



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>) Fourth report of the General Committee	1
Agenda item 16: Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council	2
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>) Fourth report of the General Committee	3

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

FOURTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/9200/ADD.3)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Assembly to the fourth report of the General Committee, which appears in document A/9200/Add.3 and deals with the organization of the twenty-eighth regular session of the General Assembly. As will be seen, it concerns the time-table of meetings of the Assembly. At its 210th meeting, held on 12 October, the General Committee decided, by 17 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions, to recommend that the General Assembly adopt the time-table proposed for its plenary meetings and the meetings of the General Committee during the week beginning 15 October 1973. I now invite the Assembly to consider the report submitted by the General Committee.

2. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): One small point of clarification. Are we to take it that at this afternoon's plenary meeting we shall have only one statement—that is, from the sponsor of agenda item 102—as I think was agreed at the 210th meeting of the General Committee? We do not yet have the summary record of that meeting, but I think it will bear out what I have said. Could I have clarification of that point, Mr. President?

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In summarizing the debate held in the General Committee on 12 October, I ventured to draw to the attention of members what might be called almost a compromise between opposing opinions. After my statement, the General Committee

decided by vote that, at this afternoon's meeting, we would take up the item submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union, hear his statement introducing the item and then allow time for delegations to study it and send it to their respective Governments, and that we would wait until their technical advisers were present before proceeding to the consideration of the item *per se*. It was agreed—at least that was my understanding—that what had been accepted was the presentation of the item and that the debate proper would start at a later day, to be fixed by the Assembly itself. That was my understanding of the proposal as it was voted on.

4. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): We understood from the discussion of this matter in the General Committee that today, 15 October, or tomorrow, 16 October, one meeting would be set aside for the Soviet Union to introduce this item to the Assembly. You have rightly noted that the Committee had in mind that many delegations had stated that their disarmament experts were not yet present so that they required time to study the matter and we should await the arrival of those experts for the discussion of the question of disarmament in the First Committee. The Committee also had in mind that there had earlier been a special decision of the General Committee to the effect that discussion of this new Soviet proposal in plenary meetings should not coincide with the discussion of disarmament matters in the First Committee. All that was taken into account. However, the General Committee none the less decided by an overwhelming majority of votes—only 1 against and 3 abstentions—to give the Soviet delegation the opportunity to introduce this item to the Assembly on either 15 or 16 October. That was our understanding of the General Committee's decision. The item has been included in the Assembly's agenda for today. We shall make a statement and present this item to the Assembly, setting forth in detail the substance of the proposal and how we think it can be put into effect should the Assembly adopt it. At the same time, I did not understand the General Committee's decision to mean that no one else would have the right to speak at this afternoon's meeting of the Assembly, that, as it were, the mouths of all other delegations would be stopped. If any delegation expresses the wish to speak or make a comment, could it really be, Mr. President, that you would not grant it the opportunity to do so? It was also agreed that this item would not be discussed in the General Assembly until the middle of November. That is my understanding of our agreement in the General Committee. But if, after my statement—that is after the statement of the Soviet delegation at today's plenary meeting—anyone expresses the desire to speak, why should we place a taboo on that? That is exactly how I understand the agreement in the General Committee.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Of course, this problem is before the Assembly. There was a request for clarification; a clarification was given. We now have an interpretation, namely, that the actual debate will not start, although some other representatives may wish to speak this afternoon. I think it would be the Assembly which would decide on this point.

6. I wonder whether we could adopt the report of the General Committee and this afternoon consider whether or not we should allow other representatives to speak.

7. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I find some difficulty about that because I think it is merely putting off a discussion of this point. After all, we are now approving a report of the General Committee and I think other members of the General Assembly as well as members of the General Committee would want to be sure what it is they are approving.

8. I do not know whether we could ask the Under-Secretary-General if he has with him an advance copy of the summary record of the General Committee's 210th meeting, but I think that the summary record would bear out the fact that a compromise proposal was made suggesting the procedure which you yourself, Mr. President, summarized in response to my request for clarification.

9. Mr. MORSE (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs): The summary record is not available, Mr. President. I have asked the Translation Section, where the summary record is produced, to inform us whether we can have the *précis*-writers' notes. I should have a report on that in a matter of minutes.

10. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I do not see the need for these notes or why we should complicate this question. The Soviet delegation is not insisting that other delegations must obligatorily speak after us. But if anybody does wish to speak, will the United Kingdom representative really shut that delegation's mouth and the General Assembly agree with that? I merely wish to ask. This is a most important aspect of established practice and of the democratic process for the consideration of items in United Nations bodies. All the more so as only one meeting will be set aside for the introduction of this item. Why is the United Kingdom representative so afraid that someone may ask for the floor after the Soviet delegation's statement to explain his position or to express his opinion? I can see nothing seditious in this. Why is the United Kingdom representative so agitated about the possibility that events may develop in this way in the Assembly, at this afternoon's meeting? After this, there will be an interval for delegations to study this problem. By that time, as I have already pointed out, the experts will have arrived and, as agreed in the General Committee, the Assembly will take up consideration of this item in mid-November. But meanwhile, the Soviet delegation invites all delegations to hold consultations. We appeal especially to the group of non-aligned countries and to the action group of these countries in the United Nations, headed by the representative of Algeria, to form a contact group for this purpose, as has been done in the past. If other regional groups also wish to form their own contact groups, that

would be very useful to us all so that we could hold consultations during that period, produce a mutually acceptable draft resolution and, on the basis of that resolution, continue the discussion and adopt a decision acceptable to all. This is a normal process and there will be no cause for alarm if the President gives the floor this afternoon to any representative after the statement by the Soviet delegation. Why should we complicate the matter? Such action is completely incomprehensible and inappropriate.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would venture to suggest to the Assembly the following procedure: that until the Secretariat receives the summary record that has been requested we should proceed to the second item on our agenda for this meeting and revert to this item after we have concluded the election of non-permanent members of the Security Council.

12. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I apologize for speaking a third time but, as past experience has shown, summary records do not always fully reflect the positions of delegations. After all, they are not verbatim records. We should bear that in mind, too.

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is my understanding that the representative of the Soviet Union is not opposed to our proceeding for the moment to the consideration of the second item on the agenda for this meeting, and then reverting to the first item. As I hear no comments, we shall proceed in that way.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

14. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning the Assembly is to elect five non-permanent members of the Security Council to replace the following outgoing members, whose term of office expires on 31 December 1973: Guinea, India, Panama, Sudan and Yugoslavia. Those five countries cannot be re-elected and their names therefore must not appear on the ballot papers.

15. Apart from the five permanent members, the Security Council will have as members in 1974: Australia, Austria, Indonesia, Kenya and Peru. Therefore the names of those States also should not appear on the ballot papers.

16. Of the five non-permanent members which will remain in office in 1974, two are from Africa and Asia, one from Latin America and two from Western European and other States. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 3 of resolution 1991 A (XVIII) of 17 December 1963, the non-permanent members to be elected should be made up as follows: three from Africa and Asia, one from Eastern Europe and one from Latin America.

17. I shall now call in the representative of Jordan on a point of order, before we proceed to the vote.

18. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): In my capacity as chairman of the Asian group of States for the month of October I

should like to inform the General Assembly that this group has endorsed the candidature of Iraq for election as a non-permanent member of the Security Council.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mauritius on a point of order.

20. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I wish to announce to you, Sir, and to members of this Assembly that the two official candidates of Africa are Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon. Both have the full support of the African group of States.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure, the election shall be carried out by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations. I request representatives to use only the ballot papers that have been distributed and to write on them the names of the five Member States for which they wish to vote. As I have indicated, the ballot papers should not include the names of the five permanent members, the five outgoing non-permanent members or the five countries that are already non-permanent members of the Council for 1974. Any ballot paper containing more than five names will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sithimolada (Laos) and Mr. Bellizzi (Malta) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

22. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from Spanish*): If there is no objection, I propose that the meeting be suspended for 20 minutes while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 11.35 a.m. and resumed at 12 noon.

23. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The result of the voting for the election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	125
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	125
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	125
<i>Required majority:</i>	84

Number of votes obtained:

Mauritania	120
United Republic of Cameroon	120
Iraq	116
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic ...	112
Costa Rica	104
Cuba	5
Jamaica	3
Romania	2
Honduras	1
Iran	1
Libyan Arab Republic	1

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Iraq, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, having obtained the required two-thirds majority, were elected

non-permanent members of the Security Council for a two-year period beginning on 1 January 1974.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I congratulate the countries which have just been elected non-permanent members of the Security Council and I thank the tellers for their assistance in this election.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

FOURTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/9200/ADD.3)

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the light of my summary of the position on 12 October in the General Committee, I thought we had agreed that the Soviet Union would be given the floor at the meeting this afternoon to introduce item 102. But I saw no reason why others should not speak if they wanted to do so. In other words, the situation was not entirely clear. Since in a few minutes we shall be having a meeting of the General Committee, I should like to know if it would be possible—since there are doubts about the interpretation to be given to the report—to take the matter up again in the General Committee and then submit it tomorrow to the General Assembly.

26. If there are no observations, we shall reconsider this question in the General Committee, in order to clarify the matter.

27. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): There is no need to postpone the decision on this matter and to complicate it by referring it back to the General Committee. The Soviet delegation does not intend to carry things to the point of inflaming passions over this problem. We are not insisting that somebody must necessarily speak. And I think that the General Assembly will agree with this. Thus, if nobody wishes to speak, or delegations are not ready, as many of them have told us in the General Committee and in private conversations, we shall limit ourselves to our own statement, and I therefore feel that there is no need to complicate this matter by taking it back to the General Committee once again.

28. Let us rely on your judgement and decision, Mr. President. You are the most authoritative person in the General Assembly and whatever decision you may take about the conduct of the Assembly's affairs, we shall follow it. Let us leave this to your judgement. We are not insisting on anything. We shall take it that the Soviet delegation will have an opportunity to speak at the next meeting in order to introduce this item at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

29. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his expression of confidence in me.

30. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I think that we are having a storm in a teacup on this question. It is purely a question of procedure. Whatever decision the General Committee has taken, it need not be binding on the General

Assembly. We are the masters of our own procedure. That has been the rule ever since the United Nations was founded.

31. It so happens that a Member State has submitted an item, and it has been discussed in the General Committee. Here, it is our duty to ratify or to reject unconditionally. Whatever decision was taken by the General Committee, it is not necessarily binding on us.

32. Of course I defend, as anyone should, the right of any member who wants to have an item included in the agenda to go through the usual procedure. Therefore, why postpone the question? There is an Arabic proverb which says, "It is better to sell something than to have a mortgage on it." Why delay the pain, so to speak, or the argument until Wednesday? It is still early and you, Mr. President, are a stickler for efficiency.

33. Ambassador Malik wants to speak; Ambassador Jamieson may elect to be silent. The question is asked, Who are the speakers? With all due respect to my colleague from the United Kingdom, I wonder why he is probing about speakers. Why is he trying to find out who is going to speak and who is not going to speak? All that is beside the point.

34. I formally propose that we now, forthwith, either include the item or reject it—regardless of whether or not any of those who have spoken in the General Committee would like to do so again. We are not at all bound by any decision taken in the General Committee. I think, therefore, that it would be wise for us to vote and dispose of this question.

35. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Saudi Arabia is quite right; it is the Assembly that must decide on recommendations of the General Committee. My suggestion was merely that we should go back to the General Committee because there were some doubts about the meaning of its report. That is only a suggestion. The matter is fully and completely before the General Assembly, the body with the power to decide.

36. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation cannot agree with the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. The Chinese delegation has already made clear its position on agenda item 102 at a previous meeting of the General Committee, that is: we are strongly opposed to discussing, as a matter of priority, the item proposed by the Soviet representative.

37. Before a previous meeting of the General Committee, the Chairman had arranged consultations with members of the General Committee concerning the request by the Soviet Union. The majority of the members did not agree with the request of the Soviet representative and, after that, the Chairman called a meeting on 12 October. At the General Committee's 210th meeting on 12 October, the Soviet representative proposed that this item should be discussed as a matter of priority. That still did not receive the support of the majority of the members. Afterwards, Mr. Malik changed his position and proposed that the Soviet representative should be allowed to introduce this item in the General Assembly. The majority of the members of the

General Committee, making allowance for the request of the Soviet Union representative, arrived at a compromise, that is, that at the next meeting of the General Assembly only the Soviet representative would be given the floor to introduce this item.

38. Just now we heard in the Chairman's statement that he has reconfirmed that decision. There is no reason whatsoever to change the General Committee's decision.

39. Unfortunately, the report of the General Committee to the General Assembly did not accurately reflect the decision made in the previous General Committee meeting, which was that only the Soviet representative was to be given the floor to introduce item 102 at the next General Assembly meeting.

40. The statement just made by the Soviet representative is tantamount to turning this afternoon's meeting into a discussion in a disguised form of this Soviet Union item as a matter of priority. This totally contradicts the decision made at the 210th meeting of the General Committee and breaches the good faith of the Soviet delegation. The Chinese delegation cannot agree with this request by the Soviet representative, which was also rejected by the majority of the countries in the last General Committee meeting.

41. Since the report of the General Committee does not accurately reflect the actual state of affairs at the last meeting of the General Committee, and if the Soviet representative insists on changing the decision made then, then that is tantamount to changing the organization of the procedure of the whole General Assembly.

42. Under these circumstances, the Chinese delegation would like to request that this proposal made by the Soviet representative be sent back to the General Committee to be re-examined there.

43. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I am afraid I started something off by seeking clarification of this paragraph of the report of the General Committee. I had a very clear understanding of what we had agreed in the General Committee and I think it was an understanding which was shared by you, Mr. President.

44. However, if Ambassador Malik feels it essential that in presenting his proposal this afternoon he should be supported by a parade of his associates, if he thinks it right to vary the recommendation of the General Committee and, as the representative of Saudi Arabia has said and as you have ruled, Sir, the Assembly in any case has the right to vary a recommendation of the General Committee—then my delegation, for its part, would not wish to stand in his way.

45. Mind you, we do not think it is a very sensible way of setting about the discussion of what is presumably intended to be a serious subject. If it were intended purely, shall we say, as a propaganda item—and I hope you will notice, Mr. President, my use of the conditional tense, even of the subjunctive tense—then possibly this would be a good way of setting about it: have a great parade of representatives speaking on one side and hit the headlines and so on. But we had thought that this had been introduced as a serious

subject and that it would be debated properly. Now "debate" means that you get both sides of an argument running at the same time. We had thought that, to make it a serious debate, some of those who share the views of the Soviet Union on this proposal would wish to listen to views expressed on it before speaking.

46. However, having said that, let me repeat that I do not object to the meeting this afternoon being prolonged so as to hear other speakers. Perhaps a vote on this is not necessary, and still less is it necessary to refer it back to the General Committee. If there were a vote, of course I would abstain, because I think this is not what the General Committee recommended. But I am not going to object, Mr. President.

47. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I thought that what we were discussing now was the time-table for plenary meetings of the General Assembly. The decision of the General Committee seems to have given rise to different interpretations and some confusion. One thing should be absolutely clear to all members: if the General Assembly wishes to vary any recommendation of the General Committee it has the absolute right to do so without referring the matter back to the General Committee. We can make our own interpretation regardless of what the views of a minority or a majority in the General Committee were.

48. We seem to forget that we should make the best use of the time and facilities the Organization places at our disposal. A meeting has been fixed for 3 o'clock and to suggest that it was fixed just to enable Ambassador Malik to present a proposal but that everybody else should be muzzled is contrary not only to logic but also to the unwritten rule of procedure that no one should be muzzled.

49. We stated in the General Committee that we welcomed an opportunity being given to Ambassador Malik to introduce the item at the earliest possible date so that we would be informed of its content and merits and be able to refer back to our Government for instructions. As we said, we would not be able to participate immediately for lack of a full understanding of the content, the purpose and the merits of the item.

50. I do not share the Sunday-school-preacher attitude adopted by my friend the representative of the United Kingdom. If there are others who wish to support the proposal and to give their own interpretations of it, then all the better for us because we shall be still better informed of the content of the proposal, and I think it would advance the work of the Assembly if we adopted that attitude.

51. I would suggest, Mr. President, that your interpretation was correct—that is, that mere reference to the introduction of the item by the delegation of the Soviet Union did not preclude others from speaking if they wished to do so in support—whether for purposes of propaganda or for purposes of a parade, as some would like to suggest—and that those wishing to speak after the Soviet Union has introduced the item should be allowed to do so.

52. Mr. OGBU (Nigeria): My delegation has listened carefully to the discussion and it is quite clear to us that there is

no need for any controversy over this. We have listened to the representative of the Soviet Union, who has said—and I stand to be corrected if I heard him wrongly, perhaps through the interpretation from Russian into English—that he was not insisting that anyone else speak after the topic has been introduced this afternoon. He also mentioned in fact the resumption of the debate some time in mid-November. So I am at a loss as to why there should be apprehension on the part of some delegations that there might be some speakers this afternoon. If there are, so what? They are entitled to speak, and I would suggest that the matter be left entirely at your discretion, Mr. President. The item is already included on the agenda of the plenary meeting this afternoon and we should leave it entirely in your hands to decide whether there should be more speakers or no speakers after the subject has been introduced.

53. I think the representative of the Soviet Union has been very clear, and we must, as the representative of Sri Lanka has said, be guided by the fact that no delegation should be muzzled and if any delegation wishes to speak after the introduction of the subject, that would not preclude it from speaking again at a later date, when the full debate takes place.

54. My delegation would appeal to you, Mr. President, to bring this discussion to a close, as the General Committee still has to meet after this plenary meeting.

55. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): As a member of the General Committee I feel obliged to clarify a certain issue, because we heard a little while ago a somewhat distorted explanation of what happened at our 210th meeting. I am sorry we do not have the record of the meeting here, but we did not discuss anything about priorities, about which item should have priority. We discussed only with what item the work of the General Assembly should begin, and the Soviet representative—as all members of the General Committee will recall—stated that if there should be something more urgent he would defer to it, but if not he would like to explain and introduce his item. We voted upon a proposal to give him the opportunity of explaining the item.

56. Then, of course, it would be completely undemocratic, if someone else felt he would like to speak after the Soviet representative, to refuse to allow him to do so. I completely agree with the representatives of Sri Lanka and Nigeria that that is only a matter of democracy and fair procedure: if somebody else wishes to speak after the Soviet representative, he should be allowed to do so.

57. To the representative of the United Kingdom I would say that as far as I know there is going to be no parade of any kind. But it was he who stated that he would not like to have a one-sided opinion, so I think, in a democratic way, we should have the debate open and thus leave open the possibility for him to speak this afternoon, perhaps, in order to preclude a one-sided opinion.

58. What is also very interesting is that those who are now defending and explaining the decision of the General Committee did not vote in favour of it. That is just for clarification.

59. In conclusion, I think that the representatives who have spoken before me, especially those of Sri Lanka and Nigeria, are in full agreement with what I have just stated.

60. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I wanted to make things clear. But the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Ogbu, has made my task easier. I am really not insisting that there should be a discussion today in the Assembly if representatives are not ready to speak following my statement. So there is no problem. And the distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroodi, was right in characterizing the situation as a storm in a teacup. What started all this? Two delegations showed themselves to be opposed to our proposal and for that reason they are speaking out so vehemently against the granting to any other delegation of the right to speak after my statement this afternoon at the plenary meeting. They do not want to discuss this question at all. And so the British representative, true to the habit of British representatives after 27 years in the United Nations of calling everything that displeases them in Soviet proposals propaganda, once again pronounced the word "propaganda". But the truth is that this is not the most convincing argument, Mr. Jamieson. We have been hearing such flimsy arguments from our British colleagues for 27 years. As soon as the Soviet Union proposes something which Britain does not like, then it is "propaganda, Soviet propaganda". May God grant—I pray to Allah, although I am an atheist, and to God—that Britain will propagandize concrete proposals which will provide a thousand million dollars in additional assistance to the developing countries. Please, do make such propaganda; I will applaud your propaganda if you make such a proposal. So, let's not play around here with old terms, with old concepts, with the old approach about "propaganda". Let us approach the matter seriously. Our proposals are serious and I shall try this afternoon to back that up and show it to be so. I do not believe that I can convince Mr. Jamieson. I shall not even take on such a task. There is no hope of convincing someone who does not want to be convinced. Your interpretation, Mr. President, is correct: we are not insisting that anyone speak. If people are not ready, then they need not speak; nobody is twisting anyone's arm. On the basis of the General Committee's decision, the delegation of the Soviet Union has the opportunity to speak this afternoon at the plenary meeting. However, there is a question as to whether any other delegation will be deprived of the right to speak or to make a comment after this. The General Committee did not take any such prohibitive decision; indeed, it could not take such a decision. That would have conflicted with common sense, logic and the working practice of the Assembly. And that is how the matter stands. The question was not even discussed. What was discussed was whether the Soviet delegation will speak, and that is all. The Soviet delegation is not proposing anything else; it is not insisting on anything. According to the General Committee's decision, it has the opportunity to speak, it has the right to speak and I take it that the General Assembly will agree with that. And that is all. There is no other question. Furthermore, we have a sufficiently authoritative and experienced President, and in guiding our proceedings he will or will not give the floor to someone else if anyone wants to speak. As for a decision to prevent anyone at all from speaking, to stop his mouth, there has never been anything like it in the history of the United Nations. But that

is what Mr. Jamieson is proposing and that is what I cannot agree with.

61. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I would not wish to complicate your task, but I simply want to point out that, in my delegation's view, the meeting this afternoon should be devoted to item 102 of our agenda, for the introduction by Mr. Malik of his proposal. If other delegations wish to speak, they can do so; but after that meeting, the consideration of item 102 should be held over until mid-November. I thought we had agreed on this procedure at the meeting of the General Committee and I still believe that this is the most appropriate solution. If the discussion on this item is to continue, I would ask for the application of rule 119 of the rules of procedure concerning closure of a debate, and I would call for a vote on the question.

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Tunisia has asked me to apply rule 119, which relates to meetings of committees; rule 77 is the one that applies to the plenary Assembly, although they both say the same thing. I shall therefore read out rule 77, which is the applicable one. It reads as follows:

"A representative may at any time move the closure of the debate on the item under discussion, whether or not any other representative has signified his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the closure of the debate shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. If the General Assembly is in favour of the closure, the President shall declare the closure of the debate. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.

63. If any delegation wishes to oppose the motion made by the representative of Tunisia, I shall give it the floor for five minutes.

64. Mr. HUANG Hua (*translation from Chinese*): The opinion given by the Soviet and Czechoslovak representatives just now demonstrates that the intent of the Soviet representative was to have a comprehensive discussion of item 102 as a matter of priority in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. We regret that the Soviet representative should want to impose his opinion on the General Assembly. The usual practice of Soviet representatives is that if they make a proposal, then it should be discussed as a priority item. If the proposal does not receive support in the General Committee, then they resort to devious means to achieve their aim. They would attempt to use the rostrum of this Assembly to engage in propaganda. This is out-and-out propaganda, to propagandize their fraudulent stuff, and then to use that propaganda to provoke a debate, with a view to achieving the aim of starting a discussion on the item as a matter of priority. If this is not imposition, what is it? This kind of behind-the-back, underhanded manoeuvre used by the Soviet delegation is deplorable. We definitely cannot agree to the request made by the Soviet representative, because to do so would be to upset the arrangement of the procedure of the Assembly. This would force many delegations to enter into the discussion before they are well prepared. This view was also expressed by many representatives in the General Committee. Some delegations would have to contact their Governments.

65. Since the Soviet representative insisted on his request, we hold that this is a matter that is relevant to the original report of the General Committee, which did not accurately reflect the actual substance of the decision made in the General Assembly. Therefore, we still believe that this question should be taken up in accordance with the spirit of the original decision made in the General Committee. This is not to limit the right of speech of any representative; it is only to facilitate the discussion in an orderly and serious way, so that the proceedings of the General Assembly will not be interfered with.

66. The Chinese delegation hopes that the delegations that are prepared to discuss this item seriously will treat this request by the Soviet representative cautiously. We should not allow the General Assembly to be led into a debate without full preparation and before the instructions of the Governments are received.

67. May I make the following request now? I should like to ask the President to clarify again the exact context of the decision made in the General Committee and afterwards the General Assembly could make a decision on whether we should respect the decision taken in the General Committee regarding this item, and put it to a vote.

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain that in accordance with rule 77 I had said I would call on two representatives wishing to oppose the motion for closure. One speaker has spoken against closure. As no one else wishes to speak against closure we shall consider that the debate is closed. The debate being closed, it is my duty to summarize the procedural situation as I have been asked to do.

69. At the time when the general debate was concluded, the duty of the President was to establish the order of, and priorities for, the continuation of the work of the General

Assembly. Rule 41 of the rules of procedure states that the General Committee

“... shall assist the President and the General Assembly in drawing up the agenda for each plenary meeting, in determining the priority of its items and in co-ordinating the proceedings of all committees of the Assembly. It shall assist the President in the general conduct of the work of the General Assembly...”.

And therefore I ventured to convene the General Committee pursuant to that rule, not to discuss an item, but to hear its opinion on the order of our work. Therefore, what is before us at this time is the time-table for our work which appears in the General Committee's report, in document A/9200/Add.3.

70. That time-table suggested that there should be a plenary meeting at 3 p.m. if possible, to hear the introduction of item 102 by the USSR delegation. That was decided in the General Committee: that we would hear the representative of the Soviet Union, after which the debate would be postponed. I think, therefore, that we cannot take up this item on Tuesday, 16 October, when there is no plenary meeting scheduled, or on Wednesday, 17 October, when we have an exceedingly important item scheduled. And in general, as the debate on disarmament items in the First Committee might coincide with the debate on such items in plenary meetings, we shall not take this matter up again until we have concluded the debate on questions of disarmament in the First Committee. As I understand it, that is the agreement that was reached, and if there is no objection I shall take it that that is indeed the case.

71. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that we have adopted the fourth report of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.