

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 148th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 19 September 1962,  
at 3.10 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Organization of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the seventeenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General . . . . .</i>	1
Item 89 . . . . .	1
Items 1 to 6 . . . . .	1
Items 7 to 19 . . . . .	2
Item 20 . . . . .	2
Items 21 to 24 . . . . .	2
Item 25 . . . . .	2
Items 26 and 27 . . . . .	2
Item 28 . . . . .	3
Item 29 . . . . .	3
Items 30 to 32 . . . . .	4
Items 33 to 40 . . . . .	4
Items 41 to 47 . . . . .	4
Items 48 to 52 . . . . .	4
Item 53 . . . . .	4
Item 54 . . . . .	4
Item 55 . . . . .	4
Items 56 to 58 . . . . .	5
Items 59 to 71 . . . . .	5
Items 72 to 75 . . . . .	5
Item 76 . . . . .	5
Items 77 and 78 . . . . .	5
Item 79 . . . . .	5
Items 80 to 83 . . . . .	5
Item 84 . . . . .	6
Item 85 . . . . .	6
Item 86 . . . . .	7
Item 87 . . . . .	8
Item 88 . . . . .	8
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventeenth session: item proposed by the Secretary-General . . . . .</i>	9
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventeenth session: item proposed by fifty-nine States . . . . .</i>	9
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventeenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .</i>	9
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventeenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .</i>	10

**Chairman:** Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN  
(Pakistan).

**Organization of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/156)**

1. The CHAIRMAN congratulated the Chairmen of the Main Committees and the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly upon their election. He hoped that the schedule of meetings suggested by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/156, paras. 2 and 3) would be followed in the organization of the seventeenth session.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the proposals contained in the Secretary-General's memorandum.*

**Consideration of the agenda of the seventeenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/157 and Add.1 and 2)**

2. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the agenda of the seventeenth session, as set out in the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/157). He asked the Committee to give its attention first to item 89 entitled "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)".

### ITEM 89

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 89 should be included in the agenda and discussed in plenary meeting on Friday, 21 September.*

### ITEMS 1 TO 6

3. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Assembly had already completed the items.

*The printed official records of the General Assembly are published in fascicle form, the record of each meeting being issued separately. In order that the fascicles may subsequently be bound in volumes by organ and session, the pagination is continuous throughout each series of records of a single body. At the end of the session, a prefatory fascicle is issued for each series containing a table of contents, an agenda and other prefatory matter. The complete list of delegations attending the session is published in the prefatory fascicle to the plenary meetings.*

*After the close of the session, collated sets of fascicles will be placed on sale for the general public.*

## ITEMS 7 TO 19

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 7 to 19 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 20

4. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Assembly had already decided to include item 20 in the agenda.

## ITEMS 21 TO 24

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 21 to 24 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 25

5. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Portugal had asked to participate in the debate. In accordance with the established practice, he would be entitled to take a seat at the Committee table.

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Garin (Portugal) took a place at the Committee table.*

6. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said that it was his understanding that, under rule 43 of the rules of procedure, only a Member State which had requested the inclusion of an item in the agenda was entitled to attend the meeting of the General Committee at which its request was discussed.

7. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) confirmed that rule 43 was explicit, and the present item had been proposed by the Secretary-General and not by Portugal.

8. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the view of the representatives of the Sudan and Guinea. The Soviet delegation was surprised that the representative of Portugal had already taken a seat at the Committee table. It formally opposed Portugal's request, which conflicted with the rules of procedure.

9. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) thought that the Chairman should rule on the preliminary question of the admissibility of Portugal's request.

10. Sir James PLIMSOLL (Australia) said that rule 43 of the rules of procedure allowed the right of automatic hearing only to a Member State which had requested the inclusion in the agenda of the item under consideration. But under its general powers the Committee could authorize a Member State to explain its position on the inclusion of an item which concerned it. To reject a request for permission to do so would be unfair and might impress the general public adversely. Moreover, it would be a dangerous precedent. Every Member State ought to be heard if it wished on an item of particular concern to it. He therefore formally moved that the Committee should grant the request of the Portuguese delegation. He was taking this stand on a question of principle and not on the merits of the item itself, since he felt he already knew the Portuguese position, and he was not going to oppose the inclusion of the item.

11. Mr. YOST (United States of America) supported the Australian motion, which conformed with the established practice. He recalled that at the sixteenth session the representative of Hungary had participated in the debate on the inclusion of the question of Hungary; nor would the United States object to hearing Hungary at the present session.

12. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) thought that the solution suggested by the representative of Guinea was wise. He suggested that, if the Chairman did not wish to rule

on the admissibility of Portugal's request, the question be put to a vote.

13. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) observed that the report of the Special Committee of Seventeen had not yet been published, and therefore wondered to what Portugal's statement could relate.

14. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) agreed with the representatives of Sudan, Jordan and Guinea. He regarded the analogy drawn by the United States representative as inapplicable.

15. Mr. KASLIWAL (India) supported the position of Sudan, Guinea and Poland. He considered the Australian representative's arguments general, and felt that they were inapplicable in the present instance. According to the rules of procedure, Portugal was not entitled to speak.

16. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that an important question of principle with political overtones was at issue. Only representatives of colonial Powers had supported Portugal's request. The United States representative's argument based on the precedent of Hungary was untenable: the Hungarian delegation had properly been allowed to oppose the inclusion of an item directed against its country, but the case of Portugal, which item 25 did not directly concern, was very different.

17. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) considered that, except in the instance specified in rule 43 of the rules of procedure, the Committee could not continue to discuss a request for a hearing if one member objected. The Guinean delegation therefore proposed that the Committee should proceed to the next item on the agenda. It would remind the Australian delegation, however, that Portugal could not be refused a hearing at the proper time in the proper body.

18. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) observed that, if the terms of rule 43 were strictly observed, Portugal's request might not be granted. In placing the emphasis on fairness, however, Australia had adduced a cogent argument. It was dangerous for any organ to refuse to hear a delegation which had asked to speak. Such a decision might lead to serious injustices.

19. The CHAIRMAN expressed the view that no provision of rule 43 prevented the Committee from granting a Member State's request to be heard. At the sixteenth session the representative of Portugal had been allowed to speak on agenda items 27, 79 and 82. Admittedly the wording of those items had indicated that Portugal was directly concerned, whereas that of the present item did not. The Committee should therefore decide the question by a vote.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote Portugal's request to be heard.

*There were 8 votes in favour, 8 against and 5 abstentions.*

21. The CHAIRMAN considered it preferable in the circumstances that Portugal should not be heard on the inclusion of item 25.

*Mr. Garin (Portugal) withdrew.*

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 25 in the agenda.*

## ITEMS 26 AND 27

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 26 and 27 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 28

22. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) congratulated the Chairman upon his election.

23. The inclusion of the Korean question in the agenda would constitute interference in the domestic jurisdiction of Korea. Moreover, since the establishment of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the situation had grown steadily worse: the country was divided and subjected to a military and fascist dictatorship, and the people were denied fundamental rights and freedoms. The crux of the problem was the foreign occupation, which threatened peace and security and was the main obstacle to the peaceful unification of the country. The reports of the United Nations Commission were mendacious and flagrantly violated the Charter. The Soviet delegation therefore strongly opposed inclusion of the item.

24. Sir James PLIMSOLL (Australia) said that it would be odd for the Assembly to refuse to discuss the report of an organ which it had itself established. On the contrary, it was bound to examine the substance of the question. Australia favoured the inclusion of the item.

25. Mr. YOST (United States of America) thought it regrettable that the USSR representative had referred to the substance of the Korean question. The report of the United Nations Commission should be considered by the Assembly as it had been in the past, and the General Committee should decide to retain the item.

26. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) considered the USSR representative's objection well-founded. The debates to which the Korean question had given rise for years had merely paralysed the efforts at democratization and unification made in Korea. Reasonable proposals for the attainment of those ends had never been considered by the United Nations Commission, which had evaded vital questions and shown itself biased. The Commission claimed to act on behalf of the United Nations but actually undermined its prestige. Romania opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda because that could not lead to a real solution of the Korean problem.

27. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) pointed out that the reports of the United Nations Commission had never helped to solve the problem. Moreover, the Commission had always been hostile to the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, and that attitude was a major obstacle. He did not wish to embark upon the substance of the question, but still believed, in spite of what the United States and Australian representatives had said, that the Commission had been set up illegally. He associated himself with the remarks made by the Romanian representative, and considered that examination of the Commission's report would merely exacerbate tempers. The Polish delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of that item in the agenda.

28. Mr. ZEA (Colombia) considered that all world problems should be discussed by the General Assembly; the problem of the unification of Korea in particular should be debated with all its implications. Moreover, the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was an organ set up by the United Nations. He noted the differences of opinion on the item, and declared that the interests of delegations could not prevail over those of the whole world. He was therefore in favour of retaining the question of Korea on the agenda.

29. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the remarks made by the representatives of Australia and the United States, said that he had been obliged to refer to the substance of the question in order to justify his position. A number of resolutions on the Korean problem had already been adopted, but the present need was for a decision conducive to international peace and security. The Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should not consider a report so sterile as that of the Commission.

30. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) said he did not want to speak on the substance, but considered that the Korean problem should be included in the agenda. The development of Korea in democratic and peaceful conditions had already been the subject of several General Assembly resolutions, and was still an aim of the United Nations.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that it was not for the General Committee to decide whether the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea no longer served a useful purpose. He called upon the Committee to vote on the inclusion of item 28 in the agenda.

*The Committee decided, by 14 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 28 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 29

32. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Portugal had asked to be heard on the question, which concerned his country directly. It was for the Committee to decide whether he should be heard, as he had been at the preceding session.

33. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) recalled that items corresponding to items 29 and 53 had been included in the agenda of the preceding session and the Portuguese delegation had expressed its views on the subject at length. The Portuguese representative could not be heard by the General Committee, since he could not invoke rule 43 of the rules of procedure; moreover, he would have an opportunity to speak in plenary. The Guinean representative therefore moved that the Committee should proceed to the next item.

34. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that no representative could speak unless his own country was being discussed. The item related to the situation in Angola, not in Portugal; to permit the Portuguese representative to speak would therefore constitute complicity with Portugal and acceptance of its acts in Angola. The Soviet delegation formally opposed the participation of the Portuguese representative in the debate.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote Portugal's request for a hearing.

*Portugal's request was granted by 11 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Garin (Portugal) took a place at the Committee table.*

36. Mr. GARIN (Portugal) deplored the insistence of the attempts to perpetuate the illegal inclusion of item 29 in the agenda. As the Portuguese delegation had already stressed on a number of occasions, attempts to include in the agenda an item entitled "The situation in Angola" flagrantly violated Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations and

conflicted with the universal principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States and of respect for their territorial integrity. The Portuguese delegation considered that the United Nations, in allowing the sovereignty of a Member State to be compromised, was exceeding its competence and thus undermining its own authority. The Portuguese Government, as many foreign visitors had testified, was sparing no effort to quicken the political, social and material advancement of the peoples of Angola. A further debate on this subject in the General Assembly could only hamper those efforts and harm the Angolans. The Portuguese Government's position remained unchanged, and, if the General Committee recommended that the item should be included in the agenda, the Portuguese delegation would, as in the past, lodge the most formal objections.

37. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) observed that the African countries were the most interested of all in the Portuguese African colonies. On their behalf he protested against Portugal's attitude, which had remained unchanged since its admission to the United Nations. He could not understand how Portugal could contest the General Assembly resolutions recognizing the Portuguese colonies as Non-Self-Governing Territories. By requesting a hearing on item 25, the Portuguese representative had implicitly admitted that his country was a colonial State.

38. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United Nations could not remain indifferent to such a situation, and could not allow a small country to obstruct the abolition of colonialism. The Soviet delegation requested that the item should be included in the agenda.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 29 in the agenda.*

*Mr. Garin (Portugal) withdrew.*

#### ITEMS 30 TO 32

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 30 to 32 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 33 TO 40

39. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that item 36 should be combined with the new item proposed by the Soviet delegation, "Question of holding an international conference on trade problems" (A/5219).

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that those two items should be considered when the Committee discussed the inclusion of the new item.

*It was so decided.*

*Subject to that decision, the Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 33 to 40 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 41 TO 47

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 41 to 47 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 48 TO 52

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 48 to 52 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 53

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Garin (Portugal) took a place at the Committee table.*

41. Mr. GARIN (Portugal) emphasized that his country adhered to its contention that Chapter XI of the Charter did not impose and could not legitimately be interpreted as imposing obligations on Member States which they were unwilling or unable to assume because they considered them incompatible with their legislation. His delegation had serious misgivings about attempts to alter an interpretation which the United Nations had for many years regarded as the only valid one. The wording of item 53 was incorrect, since there could be no question of Portugal's "non-compliance" with any provision of the Charter. Portugal had merely resisted attempts to impose unjustified and imaginary obligations upon it, in a discriminatory manner and in flagrant violation of its sovereignty. Events showed that moves with a view to the inclusion of item 53 in the agenda were no longer motivated by the desire to obtain information under Article 73 e of the Charter; their hidden purpose was the dismemberment of Portugal and the destruction of the multiracial society which was the very foundation of that country's national structure. Such had never been the intention of the authors of the Charter. In those circumstances, his delegation had the strongest reservations regarding the inclusion of that item.

42. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) pointed out that Portugal had always refused to participate in General Assembly debates concerning the territories under its administration. It should be noted that twelve African States which had met at Libreville had decided to call for the expulsion of Portugal from the United Nations.

43. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his indignation at the Portuguese representative's reference to a multiracial society. The fact that Portugal had re-christened its territories in no way affected the tragic situation prevailing in those territories or the atrocities being perpetrated there on racial grounds. It was intolerable that Portugal should refuse to transmit information on its territories. The Assembly was confronted with a flagrant case of failure to implement the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 53 in the agenda.*

*Mr. Garin (Portugal) withdrew.*

#### ITEM 54

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 54 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 55

44. The CHAIRMAN said that no report had been submitted on the question since the adoption of resolution 1747 (XVI). He therefore suggested that the item should not be included in the agenda.

45. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected. Southern Rhodesia remained a bastion of colonialism and the United Kingdom Government had shown no intention of putting an end to that situation or of granting immediate independence to that country. A further examination of the question was therefore necessary in order to hasten the liberation of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

46. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) shared the opinion of the Soviet Union representative and proposed that item 55 should be retained in its present form.

47. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) reiterated his country's view that the United Nations was not authorized to intervene in the domestic affairs of a Member State. If item 55 were retained, it should be considered under item 25.

48. Mr. KASLIWAL (India) said he was in favour of retaining item 55, particularly as the Committee of Seventeen was still in being.

49. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that if the item had not appeared in the provisional agenda, the African States would have requested its inclusion. The circumstances were exceptional, since the General Assembly had decided to consider the question at its resumed sixteenth session, which was to have been devoted exclusively to Ruanda-Urundi.

50. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) was also in favour of retaining the item on the agenda.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 55 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 56 TO 58

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 56 to 58 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 59 TO 71

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 59 to 71 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 72 TO 75

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 72 to 75 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 76

51. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) pointed out that items 76 and 28 both concerned the same problem. They might therefore appropriately be combined into a single item, item 28 becoming sub-heading (a) and item 76, sub-heading (b).

52. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) and Mr. FLORES AVENDAÑO (Guatemala) supported that proposal.

53. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he attached great importance to the inclusion of item 76 in the agenda. It would be for the appropriate committee to decide whether the two items should be combined.

54. Mr. YOST (United States of America) thought that the arrangement suggested by Greece would simplify and accelerate the Assembly's work. He pointed out that the wording of item 76 might give a misleading impression, since the troops in question were United Nations troops which were in the country because of the attack made by North Korea. The United States was not, however, opposed to the inclusion of the item.

55. The CHAIRMAN suggested that when the Committee was allocating the agenda items, it should consider the possibility of combining the two items.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 76 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 77 AND 78

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 77 and 78 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 79

56. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had already twice opposed the inclusion of that item. The arguments it had given on those occasions had lost none of their validity, quite the contrary. It therefore considered that there were no grounds for including the item in the agenda.

57. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) felt that the time had passed for discussing the appropriateness of including the question in the agenda; it had already been discussed at length in the Special Political Committee, where a resolution had been adopted (A/5010, para. 10). The situation had not changed since then, and his delegation hoped that the United Nations would keep it under consideration until a satisfactory settlement could be achieved. It urged the United Kingdom to show a spirit of co-operation.

58. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that, given the present situation and the struggle which the people of Oman was waging for its independence, the item was an important one, which should obviously be included in the agenda in the interests of maintaining peace.

59. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) pointed out that that question had already twice been regarded as sufficiently important to appear on the agenda and that the Special Political Committee had adopted a resolution at the sixteenth session recognizing the right of the people of Oman to independence and inviting the parties concerned to settle peacefully their differences with a view to restoring normal conditions in Oman. That resolution had failed to receive the required two-thirds majority in plenary, but there had been reason to hope that it might induce the United Kingdom and the Oman leaders to begin negotiations on the question. Unfortunately, that had not proved to be the case and the situation remained as tense as ever. He therefore hoped that the United Kingdom delegation would not maintain its opposition to the inclusion of the question in the agenda.

60. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) pointed out that inasmuch as the United Kingdom had given all its reasons for opposing consideration of the item at previous sessions, the Committee had acted advisedly in proposing its inclusion in the agenda, as had the General Assembly in adopting that proposal. It was now for the Assembly to decide whether the situation had changed sufficiently to warrant revising that decision. His delegation believed that the problem would only be solved when the people of Oman became sovereign and independent. It therefore associated itself with the delegations of Jordan and the Sudan in requesting the inclusion of the item.

61. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had wished to express its formal opposition to the inclusion of the item, but would not press for a vote.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 79 in the agenda.*

#### ITEMS 80 TO 83

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 80 to 83 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 84

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 84 in the agenda.*

## ITEM 85

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Csatorday (Hungary) took a place at the Committee table.*

62. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that he objected strongly to any attempt to place the so-called question of Hungary on the agenda. That would be interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State, which was not justified by any threat to international peace and security or to the security of Hungary's neighbours. By persistently requesting the inclusion of the item, despite the small amount of interest it had aroused in the past, the United States showed that it regarded the Charter, the United Nations and the rules of international law merely as instruments of its foreign policy. It thereby perpetuated the cold war and undermined the ideal of peace and mutual understanding which the Organization was intended to serve. Instead of damaging its own prestige and that of the United Nations in that way, the United States would do better to concentrate on the major problems of the day, such as disarmament, the elimination of colonialism and the attainment of universality by the Organization.

63. It was time to right the wrong done by the resolutions adopted in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. He therefore urged the Committee not to recommend the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the United Nations Representative on Hungary had asked for permission to take part in the discussion on the question.

65. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that he could not agree to that request. Nothing in the rules of procedure or the practice of the Committee warranted a statement by a private individual on the domestic affairs of a sovereign State.

66. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) said that his delegation did not recognize the self-styled United Nations Representative on Hungary. By giving him a hearing, the Committee would preclude any objective consideration of the request for the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary, since it would give the impression of implicitly recognizing the legality of United Nations activities with respect to Hungary.

67. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the objections made by the representative of Romania. Although it might be usual to hear a representative of a sovereign State concerning a question which concerned that State, the Committee and the Chairman would be exceeding their powers if they invited a private individual to interfere in the affairs of a sovereign State. His delegation was therefore categorically opposed to hearing Sir Leslie Munro.

68. Mr. YOST (United States of America) was in favour of inviting the United Nations Representative on Hungary to be seated at the Committee table, as had been the practice in previous years. He said that Sir Leslie Munro was not merely a private individual; he had been entrusted with a certain task by a resolution of the General Assembly and the Committee would certainly profit from hearing his opinion.

69. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) pointed out that Sir Leslie Munro had spoken before in the Committee on the

question of Hungary. There was no reason to proceed differently on the present occasion, and the Committee would be well advised to hear the opinion of the Special Representative before taking a decision.

70. In reply to a question from Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the CHAIRMAN explained that if the Committee invited Sir Leslie Munro to take part in the debate, it would do so on the basis of established practice, not of any provision of the rules of procedure. There was nothing in the rules of procedure to prevent its doing so.

71. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that no provision of the rules of procedure authorized the Committee to hear Sir Leslie Munro. The fact that an error had been made in the past was no reason to repeat it. By doing so, the Committee would be showing a lack of respect for the representative of a sovereign State, merely because the social system of that State was not to everyone's liking.

*The Committee decided, by 13 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions, to hear Sir Leslie Munro.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Sir Leslie Munro, United Nations Representative on Hungary, took a place at the Committee table.*

72. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed that the Soviet delegation did not recognize the United Nations Representative on Hungary.

73. Sir Leslie MUNRO (United Nations Representative on Hungary) said that he had been appointed to his office by a resolution of the General Assembly. The arguments in favour of placing the question of Hungary on the agenda were clear from the explanatory memorandum submitted by the United States (A/5164). The Hungarian Government had refused from the outset to co-operate with the United Nations and its appointed representatives and had not complied with any of the resolutions adopted on the question by the General Assembly. There had not been free elections. Despite the assurances given by the Hungarian Prime Minister on the withdrawal of Soviet troops, such troops remained in Hungarian territory. Not only were the Hungarian people deprived of human rights and fundamental freedoms, but 8,000 political prisoners were still being detained despite all the appeals made by Member States and eminent persons throughout the world.

74. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland), speaking on a point of order, said he was surprised that Sir Leslie Munro had not left it to the United States delegation to comment on its own memorandum. Not only had he dealt in his statement with matters which lay solely within the competence of the Hungarian Government and people, but he had embarked on a discussion of an item which had not yet even been placed on the agenda.

75. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Sir Leslie Munro was not claiming to put forward his personal opinion.

76. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that Sir Leslie Munro was dealing with the substance of the problem without authorization and was straying into a questionable discussion on the subject of freedom, for which there was no apparent justification.

77. The CHAIRMAN explained that Sir Leslie Munro was merely presenting arguments indicating the need



to place the question of Hungary on the agenda once again.

78. Sir Leslie MUNRO (United Nations Representative on Hungary) said that he would submit a detailed report to the General Assembly on the matters entrusted to him. The question of Hungary remained open and should be placed on the agenda.

79. Mr. YOST (United States of America) rejected the allegation that the United States was seeking to perpetuate the cold war in requesting the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the agenda. He was obliged to do so because the Hungarian and Soviet Governments had treated the many resolutions on the question as a dead letter; the Hungarian Government had not, for example, rescinded any of the measures taken against these who had participated in the events of 1956. The sole concern of the United States was the restoration of a normal situation in Hungary, in accordance with the decisions of the General Assembly, but until that had taken place, the question would have to be discussed.

80. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that if, contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the United Nations intervened in matters which came within the domestic jurisdiction of a State, it would cease to be an instrument for international co-operation and for developing friendly relations between peoples. It was regrettable that the United States was working to prevent the development of such relations by requesting the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the agenda for reasons and in terms which were scarcely conciliatory. As for the task of improving the situation of the Hungarian people, that could be left to the people themselves and to their socialist State, which remained devoted to the ideal of peaceful coexistence. His delegation was therefore opposed to including the question in the agenda.

81. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) said that the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda would constitute interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State, in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7. In view of the fact that the agenda was already overburdened with questions which could be settled only through the collaboration of all Member States, any attempt to include an artificial and unlawful question could be motivated solely by a desire to create a diversion, to hinder the examination of genuinely important questions and to keep the cold war in being. The resolutions referred to by the United States delegation had been imposed on the Assembly illegally, contrary to the purposes of the Charter, and repetition would not make them any more legal. The course of events had shown that they lacked any legal or practical basis. The Hungarian people, having rejected any foreign interference, were today masters of their destiny, and it was not they who would suffer if the question were placed on the agenda, but rather the effectiveness and the prestige of the United Nations.

82. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that he considered the question of Hungary a "cold war" subject. One of the fundamental aims of the non-aligned States, however, was to seek a relaxation of international tension. No doubt it was regrettable that relations between the United Nations and Hungary had not progressed since 1956, but normal relations would not be restored by including the question in the agenda in the same spirit as in the past. His delegation was therefore opposed to its inclusion.

83. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found it surprising that the United States delegation, which claimed to wish to end the cold war, was doing everything in its power to perpetuate it and, while professing respect for international law, was encouraging interference in the affairs of a sovereign State whose only fault was its desire to build socialism. If the present régime in Hungary was not what ruling circles in the United States wanted, that was no reason for trying to intervene in its domestic affairs; the United States would certainly not tolerate similar action in relation to countries where NATO troops were stationed. To place the present item on the agenda would be a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

84. His delegation was not looking for an argument and sought only to maintain good relations with the United States; but, if that country persisted in uttering such challenges, they would have to be answered.

*The Committee decided, by 13 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 85 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 86

85. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that for the past several years some delegations had been considering the idea of amending the rules of procedure in the hope of improving the methods of work of the General Assembly. In practice the only result of such a study would probably be to add another item to the agenda and thus prolong the session, which everyone would prefer to shorten. Moreover the rules of procedure were not the cause of the trouble. When they were properly used, the work could normally be completed by the desired date. The real causes of inefficiency must be sought further afield; they were well illustrated by the manoeuvres through which the United States and its allies had just secured the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda, and those which, at the previous session, had led to three weeks' discussion in the Political Committee on the priority to be assigned to certain items. The first prerequisite for efficiency was an atmosphere of agreement, which presupposed some willingness to co-operate.

86. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) pointed out two factors which militated in favour of a review of methods of work: the constant increase in the number of delegations and in the number of agenda items. The expense involved in long sessions and the impression world opinion was likely to receive from the slowness of United Nations proceedings should also be borne in mind. He paid a tribute to the wisdom of the proposals made by the outgoing President of the General Assembly (A/5123); those proposals entailed the review, not of the rules of procedure, but of the manner of their application. He supported the inclusion of the item and wondered whether, when it had been allocated to a committee, a working group should not be established to consider the technical details.

87. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that he had read the proposals made by the outgoing President of the General Assembly. His delegation could not yet declare itself for or against those proposals, but felt that the item should be placed on the agenda so that all points of view might be heard, either in committee or in plenary meeting, or in the General Committee itself if it was instructed to work out new methods.

88. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) remarked that the proposed item covered only one minute aspect of a more complex problem; that created by the changes of recent years in the composition of the United Nations. Without prejudging its position on the specific proposals made by the former President of the General Assembly, his delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The prolongation of sessions made serious difficulties for small delegations; in addition it was certainly desirable to improve the efficiency of the United Nations.

89. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that he had studied with great interest the memorandum submitted by the former President of the General Assembly. He was in favour of including the item in the agenda and might return to the subject when the items were being allocated to Committees.

90. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he still doubted the desirability of including the item in the agenda. He continued to think that the length of the debates was due, not to the methods employed, but to other causes. However, he would not formally oppose the inclusion of the item.

91. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 86 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 87

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Botha (South Africa) took a place at the Committee table.*

92. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa) stated that his Government categorically opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda, which would be a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

93. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) pointed out that the African countries had asked almost unanimously for the item to be included, and that the problem was before the General Assembly for the sixteenth time. There should therefore be no difficulty about including it. His only regret was that the item had been divided into two parts. In his view, there was only one problem—apartheid—and all the rest stemmed from that. He hoped, therefore, that the item would be debated as a whole and that the same solution would be found for all victims of apartheid, regardless of their origin.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 87 in the agenda.*

*Mr. Botha (South Africa) withdrew.*

#### ITEM 88

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) took a place at the Committee table.*

94. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that he found the step taken by Venezuela surprising, for the proposed item had been the subject of arbitration sixty years before; it seemed pointless to revert to it now. If the item was placed on the agenda, his delegation would state its position on the substance of the problem at the appropriate time.

95. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, since British Guiana was still under foreign rule, any discussion of its boundaries with Venezuela at the present stage could only benefit

those who wished to delay the attainment of the territory's independence. The only fair way to settle the question was through an agreement between Venezuela and an independent Guiana, without foreign interference. His delegation therefore opposed the inclusion of the item.

96. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) recalled that, when the question of the independence of British Guiana had been examined at the resumed sixteenth session of the General Assembly, Venezuela had expressed reservations and referred to its rights and claims in relation to the territory of British Guiana. They presented a problem which should be discussed by the United Nations. Far from delaying the attainment of British Guiana's independence, the examination of the item would facilitate that development. In addition it would spare the newly independent country the necessity of solving, at the very start of its life, a problem which was purely the outcome of colonial rule. His delegation had always been in favour of independence for British Guiana but considered it preferable that the question of boundaries should be taken up straight away. Then Venezuela could not be accused of turning on a small country after holding its hand while that country was under the protection of a great Power. Moreover, if the world was unaware of the matter, it would be much more difficult to settle after independence, whereas, if the United Nations examined the problem in every detail, it would be able to recommend a solution which would obviate any difficulties between an independent Guiana and Venezuela. At no time, however, had Venezuela made the previous solution of the question a condition of its support of British Guiana's independence, and it had stated that very clearly at the time it had voted recently, in the Special Committee of seventeen members,<sup>1/</sup> in favour of the immediate independence of British Guiana. Consequently Venezuela had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda so that it could be settled equitably for both parties. There was nothing in the Charter to prevent such a question from being examined. He expressed the hope that the Committee would accept his delegation's request.

97. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that he did not oppose the inclusion of the item in the agenda. He merely doubted whether its discussion would serve any purpose.

98. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) supported the inclusion of the item. An item should be excluded only if it conflicted with the spirit or the letter of the Charter. For that reason, he did not see why the representative of the Soviet Union should oppose the inclusion of the item proposed by Venezuela. Merely to place an item on the agenda did not prejudice the position of delegations on the substance of the problem, and the Soviet delegation could give its views in detail when the matter came up for discussion.

99. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) noted with satisfaction the assurances given by Venezuela. He favoured the inclusion of the item, without prejudice to the sovereign rights of British Guiana. He felt, however, that a colonial Power could not represent a nation under its rule, and that the question of boundaries could not be settled until after British Guiana had attained its independence.

100. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that, in the light of the explanation given by the Venezuelan delegation, he could support the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

<sup>1/</sup> Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.



101. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) favoured the inclusion of the item on the understanding that its examination would not prejudice the date of independence for British Guiana, and that the people of the territory would be allowed to participate in the decision.

102. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he still believed the question could be settled only between Venezuela and an independent Guiana. However, in view of the assurances given by the Venezuelan delegation, which had been noted with satisfaction by a number of countries, he would not formally oppose the inclusion of the item.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 88 in the agenda.*

*Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) withdrew.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/5197)

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY FIFTY-NINE STATES (A/5198)

103. The CHAIRMAN called the Committee's attention to the addendum to the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/157/Add.1) containing a list of additional items which were being proposed for inclusion in the agenda. He asked the Committee to vote on the inclusion of the first two of those items in the agenda.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the first two items.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/5218)

104. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) protested strongly against the inclusion of the item proposed by the Soviet Union. The USSR had been raising the question of the legality of the representation of China since 1950 and the General Assembly had consistently repulsed its every attempt. The item had been included in the agenda for the first time at the previous session, and the Assembly had rejected (1014th meeting) the Soviet proposal by a large majority. No purpose would be served by re-opening the question. In any event, the legality of representation by the Chinese delegation was beyond question. The Soviet Union's action was simply one of that country's manoeuvres to undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations.

105. Contrary to the assertions made by the USSR in its memorandum, mainland China, far from having attained prosperity, was at present experiencing an extremely serious crisis due to the errors committed by the communist leaders of the country. The inhabitants of mainland China were leaving the country in large numbers, at the risk of their lives, in order to escape from the communist régime, which treated them like animals. As recently as May more than 100,000 of them had taken refuge in Hong Kong: a fact which showed clearly that the Chinese people did not accept the communist régime. To say that such a régime represented the Chinese people was to claim that a hangman could speak for his victims.

106. In its memorandum (A/5218) the Soviet Union also tried to give the impression that the communist régime was peace-loving and careful to respect the Charter. Yet it was known that the United Nations had found that régime guilty of aggression in Korea, and that its aggressive manoeuvres had continued without interruption in South-East Asia and other parts of the world. Even India was not exempt from the imperialistic pressures of the Peking régime. The Soviet memorandum gravely distorted the facts, and its only purpose was to impede the orderly progress of the Assembly's work.

107. Mr. YOST (United States of America) recalled that the item proposed by the Soviet Union had already been examined by the General Assembly at its previous session; there was no justification for including it again at the present session. Since China was satisfactorily represented already, his delegation opposed any attempt to secure Communist China's admission to membership in the United Nations or to change the existing representation of China. Although doubtful of the usefulness of the item proposed by the Soviet Union, the United States delegation would not oppose its inclusion in the agenda.

108. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) observed that a great country was being kept out of the United Nations because some delegations did not like the régime in power there. China's seat was occupied by a person who represented no one. Yet the United Nations could not be effective without the participation of China. He therefore supported the Soviet proposal, so that the question might at last be settled.

109. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that all countries agreed in acknowledging that the United Nations should be as universal as possible, as the President had pointed out at the plenary meeting the previous day. It was therefore absurd and contrary to United Nations principles to refuse to admit a country whose population represented one-fifth of the population of the world. There could be no true international co-operation without the participation of the People's Republic of China, especially where economic co-operation and general and complete disarmament were concerned. There was no doubt that the prestige of the United Nations would be enhanced if the People's Republic of China was at last admitted to membership and the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique were expelled from all United Nations organs.

110. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that, for reasons he had already stated in detail at previous sessions, he did not oppose the inclusion of the item.

111. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Since the principle of universality was fundamental to the United Nations, it was anomalous that the most populous nation in the world should have no voice in the Organization. China's seat was at present illegally occupied because of the attitude adopted by the United States and a few other countries. The obstructionist policy pursued by those countries was contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter, and the People's Republic of China, which was a permanent member of the Security Council, must be restored to its rightful place. The Government of the People's Republic of China was the only Government that could lawfully represent the Chinese people. It had some remarkable achievements, political, economic and social, to its credit. Moreover, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's

Republic of China would unquestionably improve the international climate. It was time, therefore, to end an abnormal situation which had lasted all too long.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of the item in the agenda.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/5219)

112. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) announced that, after consulting various delegations, he wished to propose that the title of item 36 of the provisional agenda should be deleted; that sub-title (a) should become a new item 36 entitled "Question of holding an international conference on trade problems"; and that sub-title (b), reading as before, should become a new item 37.

113. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) said that he was satisfied with the compromise proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet memorandum (A/5219) contained assertions that were contrary to the facts, particularly with respect to the allegedly discriminatory nature of the Common Market. Furthermore he believed that the examination of the item should be based on the recommendations made on the subject by the Economic and Social Council in its annual report to the General Assembly.

114. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that he was in favour of the conference on trade and development recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 917 (XXXIV). However, in the view of the United States delegation, the new item 36 would be considered in the light of that resolution.

115. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) agreed with the Netherlands representative. The Soviet compromise was acceptable only as a means of placing the question on the agenda and as a replacement for the original Soviet proposal. His delegation would have preferred

the wording of item 36 (a) to be retained. However, it was prepared to accept the compromise proposed by the USSR. It wished merely to register its rejection of the appraisal of the Common Market made by the Soviet Union in its explanatory memorandum.

116. Mr. LORIDAN (Belgium) said that he was in favour of any action aimed at the development of international trade. He was therefore willing to accept the Soviet compromise, although he did not see why the USSR had found it necessary to propose an additional item on a subject already covered by item 36. His delegation could not, however, accept the memorandum accompanying the original Soviet proposal. The memorandum contained assertions which were tendentious and contrary to the facts, as for example the reference to the Common Market as a closed grouping.

117. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he was in no way repudiating his original proposal. He had simply submitted it in a form acceptable to other delegations. He would revert to the question of the Common Market at a later stage.

118. Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) recalled that the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 917 (XXXIV), had recommended the convening of an international conference on trade and development. The question of development had been dropped in the new proposal. He would not oppose the wording proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union, but wished to emphasize that the terms used did not preclude the possibility that the conference proposed by the Economic and Social Council might deal with development as well as trade.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the new item proposed by the USSR and the former item 36 (a) should be combined and included in the agenda under the heading "Question of holding an international conference on trade problems". Item 36 (b) with its present wording, would become item 37.*

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.