



Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

*Organization of work (continued)*

1. Mr. LUTEM (Secretary of the Committee) said that the summary of the 1804th meeting given in the *Journal* of the United Nations of 2 December 1970 did not mention the Senegalese representative's motion for the closure of the debate on the organization of work. The omission would be rectified.
2. Mr. PAOLINI (France), speaking on a point of order, said it was regrettable that the Committee's debates were not always conducted in a proper atmosphere of dignity and seriousness. In that connexion, he recalled that at the beginning of the current session he had observed that the Committee tended to follow unfortunate practices in procedural matters and had expressed the hope that such practices would be abandoned in favour of stricter application of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He had at the time promised his delegation's co-operation in achieving that goal. In that spirit, and with the sole purpose of assisting the Chairman, he formally moved the closure of the procedural debate on the organization of work, on the understanding that seven of the remaining meetings would be devoted to consideration of the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (item 46), as had been decided at the beginning of the session. A decision on how to dispose of the other agenda items, which were less controversial and difficult, could be left until a later stage.
3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) agreed that procedural debates were usually interminable and unproductive and that the substantive questions should be taken up as soon as possible, but opposed the French representative's motion because he did not see how the other agenda items could be dealt with adequately if seven meetings were allocated to item 46. In any event, it was his understanding that the motion for the closure of the debate related only to the discussion on the procedure for item 46 and he reserved the right to speak later on the way in which the other agenda items should be taken up.
4. The fact that a question was deferred from one session to the next and was given priority had no great significance, since there had been numerous instances in which no attention had been paid to that instruction; for example, consideration of the question of freedom of information had repeatedly been adjourned although it had been termed a matter of priority. Moreover, the rules of procedure should not be regarded as being more than provisional in nature; it should be borne in mind that day-to-day practice created precedents and that, as in some parliamentary systems, such precedents might be more important than written rules. The Committee should not therefore plunge headlong into a debate on the creation of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights, giving precedence to that question merely because it interested certain major Powers, without first establishing a certain balance in the allocation of the remaining fourteen meetings to the items still to be considered.
5. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) observed that the Committee had two motions before it: a motion for the closure of the procedural debate and a motion to allocate seven meetings to item 46. His delegation opposed the first motion. With regard to the second, it wished to propose an amendment to the effect that the Committee should allocate seven meetings to the question of the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and five to the report of the Economic and Social Council (item 12) and the question of housing, building and planning (item 48).

*The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 43 votes to 29, with 18 abstentions.*
6. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on a point of order, recalled that at the previous meeting the Chairman had made a suggestion concerning the allocation of the remaining fourteen meetings to the agenda items still to be considered. As he understood it, that suggestion had priority over any other proposal which might be made on the question.
7. Mr. SATHE (India) pointed out that, if the motion to allocate seven meetings to item 46 and the amendment to allocate five other meetings to items 12 and 48 were adopted, virtually all the remainder of the current session would be used for consideration of only three items.
8. Mr. PAOLINI (France) pointed out that the Committee had decided to close the debate on the organization of work. It was therefore not in order to continue to discuss the question, and a vote should immediately be taken on the Pakistan oral amendment and the motion concerning the allocation of meetings to item 46.
9. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as he had understood it, only a motion for the closure of the debate had been adopted. At the previous meeting, the Chairman had made a suggestion concerning all the agenda items which had not yet been considered; a vote must first be taken on that suggestion.
10. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said it had already been obvious at the previous meeting that the Chairman's

suggestion would give rise to controversy; it would therefore be better to put the Pakistan proposal to the vote.

11. Mr. SATHE (India) considered that adoption of the motion for the closure of the debate did not mean that a decision had been taken automatically to keep the established agenda. The Committee must decide how many meetings would be allocated to each item. In that connexion, he did not agree with the French representative that seven meetings should be allocated to item 46; the French proposal had given rise to a Pakistan amendment to the effect that five meetings should be allocated to the report of the Economic and Social Council and the question of housing, building and planning. He wished in turn to propose, as an amendment to the Pakistan oral amendment, that only four meetings should be allocated to item 46 and the remaining meetings should be divided between the items of most importance.

12. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. PAOLINI (France) took part, the Chairman suggested that the meeting should be suspended in order to enable delegations to hold consultations and agree on a solution that was acceptable to all.

*The meeting was suspended at 12 noon and resumed at 12.50 p.m.*

13. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) formally moved, under rules 117 and 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that consideration of item 46 should be adjourned until the next session.

14. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that the Committee had before it a motion by France and an amendment thereto proposed orally by Pakistan. Since the procedural debate had been closed, the French motion and the Pakistan amendment should be put to the vote. It was clear from the rules of procedure that a vote must be taken immediately.

15. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) agreed with the United States representative that the Committee should vote on the French motion and the Pakistan amendment; the motion of the Soviet Union could not be put to the vote, since discussion of item 46 had not yet begun.

16. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the closure of the debate could be interpreted in various ways. In his opinion, the debate related only to the organization of work in connexion with item 46. In any case, before deciding whether to consider item 46 at the current session, the Committee had to decide how it would organize the consideration of the remaining items on the agenda in an orderly and systematic manner.

17. Mr. SATHE (India) said that the Committee still did not know what ruling the Chairman would give on the motion of the Soviet Union; in his opinion, a ruling was necessary, because under rule 120(c) of the rules of procedure, that motion would have precedence. If the Chairman ruled that the Soviet Union motion was out of order, a vote would first have to be taken on the amendment submitted by the Indian delegation to the Pakistan amendment.

18. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to clarify the meaning of his motion, which was clearly admissible. He had formally moved the adjournment of the debate on item 46, so that the Committee could decide at the proper time on the procedure to be followed in that connexion. That motion had precedence, according to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

19. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that the Committee was not discussing the motion presented by the Soviet Union delegation. The Committee had already decided to close the debate, and the motion of the French representative and the amendment proposed by Pakistan were very clear. Members of the Committee who did not want item 46 to be considered could vote against the French motion; if it was rejected, the Indian proposal could be considered, which was in fact designed to replace an earlier proposal and would therefore be tantamount to reopening the debate that the Committee had decided to close. There was no reason to prolong matters and the Committee must take a decision on the motion of the French representative.

20. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) asked for clarification. He understood that consultations had been held to arrive at a solution, but, if there was no consensus, the Legal Counsel should give an opinion on the subject.

21. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) withdrew his amendment to the motion of the French representative.

22. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked the French representative to submit his motion in writing and added that he wished to submit, as his own amendment to that motion, the suggestion made by the Chairman at the previous meeting concerning the organization of work. However, if the Legal Counsel felt that it would be preferable to resubmit that idea as a proposal, instead of an amendment, his delegation was willing to facilitate the work of the Committee and submit a proposal, which then would have precedence.

23. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that the situation was very complex in that it involved various separate procedural questions. In addition, the motion presented by the Soviet Union delegation under rule 117 of the rules of procedure complicated the situation even more. It was the responsibility of the Chairman to rule on whether such a motion was in order after the closure of the debate. Perhaps the delegations concerned should hold informal consultations to seek an acceptable solution.

24. After a procedural discussion, in which Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), Mr. PAOLINI (France), Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. GOUAMBA (People's Republic of the Congo), Mr. OLDS (United States of America), Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) and Mr. BOYE (Senegal) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested the delegations concerned should forgather before the afternoon meeting to consider the problem and try to find an acceptable solution.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*