

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



GENERAL COMMITTEE, 171st  
MEETING

Thursday, 5 October 1967,  
at 5.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Adoption of the agenda of the twenty-second session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) |      |
| Allocation of item 93 ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .  | 33   |
| Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: item proposed by Bulgaria . . . . .                                    | 33   |
| Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: item proposed by Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen . . . . .     | 36   |
| Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: item proposed by the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .  | 37   |

Chairman: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

Adoption of the agenda of the twenty-second session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/BUR/168 and Corr.1, A/BUR/168/Add.1-3)

### ALLOCATION OF ITEM 93 (*continued*<sup>1/</sup>)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Committee had before it a proposal by Malta and the United States for the allocation to the First Committee of draft agenda item 93 (Declaration and treaty concerning the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the sea beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind).

2. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said that conversations had taken place between the delegations of the Latin American countries which had had objections to the wording of item 93, and, as a result, those countries had agreed on a new wording of that item in which all the legal terms used in the original text were deleted. It was therefore no longer necessary to refer that question to the Sixth Committee. Accordingly, the Latin American countries would approve the recommendation that that item be allocated to the First Committee, it being understood that the new wording would be submitted to the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

*The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Declaration and treaty concerning the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and of the ocean floor, underlying the sea beyond the*

*limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind" should be allocated to the First Committee.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA: ITEM PROPOSED BY BULGARIA (A/6835)

*At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Tarabanov (Bulgaria) took a place at the Committee table.*

3. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria), presenting his request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda (A/6835), said that the implementation, by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was a matter of particular importance and urgency. The Declaration was a historic document, and the application of the policy which it proclaimed had become an obligation for all States Members of the United Nations and for all the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations. Attention was drawn to the role of the United Nations in that respect, *inter alia*, in the fifth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. Also, the Charter of the United Nations contained a number of provisions, particularly those of Article 58, which concerned the specialized agencies. Various agreements had been concluded with the specialized agencies in pursuance of Article 63, and under those agreements the specialized agencies enjoyed certain privileges which were naturally linked with obligations. The agreements contained specific engagements in the terms of which the specialized agencies were to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of the principles proclaimed in Chapter IX of the Charter.

4. On the proposal of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the General Assembly had adopted recommendations and resolutions calling, *inter alia*, upon the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations to take various measures designed to accelerate the process of decolonization and to contribute to the liberation of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies, Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa by assisting refugees and the inhabitants of those Territories who were suffering from the oppression of colonial States. Those bodies had also been asked to refrain from supplying assistance to the colonial and racist régimes of Africa unless they renounced their policy of racial discrimination and

<sup>1/</sup> Resumed from the 167th meeting.

colonial oppression. In view of those facts, it might be asked why it was necessary to consider the question under a separate agenda item. The answer was simple: only a small number of specialized agencies and international institutions had responded to those appeals and recommendations; in that connexion it should be noted that the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had adopted a resolution providing for assistance in the fields of education, science and culture to countries which had recently attained independence and countries which were still under the yoke of colonialism.<sup>2/</sup> On the other hand, other specialized agencies and international institutions had not yet taken any definite measures in that connexion.

5. His delegation was convinced that consideration of that question by the Fourth Committee would enable the General Assembly to make new recommendations calling upon the specialized agencies and the international institutions to grant more active assistance to countries and peoples struggling for their independence. The General Assembly would also be able to define the possibilities of co-operation between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and international institutions with a view to facilitating the implementation of the policy of decolonization. His delegation hoped that the General Assembly would take effective decisions to that end.

6. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said that he was opposed to the inclusion of that item in the General Assembly's agenda. His objections were not to the substance of the question, which his delegation was ready to have discussed, but to the procedure. The Assembly's agenda already contained several items, for example item 23, under which the questions raised in the item proposed by Bulgaria could be discussed. Furthermore, the agenda consisted of about 100 items, which already constituted a considerable workload for the Assembly and its committees. In addition, the present request for the inclusion of an additional item was at variance with the provisions of rule 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The item proposed by Bulgaria should have been presented earlier; as it was not an urgent matter, it should not be added to the agenda at that late date. Its inclusion could only slow down the Assembly's work and reduce its efficiency.

7. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said that he supported the Bulgarian proposal for the inclusion of the item in the General Assembly's agenda. The specialized agencies and the international institutions unquestionably had an important role to play in decolonization. The General Assembly resolutions, particularly resolutions 1514 (XV), 2105 (XX), 2107 (XX) and 2151 (XXI) were quite explicit with regard to the contribution of the specialized agencies. Moreover, almost all the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and transmitted to

the Fourth Committee contained a paragraph concerning the activities of the specialized agencies. The developing countries fully appreciated the work of the specialized agencies and considered it important that all countries, and particularly those which were still under the colonial yoke, should benefit from it. The work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in that regard should be co-ordinated and harmonized. The world was aware of the suffering of the colonial peoples, which was caused by under-development and colonialist régimes. Thus, the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in its agenda of the item proposed by Bulgaria, to which country his delegation paid a tribute.

8. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he whole-heartedly supported the proposal to include the item in the agenda of the General Assembly, and his delegation was grateful to Bulgaria for having presented the proposal. The observations by the United Kingdom representative would surprise no one, for those who did not wish all the important questions of colonialism to be solved naturally sought to prevent their being considered in the United Nations. The world knew only too well what the United Kingdom had done in 1910, in 1923 and in 1965. The United Kingdom representative had said that there were already about 100 items before the Assembly and its committees. The number of items was not, however, the main consideration; if they were important, as the item proposed by Bulgaria was, they should be included in the agenda and given thorough consideration.

9. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America) said that although for the present he would not consider the substance of the question, he did have serious reservations concerning Bulgaria's explanatory memorandum (A/6835). That did not mean that the United States was opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. However, the request for inclusion had been made late, a fact which created doubt with regard to the faithful application of rules 12, 13, 14 and 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Furthermore, his delegation saw nothing extraordinary or urgent in the question proposed by Bulgaria. The problem had been considered in the past, and nothing had occurred recently which would make it appear urgent. He reserved the right to insist on a more faithful application of rule 15 at future sessions.

10. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had intimated in his statement that the United Kingdom did not want the item proposed by Bulgaria to be considered and did not regard it as important. That was not so. The objection raised by his delegation related solely to procedure. Rule 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly laid down that additional items must be of an important and urgent character. His delegation had doubts only about the urgent character of the item proposed by Bulgaria, and not about its importance. In addition, if the discussion was to be fruitful, the matter should be raised sufficiently in advance to permit adequate forethought.

<sup>2/</sup> See United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Records of the General Conference, Fourteenth Session, Resolutions, Paris, 1966, p. 94.

11. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) endorsed the views of the United States and United Kingdom delegations concerning the application of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Nevertheless, his delegation, having always made it a policy not to oppose the inclusion of additional items in the agenda, would support the request for the inclusion of the item proposed by Bulgaria. The position it took on the item proposed by Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen (A/6836) would be prompted by the same considerations.

12. Mr. EL BOURI (Libya) said that he supported the Bulgarian proposal. Despite the adoption, seven years earlier, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, many countries and peoples were still under the colonial yoke. In numerous resolutions, the General Assembly and 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 called upon the specialized agencies and international institutions to take various steps to promote decolonization. It was important to examine more closely the role which those organizations could play, to encourage them to increase their collaboration with the United Nations, and to ensure unity of action by the Organization and the agencies and institutions; the specialized agencies had received requests for assistance and relief from various national liberation movements, but had not always taken the proper action on them. It was to be hoped that the General Assembly would also recommend the agencies and institutions not to extend any assistance to colonialist régimes.

13. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) expressed his support for the Bulgarian proposal. In his view, the request for the inclusion of the item in no way contravened rule 15 of the rules of procedure, which did not require that additional items should be both important and urgent in character. No one could deny that the proposed item was an important one, and it should therefore be included in the Assembly's agenda. It might be pointed out to those who felt that the matter could be taken up in connexion with items already included in the agenda that the simultaneous consideration of several questions was even more useful and that the General Assembly would save time by grouping such questions under a single heading.

14. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said that, although he was not against the inclusion of the item proposed by Bulgaria, he was not convinced that the question had suddenly become important or urgent. The matter could quite easily be considered in connexion with a number of items already on the agenda. The question of relations between the United Nations and the specialized agencies was highly complex and delicate; the agencies, some of which were older than the United Nations and which were also composed of representatives of sovereign States, did not necessarily share the views of the United Nations concerning what action should be taken on United Nations recommendations. He asked whether the representative of Bulgaria was thinking especially of agencies of which Bulgaria was a member, or whether he had in mind other agencies.

15. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Bulgarian initiative was appropriate, since the reactions of the specialized agencies to the several appeals, made to them by the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to take steps to promote decolonization had been very varied. Some agencies, like UNESCO, had followed up the appeals; others had simply taken note of the General Assembly's decisions; others again were ignoring the Assembly's resolutions and continuing to give assistance to colonialist régimes.

16. The reasons offered by the United States and the United Kingdom to explain their position on the question were specious and were intended simply to mask their opposition on the issue of substance. He agreed with the views expressed by the Libyan and Tanzanian delegations in that regard.

17. His delegation supported the inclusion in the agenda of the item proposed by Bulgaria. The Bulgarian initiative would make it possible to consider practical action to co-ordinate all activities designed to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

18. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that he supported the Bulgarian proposal, which was useful and appropriate, in that the item was of the highest importance to most Member States. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was a historic document, and its implementation required the harmonizing and co-ordinating of all the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

19. Bulgaria was fully entitled to request the inclusion of an additional item, and its proposal in no way contravened rule 15 of the rules of procedure. A clear distinction should be made between the inclusion of an item and the time of its consideration. The item proposed by Bulgaria would probably not be taken up for another month, and thus all delegations would have an opportunity of consulting their Governments. The issue was not new, of course; it had been considered before. The purpose of the Bulgarian proposal was that it should now be made a separate item, and the proposal was a practical and fitting one.

20. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that he wholeheartedly supported the request for the inclusion of the item proposed by Bulgaria. In his view, it was natural that the specialized agencies should do their best to speed up the process of decolonization. He believed that the item was both urgent and important.

21. Mrs. RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that she supported the Bulgarian proposal because she believed that the entire world community must contribute, by all the means at its disposal, to the liberation of the colonized peoples.

22. Mr. DEVENDRA (Nepal) expressed his support for the inclusion in the agenda of the proposed item, which his delegation considered to be important and urgent.

23. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) observed that it had always been the practice of the General Committee to interpret rule 15 of the rules of procedure very liberally. With that in mind, he supported Bulgaria's request for the inclusion of an additional item.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any formal objection, he would take it that the Committee recommended to the General Assembly the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the twenty-second session and its allocation to the Fourth Committee.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations" should be included in the agenda and allocated to the Fourth Committee.*

*Mr. Tarabanov (Bulgaria) withdrew.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA: ITEM PROPOSED BY CAMBODIA, CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE) AND YEMEN A/6836)

*At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Huot Sambath (Cambodia) took a place at the Committee table.*

25. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America) said that he had asked to speak first, because his delegation wished from the outset to express its very strong reservations about the request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda submitted by the delegations of Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen. The United States delegation had always displayed a very liberal attitude towards the inclusion of items in the agenda, even in the case of items it had regarded as quite inappropriate, such as that on the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea. However, the present request went beyond all limits. There was no possible justification for the submission, after the opening of the General Assembly session, of an additional item on the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea as an item of an important and urgent character.

26. He pointed out in that connexion that there was a discrepancy between the French text of rule 15 of the rules of procedure, which referred to items of "an important or urgent character ("un caractère d'importance ou d'urgence"), and the texts in the other languages, which spoke of items of "an important and urgent character". He wondered what developments could suddenly have imparted such a character to the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, whose mandate had again been renewed by the General Assembly at its twenty-first session.

27. When, in 1966, the First Committee had considered the item submitted by the communist countries, entitled "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabili-

tation of Korea", a draft resolution proposing that the Korean question should not be further considered in the United Nations had been submitted by the communist countries<sup>3/</sup> and rejected by the First Committee at its 1490th meeting; another text incorporating the same proposal<sup>4/</sup> had been rejected by the General Assembly at its 1499th plenary meeting. That being so, he felt that the request for the inclusion of the so-called "new item" proposed by Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen was simply a procedural tactic aimed at resubmitting as two separate items the proposal, which the General Assembly had already strongly rejected in the past, that the United Nations should drop the Korean question and abdicate all responsibility for the peaceful reunification of the Korean nation.

28. His delegation considered that those who wished to do so could very well discuss that question in the course of the consideration of item 33, entitled:

"The Korean question:

- "(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;
- "(b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations."

If the item proposed by Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen was to be included in the agenda, his delegation proposed that it should be included as sub-item (c) of item 33, and formally requested that that proposal should be discussed and put to the vote as soon as the Committee had taken a decision on the three-Power request for the inclusion of the item.

29. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he warmly supported the request for the inclusion in the agenda of an item whose importance and urgency was clear from the attached explanatory memorandum.

30. It was high time to put an end to the acts of foreign Powers which were interfering in the domestic affairs of Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and to allow the Korean people to manage their own affairs and, in particular, to put an end to the artificial division of their country. It was clear that the United States was continuing shamelessly to use the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, an organ illegally created to perpetuate the cold war, for its own aggressive purposes. His delegation was well aware that the inclusion of the additional item in the Assembly's agenda would not please everybody, but it considered that the General Assembly should not take orders from anyone concerning the way in which it should consider a question. The item should be included separately in the General Assembly's agenda.

31. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said that there was nothing in the explanatory memorandum attached to the request for the inclusion of the item in the agenda (A/6836) to justify the submission of an additional item on the

<sup>3/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda items 31 and 93, document A/6618, para. 6 (b).

<sup>4/</sup> Ibid., document A/L.514.

dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, when delegations had already had, and would again have, the opportunity of discussing all aspects of the Korean question at length under item 33 of the agenda. At the twenty-first session ten communist countries had requested and obtained the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Reunification and Rehabilitation of Korea" (item 93), and at the present session nine communist countries had requested the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" (A/6696 and Add.1-3). The latter item represented the first part of the item which had been considered in 1966, and it seemed to him that the submission of the request now before the Committee was actually nothing but a propaganda tactic aimed at the reintroduction of the second part of that same item and its continued consideration in the General Committee, the General Assembly and the First Committee. He considered that, if the Assembly agreed to the inclusion of the item, despite its clearly contentious nature, it should at all events make it a sub-division of item 33.

32. With regard to the substance of the matter, he wished to stress that the creation of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea had been perfectly legal and that the Commission and its observers had played a very important role in 1950. He could not help noting the strange coincidence between the request for the dissolution of the Commission and the intensification of infiltrations into South Korea by armed marauders from the North. The request for the dissolution of the Commission had an ominous sound.

33. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia), introducing the item which his delegation and the delegations of the Congo (Brazzaville) and Yemen requested should be included in the agenda, observed that the unjust division of Korea into two separate States still continued, although the Korean question had been under consideration by the United Nations for nearly twenty years. The United Nations had failed in its purpose, since it had not thus far succeeded in promoting the reunification of Korea by peaceful means. On the contrary, it had been unable to prevent the development of a strong United States military entrenchment in South Korea, in violation of the armistice agreements of 1953, while the prospects of reunification of the country were becoming more remote with every year that elapsed. The peaceful reunification of Korea called for strict respect for the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of any country and the right to self-determination of peoples. Respect for that right and that principle was the prerequisite for a solution of the Korean question. The only way in which it would be possible to end the division by peaceful means was by leaving the Korean people free to exercise their right of self-determination and refraining from intervening in their domestic affairs. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea,

which had been established in flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter, was one of the major obstacles to the unification of Korea. Its dissolution was therefore urgently necessary. He hoped that the Committee would agree to recommend the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda.

34. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) supported the United States proposal that the item should be included in the agenda as sub-item (c) of item 33.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any formal objection, he would take it that the Committee recommended to the General Assembly the inclusion of the item in its agenda.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" should be included in the agenda.*

36. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the United States representative had formally proposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda as sub-item (c) of item 33.

37. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom) said he agreed with the United States representative that the submission of the so-called additional item was simply a procedural tactic.

38. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America) said, with regard to the statement made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, that his delegation's proposal related only to the item to which the question might be linked.

39. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said he did not think that it was absolutely essential to include the question in the agenda as a separate item, as the General Assembly could decide, when considering the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, whether or not it wished to renew the Commission's mandate. Although it was a principle of his delegation not to oppose the inclusion of a question in the agenda, it believed that it would be best to deal with it as sub-item (c) of item 33.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any formal objection, he would take it that the Committee recommended to the General Assembly that the question should become sub-item (c) of item 33 and that it should be allocated to the First Committee.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" should become sub-item (c) of item 33 of the agenda and that it should be allocated to the First Committee.*

*Mr. Huot Sambath (Cambodia) withdrew.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/6832/Rev.1)

41. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan) said that the explanatory memorandum accompanying the note by the

Secretary-General (A/6832/Rev.1) referred to "an important question of principle...concerning the privileges and immunities specified in Article 105 of the Charter of the United Nations and section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations". He would like the Secretary-General to inform the members of the Committee of any other cases of actual or alleged violation of those privileges and immunities.

42. In reply to a question put by Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs), Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan) explained that his question related only to violations of section 11 of the Convention, and not all violations of the Convention as a whole which might have been committed over the past twenty years.

43. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary, Legal Counsel) said that the Secretariat had for some time been preparing a document, which it hoped to issue in 1968, giving an account of the slight differences which had been noted in the application of the Convention. That was a question for the International Law Commission and was unrelated to the question raised by the Secretary-General, which concerned only a single violation that was regarded as important. The Secretary-General did not intend to make the question a general one.

44. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said that such a question could be considered only in the light of actual cases. He did not see why the Legal Counsel had mentioned a document which would not appear until later and which would bear no relation to the subject.

45. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that he would like some information on violations of section 11 and of any other sections of the Convention.

46. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that the Committee would truly be showing discourtesy to the Secretary-General if it refused to include in the agenda the item which he was proposing. The Committee's powers called for it merely to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda and its allocation to the Sixth Committee. It would be for the latter to consider the substance of the question. The only reason the Secretary-General had requested inclusion of the item on the grounds of its urgent character was that he wished it to be considered at the present session.

47. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America) recalled that at the 170th meeting several representatives had pointed out that the immunity dealt with in the item proposed by the Secretary-General was only one among many and should be discussed within the general framework of the system of immunities. That was what had prompted the representative of Dahomey to propose that the item should be entitled "Measures aimed at implementing the privileges and immunities of representatives of Member States to the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations and to conferences convened by the United Nations and the obligations of States concerning the protection of diplomatic personnel and property" (170th meeting, para. 11). The United States delegation could support that proposal and did not think

that the Secretary-General would have any objection if the item he was proposing was discussed as part of a broader question. The latter could be entitled "Question of diplomatic privileges and immunities" and could be divided into two sub-items, one of which would bear the title proposed by the Secretary-General and the other the title proposed by the delegation of Dahomey. His delegation hoped that that idea would meet with the unanimous approval of the Committee; it supported the Secretary-General's proposal that the item should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

48. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that the item should not be restricted to the incident mentioned in the Secretary-General's explanatory memorandum. There were other instances of violations of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, such as the treatment of United Nations personnel in the Gaza Strip and the occupation of Jerusalem House by the Israelis, which came within the purview of the item proposed by the Secretary-General.

49. The question which had to be decided first, however, was whether the Committee was empowered to amend the wording of an item which it was recommending for inclusion in the agenda. He himself was convinced that the Committee was fully competent to take such action. It had, moreover, done so in the past in the case of items proposed by Member States. In any event, any text which it worked out would be merely a recommendation to be submitted to the General Assembly, which could accept it or reject it. The various formulas proposed, including the one proposed by the United States delegation and those put forward at the 170th meeting by the French and Dahomean delegations, would surely help to reaffirm the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, which must be safeguarded in their entirety.

50. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the item in question had to do with a specific immunity of rather limited scope which it was important to discuss; its reaffirmation would therefore be very timely. The formula proposed by the United States delegation had the effect of adding a further question which was completely distinct since it had to do with immunities under the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Combining the two questions could only confuse matters and divert the discussion from the problem raised by the Secretary-General in his explanatory memorandum. It would therefore be advisable to retain the title proposed by the Secretary-General (A/6832/Rev.1).

51. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said he was pleased to note that the discussion had been broadened by the statements made at the 170th meeting by the French and Dahomean representatives and that the Committee had turned from a political question to the legal problem of privileges and immunities, which affected all Member States. The question should be dealt with in that way, namely, in the context of international law, the problem raised by the Secretary-General being taken up first and then the over-all question of privileges and immunities. His delegation felt that the Committee was empowered to



amend the wording of an item, and it was prepared to support the formula proposed by the United States representative.

52. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said he agreed with the Jordanian representative that the Committee must first decide whether it could amend the wording of an item proposed for inclusion in the agenda. Rules 40 and 21 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly were silent on that point; they provided merely that the Committee should consider the provisional agenda and the requests for the inclusion of additional items and that it should make recommendations and prepare a report. His delegation supported the formula proposed by the United States delegation as far as its substance was concerned; from a procedural standpoint, however, he did not think that the Committee was competent to amend the title of an item in that manner without the author's consent.

53. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he shared the Ecuadorian delegation's doubts with regard to the Committee's competence. There was no reason to believe, after the consultations which had been held with the Secretary-General, that the latter was willing to see changes made in the wording of the item which he had proposed.

54. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America) said it was his understanding that in the course of the consultations the Secretary-General had not said that he would be opposed to an amendment which left the wording of the proposed item intact.

55. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) observed that rule 40 of the rules of procedure could be interpreted more broadly than the Ecuadorian representative had done. There had been cases in the past in which the Committee had amended the wording of items which it was recommending for inclusion in the agenda. At the current session, for example, the Tanzanian delegation had proposed at the 166th meeting a major

change in the title of an item and it had been approved by the Committee without consulting the author. He believed that his interpretation was the same as that of the Secretary-General; during the consultations which had been held, the latter had said that while he would prefer to see his own suggested wording retained the Committee could amend it if it wished.

56. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs) said the Secretary-General had indicated that he wished to see the present wording retained and that the Committee was obviously free to recommend or reject the request for inclusion of the item but only in the form in which it had been proposed.

57. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said he agreed with the Ecuadorian representative that the Committee was not empowered to amend the wording of an item. To do so would mean setting a dangerous precedent and distorting the rules of procedure in order to justify a political position under the pretext that legal considerations were involved.

58. At the 170th meeting, however, the Secretary-General's representative had proposed a formula similar to the one which the Committee had recently used for the Korean question. The Committee would recommend the inclusion of an additional item which was divided into two sub-items; the item proposed by the Secretary-General would be retained in its present form as the first sub-item, and the second sub-item would cover any additional item which a Member State might wish to propose for inclusion in the agenda.

59. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should rise in order to permit the delegations to hold consultations and that the Committee should resume consideration of the question on a date which would be duly announced.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 8.5 p.m.*