

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**TWENTY-FIRST SESSION**

**Official Records**



**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 164th  
MEETING**

*Saturday, 24 September 1966,  
at 9.50 a.m.*

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the twenty-first session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Request for the inclusion of three additional items in the agenda: items proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .</i>	<b>13</b>

**Chairman: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ**  
(Afghanistan).

Consideration of the agenda of the twenty-first session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/166 and Add.1) (*continued*)

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF THREE ADDITIONAL ITEMS IN THE AGENDA: ITEMS PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/6397, A/6398, A/6399)

1. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the three additional items proposed by his delegation were of an important and urgent character. The reasons for proposing them were to be found in the statement made by Mr. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, at the 1413th plenary meeting of the General Assembly and in the explanatory memoranda submitted to the Committee (A/6397, A/6398 and A/6399). He proposed that the items, if approved, should be allocated to the First Committee.

2. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) said that members of the General Committee had not learnt of the Soviet Union's intention to propose the three additional items until the previous day, and had not seen the letters requesting their inclusion until the day of the meeting. It was not the practice of his delegation to oppose the consideration of any important item, and it would not do so in the present case. It wished to express a reservation, however, about the procedure followed, which was not very convenient either for the Committee or for the Assembly as a whole. While the items, which had a certain familiarity, did not need lengthy consideration, there was nothing so urgent about them that they could not have been put forward earlier.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure followed was consistent with the General Assembly's rules of procedure, specifically rule 15. The convenience of the Committee was a factor to be taken into account, but the primary consideration must be the progress of the Assembly's work as a whole.

4. Mr. NABRIT (United States of America) said that his delegation had misgivings about approving requests for the inclusion of items which it had not had time to consider properly. The items proposed appeared to relate to questions which had been before the Assembly in one form or another on previous occasions, and it was difficult to see how they could suddenly have occurred to the delegation proposing them.

5. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that all delegations had had ample opportunity to follow the proceedings in the Assembly during the past few days and thus to acquaint themselves with the reasons for the proposal of three new items. The related draft resolutions had been available to delegations the previous day as annexes to the text of the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR—which had been circulated as a press release—even if not as official documents. The subjects in question, moreover, had been dealt with at length in the United States Press. All three items were urgent international issues meriting inclusion in the agenda.

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to voice its recommendations regarding the inclusion of the first additional item requested by the Soviet Union: "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty" (A/6397).

7. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that the procedure followed with respect to the Soviet Union's requests was correct and reasonable. The three questions were familiar, and the Committee should thus be able to decide on them promptly and without difficulty. The first item related to resolution 2131 (XX) adopted by the Assembly in 1965, and to check on its implementation would be logical. In his delegation's view, indeed, such a check should be a recurrent item.

8. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) said his delegation believed that any Member should be able to introduce an important or urgent item for consideration by the Assembly, and would therefore support the Soviet Union's first request. That in no way prejudged its position on the substance of the matter.

9. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that his delegation was in favour of approving all proposals for the inclusion of items unless there were good reasons for not doing so. It therefore supported the Soviet Union's proposal in the present case.

10. Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) said that the situation existing in the world a year after the adoption of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty showed that it

was urgently necessary to inquire into its implementation and bring its contents to the notice of certain Powers. As regards the procedure followed, he associated himself with the remarks made by the representatives of Hungary and Iraq.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty."*

11. Mr. NABRIT (United States of America) said that he had no substantive objection to the Soviet representative's proposal that the item just approved should be allocated to the First Committee. He wished to point out, however, that, on a similar occasion at the twentieth session, a certain time had been allowed for delegations to ponder the question of allocation. With reference to the remarks made by the representative of Hungary, he observed that the basis for the Committee's proceedings was its official documents and not statements in the United States Press.

12. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the previous session the item relating to the Declaration had been allocated without controversy to the First Committee and had been successfully dealt with by it. There could be no logical reason for departing from that procedure in the case of the closely related item just approved.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty" should be allocated to the First Committee.*

13. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to express its recommendations regarding the inclusion in the agenda of the second additional item requested by the Soviet Union (A/6398) and its allocation.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Renunciation by States of actions hampering the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" should be included in the agenda and allocated to the First Committee.*

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to express its recommendations regarding the inclusion in the agenda of the third additional item requested by the Soviet Union (A/6399) and its allocation.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and*

*Latin America" should be included in the agenda and allocated to the First Committee.*

15. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) observed that the First Committee already had item 26 concerning non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on its agenda. It might be a good idea to combine it with the one just approved.

16. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the new item related to aspects of non-proliferation which had been little discussed. It was broader in scope than the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/6390), which was the subject of the earlier item. It therefore deserved separate consideration. In any case, the matter was one for the First Committee to decide.

17. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said that under rule 40 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure the powers of the General Committee were limited to recommending the approval or rejection of requests for the inclusion of items or the postponement of their consideration to a future session. It had no power to decide how the Committees to which items were allocated should deal with them; that was the prerogative of the Committees themselves. It should be noted, moreover, that all the first four items on the agenda of the First Committee related to the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, so that to combine just one of them with an item not so related might create difficulties.

18. Mr. NABRIT (United States of America) said that he was in general in favour of combining the two items on non-proliferation. He was impressed, however, by the previous speaker's argument that a decision to do so was the prerogative of the First Committee. It was not clear why a new item was necessary; the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (see A/6399) in connexion with its proposal could equally well have been considered under the existing item. While his Government had not had time to consider the draft resolution, there seemed to be much to commend it. His delegation would not only support it, but would be able to co-sponsor it and would hope that others might also consider co-sponsorship.

19. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) said that he did not fully share the Ecuadorian representative's views about the respective competence of the First Committee and the General Committee. In the circumstances, however, he would not press his suggestion.

*The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.*