that it had no objection to the consideration of such questions by the General Assembly. The Turkish

Government made no claim that United Nations organs could not or should not consider such matters or, more specifically, the Cyprus question. It could not, however, tolerate the manner in which that question was being presented to the General Assembly by unauthorized persons in most dubious circumstances and at the most inappropriate time.

89. The members of the General Committee were no doubt aware that the General Assembly, in view of Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations, could not make any recommendation on the Cyprus question, since the Security Council by its resolutions 353 (1974), 357 (1974) and 361 (1974) had decided to remain seized of the question. Furthermore, Security Council resolution 353 (1974) had called upon the parties to enter into negotiations without delay for the restoration of peace in the area and constitutional government in Cyprus. In its resolution 361 (1974), the Security Council had expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the part he had played in bringing about talks between the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus, had warmly welcomed that development and had called upon those concerned to pursue the talks actively in the interests of both communities. It was a fact that in disregard of those resolutions, certain parties continued to refuse to resume the negotiations for the restoration of peace. However, it was also a fact that talks between the leaders of the two communities were currently under way.

90. The attempt to bring the Cyprus question before the General Assembly therefore not only contravened the Charter but also the resolutions of the Security Council. It would be interesting to hear what explanations the Greeks could give for that flagrant violation of the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations to which they professed allegiance, although it had been they who, by violating Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, had started the crisis in their disrespect for the international agreements which had given birth to the State of Cyprus.

91. It might also be asked who purported to bring the Cyprus question before the General Assembly. Their pretension to represent the interests of the two communities in Cyprus could only be rejected with indignation. They could only represent some Greek quarters, although it was difficult to determine which they were, and it was unacceptable for them to pretend that while pursuing Greek expansionist ideals, they could also consider the well-being of the Turkish Cypriots.

92. There was no question that they did not represent the Turkish Cypriot community but it was not clear who they represented among the Greek Cypriots. Was it Mr. Clerides, who was at present engaged in talks with Mr. Denktash, or was it Archbishop Makarios, who had been obliged to flee the island and who was the man principally responsible for all the evils from which Cyprus was suffering, and who was endeavouring, while the two communities were negotiating, to recruit support abroad and who was less qualified than anyone else to plead before an organization whose aim was the establishment of international peace and understanding; or did the persons concerned represent the psychopath Nicos Samson?

93. A Cypriot delegation should not try, in the absence of representatives of one of the communities, to advance its own interests at the expense of those of the other community, in defiance of the 1960 Constitution which provided for the joint administration of foreign policy by a Greek president and a Turkish vice-president. It was no longer known who was the Greek president, since there appeared to be three candidates; however, there was no doubt regarding the Turkish Vice-President, who was now the only indisputable legitimate authority on the island.

94. Lastly, it should be pointed out that the attempt to bring the question of Cyprus before the General Assembly solely for the benefit of some indeterminate elements of the Greek community could not but hamper the talks initiated between the leaders of the two communities through the efforts of the Secretary-General and gave reason to believe that those responsible for that move were motivated by personal interests and ambition.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Cyprus had asked to participate in the discussion.

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

96. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said he did not think that inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda must be refused on the pretext that the question was before the Security Council. It was for the Security Council to deal with the situation arising from the invasion, but what the General Assembly should now consider was the situation as a whole. Moreover, there was already a precedent, namely, the question of the situation in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Security Council had now adopted all possible resolutions, and Turkey had merely violated them. In its resolution 353 (1974), the Council had called for the cessation of all firing, an end to all foreign military intervention and the withdrawal without delay from the territory of the Republic of Cyprus of all foreign military personnel. Turkey had accepted that resolution but had continually violated it, attacking the civilian population and the United Nations Force itself with napalm. The accusations against Turkey were not mere slander; the facts, confirmed by the world press, were as real as the Turkish occupation and the refugees' inability to return to their homes without being killed. The entire situation in Cyprus was an unprecedented tragedy, and equally unprecedented were Turkey's attempt to make a travesty of it and Turkey's complete lack of remorse.

97. Cyprus was a symbol, and the way in which the situation there would be settled would make it possible to know whether the international community was prepared to tolerate oppression and the use of force. It had been said that the invasion was a lesson for the small non-aligned countries, which should expect to be attacked by States more powerful than they, and the President of a major country had said that, as international security had disappeared, each nation should arm itself in order to ensure its own protection. It was over the United Nations and all the principles of international law that Turkey had gained a victory.

98. The only solution was for the entire problem to be considered by the General Assembly. It was, of course, gratifying that negotiations were under way, since they would perhaps make it possible to relieve the suffering and to save the country's economy, but that did not mean that Cyprus was prepared to renounce its independence.

99. In addition, he noted that Samson had disappeared and that he himself had been recognized verbally by many delegations, including that of Turkey, as the representative of Cyprus in the United Nations. He had received from the provisional President specific instructions which had been approved by Archbishop Makarios.

100. If the General Assembly was not to be seized of the case of a small country attacked by a State with a population nearly 60 times greater than its own, a State which was occupying its territory and spreading terror there, it could be asked what questions were therefore within the Assembly's competence.

101. Mr. ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he was in favour of including the question of Cyprus in the agenda of the General Assembly. Indeed, the current crisis constituted a danger for peace in Europe and in the world, and the United Nations should play as effective a role as possible in the search for a solution.

102. Yugoslavia, a non-aligned and neighbouring country of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, with all of which it enjoyed friendly relations, had taken steps to help to bring about that solution: President Tito had sent messages to the representatives of the two Cypriot communities, to President Makarios and to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. Similarly, President Tito had sent messages to the countries concerned, to the five permanent members of the Security Council and to a number of non-aligned countries, as well as to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Yugoslavia proposed a solution based on the maintenance of the unity, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus, on the equality of the two communities and on the withdrawal of the foreign troops. The discussion in the General Assembly would be useful provided that it did not give rise to a confrontation and that efforts were made to achieve a just and peaceful solution.

103. Mr. KARAM (Iraq) pointed out that under Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Charter, the General Assembly was not to make any recommendation with regard to a dispute before the Security Council. Iraq maintained close and friendly relations with all the parties concerned and hoped that a solution would be found which would respect the territorial integrity, unity and independence of Cyprus. However, if the request for inclusion of the item was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

104. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he did not believe that anyone was opposed to the inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda. The comments of the representative of Turkey related essentially to the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request to which it would have been preferable for him to reply in writing. The Greek delegation had nothing to add to what the representative of Yugoslavia had said. The representative of Iraq had perhaps not listened to Mr. Rossides when the latter had cited precedents.

105. In view of the ties which bound Greece to Cyprus, 60 per cent of whose population was of Greek origin, and in the interest of world peace, he hoped that the General Committee would recommend the inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda.

106. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) said he wished to make it clear that his statement was an initial reply to the explanatory memorandum to which, as had been suggested by the representative of Greece, a written reply would perhaps also be made.

107. Since the napalm argument had been advanced, he pointed out that it was a daily occurrence to find the burial places of mutilated bodies of Turkish Cypriot women and children who had been shot to death or killed in some other manner by Greek Cypriots.

108. Contrary to what Mr. Rossides had said, the Turkish Government was opposed not to the discussion of the problem but to its inclusion in the agenda at the request of persons who did not represent Cyprus, since the Turkish and Greek communities could not be represented solely by Greek Cypriots.

109. It had been argued that Cyprus was a small country, but there was no justification for a country, just because it was small, to violate the principles of law and the human rights of its inhabitants and to oppress one of its communities.

110. With regard to the argument that Cyprus was a non-aligned country, it was sufficient, in order to realize the ridiculous nature of such a statement, to consider that that country, under the Makarios government, had no other goal than to put an end to its independence and, therefore, to its non-alignment, by becoming united with "Northern Greece". Furthermore, the Turkish forces had encountered a Greek army of invasion and an illegal army formed, in violation of the Constitution, by the Makarios government.

111. The representative of Cyprus had stressed that he had the approval of the provisional President and of Archbishop Makarios. One of the two should have been sufficient.

112. Lastly, it should be borne in mind that if Cyprus was still a State Member of the United Nations, it was because the Turkish forces, by their presence, had prevented its disappearance.

113. He hoped, like the representative of Yugoslavia, that the discussion in the General Assembly would be constructive, but it seemed to him that experience had shown that there could be no dialogue with the Greek and Cypriot delegations.

114. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the crisis had lasted more than two months, threatening the independence of a Member State, aggravating tension in the eastern Mediterranean and causing numerous victims.

115. The United Nations had a responsibility to defend the security, independence and territorial integrity of Member States. The Security Council had already adopted a

number of important decisions which, unfortunately, had remained a dead letter. The situation in Cyprus and in the region continued to be dangerous; the General Assembly must help to find a solution to the problem and must thwart all manoeuvres aimed at having the question of Cyprus settled within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, without the participation of the Cypriot people. The Soviet Union, which had proposed the holding of an international conference, was therefore in favour of the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

116. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the representative of Iraq did not press for a vote, said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee recommended the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 113 should be included in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 8.20 p.m.

220th meeting

Friday, 20 September 1974, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.220

Allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/182, sect. IV, and A/BUR/182/Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the suggestions for the allocation of items contained in paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/182) which listed items of the draft agenda not previously considered by the General Assembly.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 101 should be allocated to the Third Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 102 should be allocated to the First Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 103 should be allocated to the First Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 104 should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

2. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) proposed that item 105 should be allocated to the First Committee rather than for consideration in plenary meetings, so that it could be discussed together with the other items relating to disarmament.

3. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation had proposed that the item should be discussed at plenary meetings, it would not press that proposal.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 105 should be allocated to the First Committee.

4. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, at the 219th meeting, it had been decided to combine items 106 and 110 as subitems (a) and (b) respectively under the heading "Question of Korea".

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 106 and 110, combined as subitems (a) and (b) under the heading "Question of Korea", should be allocated to the First Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 107 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 108 should be allocated to the Fifth Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 109 should be allocated to the First Committee.

5. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 1 (b), 2 (b) and 3 (b) of the addendum to the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/182/Add.1) which referred to the allocation of items 111, 112 and 113, respectively.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 111, 112 and 113 should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to decide on the recommendations in paragraphs 22 to 27 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/182).

7. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, pointed out that paragraph 493 of

chapter V, section D, of the report of the Economic and Social Council had been proposed for allocation to the Sixth Committee; he stated that it would be more appropriate to allocate it to the Third Committee, since it was humanitarian in character.

8. Mr. LIND (Sweden) pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had recommended that the paragraph be allocated to the Sixth Committee, a preference which he wished to reiterate. It was closely related to item 93, concerning respect for human rights in armed conflicts, which had also been allocated to the Sixth Committee as in the past.

9. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) supported the allocation of the paragraph to the Sixth Committee for three reasons. The Economic and Social Council had recommended it; the paragraph was closely related to item 93, and could not be adequately considered if totally divorced from that item; and the paragraph concerned a legal question which demanded the expertise of the Sixth Committee.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the representatives of Sweden and the United Kingdom had objected to the USSR suggestion and since the representative of the USSR had not called for a vote, paragraph 493 of chapter V, section D, of the report of the Economic and Social Council would be recommended for allocation to the Sixth Committee.

It was so decided.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the other proposals in paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 12.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposal in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 23.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposal in paragraph 24 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 36.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposal in paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 74.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposals in paragraph 26 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to item 87.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposal in paragraph 27 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, relating to the transfer of items to the Special Political Committee.

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to decide on the allocation of items proposed in paragraph 28 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO PLENARY MEETINGS

12. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) observed that item 23 of the list of items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting contained two subitems. Subitem (a) referred to a report of the Special Committee on the Distribution of the Funds Released as a Result of the Reduction of Military Budgets, but, since it had not been possible for that Committee to meet, the report did not exist. Subitem (b) referred to the report being prepared by the Secretary-General (A/9770). He proposed that it would be more appropriate to allocate the item to the First Committee, for consideration together with other items relating to disarmament.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 23 should be allocated to the First Committee.

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

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka) took a place at the Committee table.

14. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka), speaking as the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, proposed, pursuant to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 3067 (XXVIII) and in the light of the decision of the Conference to hold its next session at Geneva in 1975, that item 27 of the draft agenda should be allocated for consideration in plenary meeting instead of to the First Committee.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that item 27 of the draft agenda, which was item 1 on the list of items proposed for allocation to the First Committee, should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 27 should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

Mr. Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka) withdrew.

16. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided to recommend (see 218th meeting, para. 7) that item 26 of the draft agenda, which was item 25 on the list of items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting, should not be included in the agenda.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the items proposed for consideration in plenary meetings in the Secretary-General's memorandum, with the exception of items 23 and 25, should be allocated to plenary meeting.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE FIRST COMMITTEE

17. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided to recommend (see para. 12 above) that item 23 of the list of items proposed for consideration in plenary meeting should be allocated to the First Committee.

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 item 1, should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

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 should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SECOND COMMITTEE

18. Mr. LIND (Sweden) proposed that item 61 of the draft agenda concerning assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations, which was item 10 on the list of items proposed for consideration by the Third Committee, should be allocated instead to the Second Committee. A similar item had been considered at the twenty-eighth session, when a subitem corresponding to item 61 (a) had been allocated to the Third Committee and a subitem corresponding to item 61 (b) had been allocated to the Second Committee. His proposal was motivated by the close link between economic development and disaster relief to which attention had been drawn, *inter alia*, by the Economic and Social Council at its fifty-seventh session and by the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator.

19. Mrs. MARICO (Mali) said that her delegation was grateful to Sweden and the Scandinavian countries in general for the assistance they had extended to the countries in the Sudano-Sahelian region.

20. Speaking as Chairman of the Third Committee, she felt that that Committee should discuss the humanitarian aspects of item 61, while the Second Committee could discuss the economic aspects, specifically, the long-term and medium-term programmes and plans needed to cope with the problem. Accordingly, item 61 (a) should be allocated to the Third Committee, while item 61 (b) should be allocated to the Second Committee.

21. Mr. KARAM (Iraq) said that, while he supported the proposal of the representative of Mali in principle, in his capacity as Chairman of the Second Committee he was compelled to point out that the agenda of that Committee was very heavy.

22. Mr. LIND (Sweden) proposed, as a compromise, that item 61 in its entirety should be allocated to the Second Committee, while the Third Committee could discuss an item entitled: "Assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations: humanitarian aspects".

23. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) said that it would not be sensible to hold two debates on the same item in two different Committees. The representatives of Mali and Sweden should consult with a view to reaching a compromise.

24. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) pointed out that the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly had recommended that agenda items should be so allocated as to ensure, as far as possible, that the same questions or the same aspects of a question were not considered by more than one Committee. That recommendation would be only partly met by the proposal made by the representative of Sweden in his most recent statement. Accordingly, he agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that consultations should be held with a view to reaching a compromise.

25. The CHAIRMAN invited the General Committee to leave the matter in abeyance.

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

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 exception of item 10, should be allocated to that Committee.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

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

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

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 13, should be allocated to that Committee.

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be suspended to permit consultations concerning the allocation of item 61 of the draft agenda.

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 12.55 p.m.

27. The CHAIRMAN announced that a compromise had been reached concerning the allocation of item 61 of the draft agenda. If there was no objection, he would take it that the General Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that item 61 in its entirety should be

allocated to the Second Committee on the understanding that the Third Committee could consider the humanitarian aspects of the item during its discussion of item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

221st meeting

Tuesday, 8 October 1974, at 10.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.221

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session: item proposed by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/9744)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/9744 containing a request for the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of an additional item entitled "Status of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in the General Assembly".

2. He said that the representative of Bulgaria had requested permission to participate in the discussion in accordance with rule 43 of the rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Grozev (Bulgaria) took a place at the Committee table.

3. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Permanent Representatives of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that, on instructions from their Governments, they had requested the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, as an important and urgent question, of a new item entitled "Status of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in the General Assembly", on a par with item 102 concerning the status of the European Economic Community (EEC) in the General Assembly.

4. As explained in the request, the urgency and importance of granting the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) the status of observer in the General Assembly emerged from the fact that the positive trends in international relations created favourable conditions for mutually beneficial economic co-operation on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and constituted an essential condition for the social and economic progress of all countries, including the developing countries. The broadening of the scope of equal economic co-operation should, in turn, serve as an important instrument for the strengthening of international security.

5. The current process of détente was not a temporary phenomenon but the beginning of a fundamental restructuring of international relations, including those in the economic field. The sponsors of the request were convinced that the progressive decisions of the sixth special session of the General Assembly, and the convening of the forthcoming seventh special session, were designed to fulfil those aims.

6. In such circumstances, the participation of CMEA—the world's first economic organization of socialist States—in the work of the General Assembly and its organs was urgent, since such participation would undoubtedly make a major contribution to the normalization of international economic relations and to the establishment of mutually beneficial co-operation among all countries, irrespective of their social systems and level of development.

7. The activities of CMEA were being accompanied by a steady rise in its prestige throughout the world, and the principles underlying its work were having an increasing influence on international relations.

8. CMEA was not a closed economic grouping: it included European, Asian and Latin American countries. The socialist States were ready to expand co-operation with all countries irrespective of their social and political structure on the basis of equality, independence, mutual advantage and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. CMEA paid continuous attention to economic relations with the developing countries, granting them economic and technical assistance in the vital sectors of their national economies. The members of CMEA would further intensify their co-operation with the developing countries and would support them in the struggle to achieve economic independence, dispose of their own national wealth in the interests of their peoples, and eliminate the inequitable economic relations imposed by the policy of imperialism and neo-colonialism.

9. Détente was paving the way for broad, lasting co-operation with the developed capitalist States, in keeping with the requirements of international economic life and the interests of all peoples.

10. CMEA currently maintained relations with more than 20 international intergovernmental and non-governmental

organizations; it attached great importance to enhancing the role of the United Nations, increasing the effectiveness of its activities on the basis of the Charter, and strengthening peace and co-operation among all peoples.

11. The economic development of the countries which were members of CMEA indicated convincingly that, on the basis of the socialist system of production and a complex programme of socialist economic integration, they had achieved high and stable rates of growth. Those countries together accounted for over one third of the world's industrial production. They thus contributed to the further improvement of world economic relations. The growing significance of the economic power of the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the increasing influence on international relations of the principles underlying the Council's work made it desirable that its representatives should be able to participate in the work of the General Assembly and that CMEA itself should be granted observer status in the General Assembly; CMEA would thus have an opportunity to take part in the work of the Assembly and its Committees during the consideration of matters relating to its field of competence.

12. The sponsors of the item also proposed that it should be considered in plenary meetings, in keeping with its importance and urgency. It was their hope that the request would receive the full support of the General Committee and of the General Assembly.

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

13. The CHAIRMAN noted that the sponsors of the item—which would become agenda item 111—had proposed that it should be considered directly in plenary meeting, as in the case of item 102 concerning the status of the European Economic Community in the General Assembly.

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

14. Mr. LECOMPT (France), noting that the request for inclusion of the additional item had been made in accordance with rule 15 of the rules of procedure, said he wondered to what extent the sponsors felt that rule 15 was applicable.

15. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) pointed out that, if the proposal for the inclusion of the additional item in the agenda of the General Assembly was adopted, there would be two separate items relating, respectively, to the status of EEC and of CMEA; it was proposed that both organizations should have equal observer status. He had indicated the importance and urgency of the item and had also pointed out that observer status for CMEA would be useful both to the organization itself and to the United Nations and would contribute to the development of international economic relations.

16. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was at a loss to understand the concern of the French delegation and emphasized that the members of

CMEA had no wish to claim the slightest advantage for their organization over and above that which might be enjoyed by EEC. The reason for the reference to rule 15 of the rules of procedure was that the request for the inclusion in the agenda of the new item was being made in the course of the twenty-ninth session rather than at least 30 days before the opening of the session.

17. Mr. LECOMPT (France) said he was raising a practical question: since it had been decided that item 102 concerning the status of EEC would be dealt with as a matter of high priority, he merely wished to know whether the same priority was requested for item 111 concerning the status of CMEA.

18. The CHAIRMAN observed that the General Committee was free to recommend to the General Assembly that consideration of the new item should be accorded priority. While he did not wish to anticipate the decision of the General Assembly, he expected the same procedure to be adopted for the consideration of both items.

19. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) suggested that the French delegation might be concerned over the possibility that the inclusion of the new item would delay consideration of item 102 as a matter of high priority. He therefore wished to propose that, for the purposes of rational procedure, the two items should be considered together; the need for two separate debates would thus be obviated, and both items could be accorded the same degree of priority.

20. Mr. LECOMPT (France) asked whether the sponsors were requesting that both items should be considered on the same date.

21. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) replied that the sponsors had made no request that the new item should be accorded priority.

22. The CHAIRMAN noted that the proposal made by the representative of the Ivory Coast was a logical one, but pointed out that it was for the General Assembly to decide whether or not to link the consideration of the two items. However, the General Committee could, if it so wished, endorse the proposal made by the representative of the Ivory Coast.

23. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) pointed out that the sponsors had made no request that the new item should be accorded priority. They must have a good reason for not making such a request: for example, they might wish a separate debate on the new item; but whatever the reason, the Committee should not run counter to the wishes of the sponsors themselves.

24. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should accordingly confine itself to the two decisions that it had already taken, leaving the General Assembly to decide when the new item would be considered.

25. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while he had not had the opportunity to consult the other sponsors, the proposal made by the representative of the Ivory Coast seemed quite logical in view of the similarity of the two items in question. He also wished to

assure the representative of Argentina that the sponsors had no special motive in not requesting that the new item be accorded priority.

26. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) said that, since his proposal appeared to be creating confusion, he would withdraw it.

27. The CHAIRMAN accordingly suggested that, in addition to the two decisions already taken, the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that, for the purposes of rational procedure, the two items should be considered successively. Since item 102 was provisionally scheduled for consideration on Friday, 11 October, the General Assembly might wish to consider item 111 on the same date, immediately after item 102.

28. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the General Committee wished to act in the way that he had suggested.

It was so decided.

29. Mr. LECOMPT (France), referring to paragraph 5 of the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request for inclusion of the item (A/9744), recalled that it was the normal practice for observers not to make statements in plenary meetings. He therefore wondered whether the wording of that paragraph was meant to imply that representatives of CMEA intended to make statements in plenary meetings. In that connexion, he gave his assurance that the observers for EEC would not, in normal circumstances, have any intention of making statements in plenary meetings, and he hoped that that tradition would be respected.

30. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the matter raised by the representative of France concerned the substance of the question, which fell outside the competence of the General Committee. He suggested that the French delegation might wish to raise the matter in plenary.

31. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) suggested that, without going into its substantive aspects, the sponsors might wish to clarify the matter before the Committee reported to the General Assembly.

32. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) emphasized that the sponsors were not requesting that CMEA should be granted a privileged status not enjoyed by EEC. He assured the representative of France that CMEA would fully respect the traditions of the United Nations.

33. Mr. LECOMPT (France) replied that he was satisfied with the explanation given by the representative of Bulgaria. It was interesting to note, however, that in all aspects of the discussion, including the question of priority and the nature of the status, EEC was held up as a model to be emulated by CMEA. He was quite gratified that such a harmonious situation existed.

34. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was surprising to note the extent to which the States members of EEC were concerned to ensure that the socialist countries did not enjoy the slightest advantage over them. Yet neither he nor the representative of Bulgaria had requested that CMEA should enjoy a higher status than EEC.

35. Mr. LECOMPT (France) replied that EEC was very satisfied with the desire shown by CMEA to contribute to international co-operation.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the General Committee on the question before it would be considered by the Assembly in the plenary meeting that afternoon as the first item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

222nd meeting

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.222

Organization of work of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly

1. The CHAIRMAN said that he had convened the meeting in order to discuss the progress of work at the current session. He had invited the chairmen of the regional groups to attend the meeting so that, through them, the entire membership of the General Assembly might be aware of how much important work still remained.

2. Only 14 of the 111 agenda items had been concluded. Several of the reports of the Main Committees which had been considered in plenary meetings had been only partial reports and very few had yet been submitted for reproduction. Some reports were before the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth

Committee for the consideration of financial implications arising out of the draft recommendations they contained. If the session was to be concluded on the date set—Tuesday, 17 December—the work of the plenary and of the Main Committees would have to be accelerated.

3. Many of the difficulties had been occasioned by delays in starting meetings and their early adjournment, long lists of speakers, the absence of representatives when it was their turn to speak, and delay in introducing proposals and taking decisions on them. Consequently, delegations should be urged to introduce draft resolutions as soon as possible, and top priority should be given to items which might have financial implications so that the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee might act on those implications.

4. If those measures were acted upon, the General Assembly should be able to finish on time without taking more drastic steps. However, if within a few days there was no marked improvement in the pace of the work, he intended to reconvene the General Committee to consider more effective measures.

5. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that he was heartened by the Chairman's decision to convene a meeting in order to consider the progress of the Assembly's work. It was essential that the membership should comply with the Chairman's constructive suggestions. For their part, he and the Secretariat would do all in their power to facilitate the difficult work of the President of the General Assembly and the Chairmen of the Main Committees.

6. He had attended the opening of the World Food Conference, which had many important proposals before it. The report of the Conference was to be submitted to the General Assembly, through the Economic and Social Council, towards the end of the current session.¹

7. During the General Assembly, the attention of the world was focused upon the activities of the Organization, which had an obligation to fulfil the trust reposed in it.

8. Mr. MORSE (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs), reporting on the progress of work in the plenary meetings of the Assembly, said that in addition to disposing of six organizational items, the plenary had completed work on seven of the items allocated to it. It was awaiting reports from Main Committees and information from regional groups before taking action on the items requiring the Assembly to confirm appointments to various bodies. Discussions on other items, such as items 21 and 26, could not be scheduled because the draft resolutions relating to them had not yet been received. Consultations were in progress on the scheduling of items 20, 23 and 25. Discussion of the question of Palestine (item 108) was expected to begin on 13 November. It had been necessary from time to time to extend meetings beyond the normal working hours, but the Department of Conference Services had been advised in time.

9. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina), Chairman of the First Committee, said that it was not surprising to find that each year the General Assembly was confronted with more problems, since the membership of the United Nations continued to grow. Although the various committees on the rationalization of the Assembly's work had resolved a few difficulties, the methods and procedures of the Assembly had remained largely unchanged since 1946. A comprehensive review and modernization of those methods were required.

10. Although meetings of the First Committee still did not begin punctually and often ended earlier than they should, the members had by and large been co-operating in following the suggestions made by the President of the General Assembly. Work on the item relating to the peaceful uses of outer space (item 32) had been completed, and the general debate on the 12 disarmament items was

expected to end on 11 November. It was anticipated that there would be 18 draft resolutions on disarmament questions, only 3 of which had so far been submitted, but all those items should be disposed of by 22 November. Thereafter there would be 18 meetings on the question of Korea (item 104) and two days devoted to item 36 on the strengthening of international security, the last item before the Committee. The First Committee was observing its time-table and he was confident that it would complete its work on time.

11. Mr. LIND (Sweden), Chairman of the Special Political Committee, said that his Committee had disposed of two of the items allocated to it and concluded its general debate on a third (item 37), to which it would revert for adoption of draft resolutions after completing its work on items 40 and 39. Item 38 would be the last item to be considered and, unless there were unforeseen developments, the Special Political Committee could be expected to complete its work by the 6 December deadline.

12. Mr. KARAM (Iraq), Chairman of the Second Committee, said that his Committee had completed work on two of the items before it, was well advanced in its consideration of four others and was engaged in informal consultations among members with a view to arriving at agreed texts of draft resolutions on three other items. In view of the willingness to compromise demonstrated by the Committee members, he was confident that the Second Committee's work would be completed by the scheduled date.

13. He drew attention to an incident which had disrupted the work of the Second Committee on 24 October: a group belonging to the Jewish Defense League had interrupted the meeting by shouting slogans. A number of delegations had complained about the incident and some had demanded that the visitors' gallery should be closed to the public when the Second Committee was meeting. He appealed to the President and to the competent Secretariat authorities to take measures to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

14. Mrs. MARICO (Mali), Chairman of the Third Committee, said that her Committee had disposed of one item (item 53) and had made substantial progress towards completing its work on the humanitarian aspects of items 12 and 60. Consideration of item 55 was well advanced and nine items remained to be discussed. On the whole, the Third Committee was complying with her suggestions for rationalizing the work, but there were still delays in submitting revised versions of draft resolutions.

15. If, however, the Third Committee was to complete its work by the 6 December deadline, it would have to hold additional meetings and a few longer meetings. She asked the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments whether it would be possible for the Committee to hold seven meetings per week instead of six.

16. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia), Chairman of the Fourth Committee, announced that the Committee had concluded its general debate on items 66 and 67 and expected to conclude that on item 65 at the afternoon meeting. The progress made on those major items had been

¹ Subsequently issued as document E/5587 and Add.1-4.

satisfactory, and he wished to record his particular appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments for the co-operation of his able staff in servicing the requisite meetings. He hoped that draft resolutions on all three items could be submitted early the following week, during which the Committee expected to complete its consideration of them and its general debate on item 68. A combined general debate was envisaged on the seven remaining items.

17. The Fourth Committee might have some difficulty in finishing its work by 6 December, in part because 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 yet to complete its own work for the year. It might, therefore, be realistic to consider holding additional meetings during the week beginning 9 December.

18. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), Chairman of the Fifth Committee, said that the Committee had completed its consideration of item 72, except for the question of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, and of items 76, 78 and 79. It was expected that the current discussion of item 77 would continue for several more days. The Committee had already considered many of the subitems of item 73 and hoped to complete that on currency instability in the course of the day. Of the outstanding subitems of item 73, it would consider those on the United Nations Industrial Development Organization financing of assistance in cases of natural disaster, and the Administrative Management Service survey within the coming two weeks, as well as items 81 and 84.

19. The time-table of the Fifth Committee depended heavily on and inevitably lagged behind that of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, whose reports on the United Nations Emergency Force and personnel matters were expected during the following week. The Committee would then have to accelerate its work by holding more meetings each week. It might be able to meet the target closing date of 6 December if the other Main Committees gave priority to draft resolutions having financial implications. He had appealed to members of the Fifth Committee to start meetings on time and to make only brief statements. He would for the remainder of the session close the list of speakers not later than 48 hours after the relevant documents became available and would, if necessary, impose a time-limit on statements.

20. Mr. ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia), Chairman of the Sixth Committee, said that, of the 12 items allocated to it, the Sixth Committee had completed items 88, 93, 96 and 97. The general debate on item 86 had been concluded, and negotiations were under way with a view to producing a draft resolution which could be adopted by consensus. The general debate on item 87 would probably be concluded at the morning meeting which was in progress. There had been a great many speakers on items 86 and 87 and the average length of their statements had been 20 minutes. The Committee's working group on the draft agreement between the United Nations and the World Intellectual Property Organization, considered under item 12, would commence its work the following week.

21. The Sixth Committee was only a few days behind its original time-table. If it used its planned reserve of six meetings, it would, he hoped, be able to complete its work by 6 December.

22. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that his Committee had a heavier workload than expected because a number of important items had been postponed from the previous session and, despite the biennial budgeting system, there were a number of new questions having financial implications. The Advisory Committee could not say when it would complete its work until it had received the interim performance report on the programme budget, which would be tantamount to a set of supplementary estimates. In addition, its time-table depended to some extent on that of the Fifth Committee, since the two bodies could not meet simultaneously. The Advisory Committee would continue to do its utmost to submit its reports to the Fifth Committee as speedily as possible. In that connexion, he appealed to the Secretariat to provide the Advisory Committee with all relevant documentation at the earliest possible moment and to the Main Committees to allow adequate time for its consideration of the financial implications of their proposals.

23. Mr. RUTLEDGE (Chief Editor and Director, Editorial and Official Records Division), speaking on behalf of the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments, said that statistics compiled by the Department of Conference Services showed that, from the beginning of the current session until 1 November, a total of 160 hours and 30 minutes had been lost because meetings had not started and ended on time. Of the 238 meetings convened, 230 had started late, with a loss of 16.7 per cent of the available meeting time. The resulting situation was a source of acute concern to the Department in view of the strain it placed on limited staff resources. Apart from the decision at the twenty-eighth session not to expand the Department, it was becoming increasingly difficult to attract adequate numbers of qualified conference staff, a problem aggravated by the need to compete for the services of temporary personnel with other organizations meeting concurrently with the General Assembly. The Department had a very slender margin of flexibility in the assignment of staff, and its capacity to provide proper services, in terms of both the personnel involved directly in meetings and those who worked behind the scenes, had already been taxed to the limit. It had not yet been possible to recruit the full complement of Arabic language staff, despite the fact that efforts to that end had begun early in the year.

24. The Department of Conference Services requested the understanding and co-operation of delegations in ensuring that meetings began promptly and made full use of the available time and resources. The essential problem facing the Department was that of the physical capacity of staff, however dedicated, to work long hours under pressure for protracted periods. The Department was profoundly grateful for the understanding of its difficulties already shown. It would do its utmost to provide the necessary facilities, including the additional meetings requested by the Third Committee, a task in which it would be aided if its services were understood and used judiciously.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that there were a number of ways in which efficiency could be improved and the work expedited.

26. If it was true that punctuality was the exception rather than the rule in the United Nations, then it was incumbent on delegations to exercise self-discipline and adopt an attitude in keeping with the seriousness of the issues. In order to avoid the nightmare of evening meetings and last-minute pressure, it might be advisable, in some cases, to extend afternoon meetings until 7 or 7.30 p.m. That course would have the advantage of relieving the Secretariat of the burden of servicing additional meetings. In addition, every effort should be made to ensure the presence of a quorum when a draft resolution was due to be voted upon; a few days earlier, in a meeting of the plenary, there had been a possibility that a vote could not be taken simply because too few delegations were present.

27. The Chairman of the Fifth Committee had made a number of constructive suggestions which deserved the attention of the membership of the Main Committees. Their attention should also be drawn to the content of the letter from the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments concerning the need to make the best use of available resources.

28. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) asked whether the Secretariat could provide an assurance that conference facilities would be available until 7 o'clock or beyond.

29. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments) said that his Department was faced with the problem of availability of staff, in particular with regard to interpretation. The matter had been thoroughly studied by the competent international bodies and by the Joint Advisory Committee. It had been agreed that, owing to the nature of the work, conference staff could not be expected to work without interruption for substantially longer than two and a half or three hours at a stretch. Consequently, if a meeting ran for an hour or more beyond 6 p.m., the Department had to endeavour to supply reserve teams of interpreters, précis-writers or verbatim reporters, and conference officers. That it would certainly do when feasible. It would also accommodate any committee for 7, 8, or even 10 meetings a week if they could be fitted in, and he would contact the Chairman of the Third Committee concerning her request for additional meetings. He urged the Chairmen to inform the Department of Conference Services as promptly as possible about any cancelled meetings so that the teams could be redeployed.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the suggestions made in the course of the meeting should be transmitted to the plenary and that copies should be sent to the Chairmen of the Main Committees.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

223rd meeting

Tuesday, 19 November 1974, at 10.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria).

A/BUR/SR.223

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/9745 and Corr.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a request from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of an additional item entitled "Implementation by States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 and measures to increase the number of parties to the Convention" (A/9745 and Corr.1).

2. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the basic reasons for submitting that request were clearly set forth in document A/9745. In the present-day world, which was characterized by the struggle of peace-loving forces to improve the international situation and achieve détente, the universality of international agreements was of particular importance. Since the establishment of the United Nations, many such agreements had

been adopted on subjects ranging from disarmament to the rules governing diplomatic relations, as spelt out in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.¹ The extent of participation in those agreements was of particular significance, because it indicated the degree of recognition of the standards laid down in them. In recent years, peace-loving forces throughout the world had made great efforts to encourage the principle of universality in United Nations practice. At its current session, the General Assembly was discussing items on participation in the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations (item 88) and on the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (item 96). The principle of universality should be applied not only to recent conventions but also to important earlier conventions. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, which had incorporated generally recognized legal standards

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, No. 7310, p. 95.

into the practice governing international relations among States, had entered into force 10 years previously. It provided both a means of consolidating economic and cultural relations among States and a legal guarantee for persons engaged in diplomatic representation, and its strict observance was necessary to normal intercourse among States. Although over 100 States were already parties to the Vienna Convention, it was regrettable that, now that the obstacles to universal participation had finally been removed, some States still failed to adhere to it.

3. In the light of the violation of that Convention even by States parties to it, the Soviet delegation had felt it necessary to raise the question of an appeal by the General Assembly to all States which had not yet adhered to it to become parties and strictly observe its provisions. Such a step was not unusual in United Nations practice, and he hoped that the members of the General Committee would unanimously support his delegation's request that the additional item should be included in the agenda of the current session as an important and urgent matter.

4. The item could be considered by the Sixth Committee in parallel with the item on diplomatic asylum proposed by Australia (item 105). Such joint consideration of the two items was particularly justified because any discussion of diplomatic asylum must inevitably touch upon provisions of the Vienna Convention of 1961, especially article 41 with regard to the use of diplomatic premises as places of diplomatic asylum.

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

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Australia had requested permission to participate in the discussion. If there was no objection, he would invite him to participate in the discussion.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Coles (Australia) took a place at the Committee table.

6. Mr. COLES (Australia) said that although he realized that there must be some correlation between the item on diplomatic asylum and the additional item on the Vienna Convention of 1961, in view of the substantial differences between the two items his delegation would prefer them to be considered separately.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the General Committee adopted the Soviet Union's proposal that the item should be recommended for allocation to the Sixth Committee, which should consider it at a time which fitted in with its calendar and organization of work.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу : Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
