

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


**792nd  
PLENARY MEETING**

 Saturday, 13 December 1958,  
at 7 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

Agenda item 41: Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (concluded) Report of the Fourth Committee (concluded) . . . .	607
Agenda item 3: Credentials of representatives to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly (concluded): (b) Report of the Credentials Committee. . . . .	608
Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting . . . .	614
Agenda item 25: Effects of atomic radiation: (a) Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation; (b) Report of the Secretary-General on the strengthening and widening of scientific activities in this field Reports of the First Committee and of the Fifth Committee . . . . .	614
Agenda item 60: Question of the peaceful use of outer space: (a) The banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space; (b) Programme for international co-operation in the field of outer space Report of the First Committee . . . . .	614
Agenda item 63: Question of Algeria Report of the First Committee . . . . .	622
Adjournment of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly . . . . .	628
Agenda item 2: Minute of silent prayer or meditation . . . . .	630
Statement by the President . . . . .	630

**President: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).**

### AGENDA ITEM 41

**Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and Italy (concluded)\***

#### REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/4073) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ireland to tell us the results of the consultations which have taken place on this matter.

\*Resumed from the 790th meeting.

2. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland): This morning [790th meeting], the Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, Mr. Eilan of Israel, presented to the Assembly the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4073] on the subject of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia. In that report the Rapporteur was unfortunately obliged to announce, with the regret which all of us feel I am sure, that it had not been possible for the Fourth Committee to present for adoption by the General Assembly a draft resolution on this subject, the urgency and importance of which is apparent to us all.
3. Since then developments have taken place which have encouraged the Irish delegation to table a draft resolution [A/L.260]. Delegations will already be fully familiar with most of the text of this draft: many of its paragraphs are set out in the Rapporteur's report. The only paragraph to which I wish to draw the special attention of the Assembly is operative paragraph 3, which reads as follows:
- "Recommends that the two Governments agree on the choice of an independent person within three months and, failing such agreement, invite His Majesty the King of Norway to nominate such independent person;"
4. Paragraph 3 is the kernel of the proposal which my delegation had the honour to submit to the Assembly. I should like to say clearly and explicitly that what has moved my delegation to put forward this proposal is the belief, and indeed the knowledge, that this paragraph is acceptable to the delegations of both Ethiopia and Italy:
5. Delegations will note that operative paragraph 3 contemplates recourse to the august action of His Majesty the King of Norway if the two parties are unable to agree on the choice of an independent person. I am sure that all Members of the United Nations will feel profoundly and respectfully grateful to His Majesty if he graciously agrees to act in this connexion in the event of its proving necessary.
6. Speaking as Chairman of the Fourth Committee, I think it is a true observation to make that the desire of the overwhelming majority of delegations in considering this matter was to arrive at a draft resolution which the two countries most directly concerned would feel that they could accept. I feel that it will be a source of deep gratification to us all that that result has been achieved, and I hope that as a mark of that feeling of satisfaction the draft resolution which the Assembly has now before it may be adopted unanimously.
7. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia): My delegation is gratified that the delegations of Ethiopia and Italy have agreed on a formula which makes it possible for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution on the item now under consideration.
8. Mr. VITELLI (Italy): I should like at this moment to express the sincere gratification of my delegation

that an agreement has been arrived at between the delegation of Ethiopia and my own.

9. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway): I should like also to extend my delegation's congratulations to the parties concerned for having succeeded in reaching agreement on the establishment of an arbitration tribunal to delimit the frontier in accordance with the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII). This has made it unnecessary to refer this matter to his Majesty the King of Norway for the appointment of a third jurist to the arbitration tribunal.

10. Having just heard the statements made by the two parties, I would like also to express optimism regarding the possibility of reaching a just solution in this matter, based on mutual understanding and giving satisfaction to both parties. I certainly hope the parties will also succeed in reaching agreement on the appointment of an independent person to assist in drawing up the terms of reference for the arbitration tribunal.

11. As the representative of Ireland and the able Chairman of the Fourth Committee has explained in introducing the draft resolution [A/L.260] which we have before us, His Majesty the King of Norway has now been invited—and I repeat, invited—to nominate such an independent person, should the parties not succeed in reaching an agreement in this matter within three months. If, against our expectations, the parties should prove unable to agree on the independent person, it would then be a matter for His Majesty to determine whether he considers it possible to accept the invitation which will then be addressed to him by the two parties.

12. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution [A/L.260] submitted by Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

13. The PRESIDENT: I assume that the Assembly would want it to be put in the record that it has taken note of the report of the Fourth Committee. If there is no objection the record will so indicate.

It was so decided.

14. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

15. Miss ANDERSON (United States of America): We are very pleased that it has been possible for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution on the Somali border question which is acceptable to the parties concerned and which gives promise of expediting the arbitration procedure established by General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII). Such an outcome has been the sole aim of our delegation and, we are sure, of representatives in the Fourth Committee who have worked so hard to this end. We congratulate the Ethiopian and Italian delegations here, including the representative of the Government of Somalia, for the spirit of compromise they have demonstrated. At the same time we express the fervent hope that this resolution will bring rapid progress towards the delimitation of the frontier prior to the independence of Somaliland on 2 December 1960.

16. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I should like to say how happy my delegation is that the General Assembly has been able unanimously to adopt this resolution in terms agreeable to the parties concerned. I should like to be allowed to congratulate all those concerned and, in particular, to express the apprecia-

tion which we feel to the delegation of Ethiopia and the delegation of Italy; and I would mention here the distinguished Minister who represents here the Government of Somalia.

17. I think, if I may be allowed to say so, that although the Fourth Committee did not in fact reach agreement on a draft resolution on this subject, this resolution which has now been unanimously adopted may be regarded as a fitting crown to the work this year of the Fourth Committee, whose Chairman has just introduced this resolution.

18. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic): The United Arab Republic delegation is indeed very happy in the unanimous adoption of this resolution by the Assembly. We have encountered considerable difficulties in the Committee, but, due to the ceaseless efforts of some representatives on the Committee—I am thinking particularly of the head of the delegation of Ireland—this resolution has now been adopted unanimously.

19. It is our fervent hope that a solution will be found to this question well before 2 December 1960, when Somalia will accede to independence and, we hope, to membership of our Organization. We are grateful to the representatives of Ethiopia and Italy for their co-operation during the last twenty-four hours.

20. I would ask the Minister from Somaliland to assure his people that the General Assembly has the matter at heart and will never fail them.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

**Credentials of representatives to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly (concluded):\***  
(a) Report of the Credentials Committee

Mr. Ramos (Argentina), Chairman of the Credentials Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/4074).

21. Mr. USTOR (Hungary): I wish to deal very briefly with the legal, and then the political, aspects of that part of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4074] which concerns the credentials of my delegation.

22. With regard to the legal aspect, I must call the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the Constitution of Hungary today is exactly the same as it was at the time when Hungary was admitted to membership of this Organization. All the political, social and economic institutions established in accordance with this Constitution are functioning in exactly the same manner as they were when Hungary became a Member of the United Nations. The functions of the Head of State are being performed by the Presidential Council, the President of which is the same as at the beginning of our membership. The credentials of my delegation are issued on the decision of the Presidential Council and are signed by the President and the Secretary of that Council. States Members of the United Nations which maintain diplomatic relations with Hungary present the credentials of their diplomatic representatives to the same Presidential Council which issued the credentials of my delegation. The Governments of many delegations in this Assembly have presented their credentials to this Presidential Council, and now representatives of those same Governments hesitate to accept the credentials of my delegation issued by that same Presidential Council.

\*Resumed from the 747th meeting.

23. Do I need to qualify this attitude? The Credentials Committee is entrusted with the task of examining the credentials submitted and of reporting upon them without delay. No discriminatory or punitive action regarding credentials can be taken without the approval of the Security Council. That is quite obvious from the provisions of the Charter, the rules of procedure of the Assembly and previous resolutions.

24. From the legal point of view, the part of the report of the Credentials Committee which pertains to the credentials of the Hungarian delegation contravenes these provisions by proposing that no resolution should be adopted on those credentials. Under the provisions of the Charter and the rules, the credentials of the Hungarian delegation are valid, and there is no legal basis for raising any objections to them.

25. As for the political aspect of the question, it is no secret that again and again the United States delegation has initiated unfounded objections to the credentials of the Hungarian delegation. I do not wish to deal here with the various inconsistencies in this attitude; this is neither the time nor the place for that. I wish, however, to emphasize that the General Assembly would be acting in the spirit of the great ideals of the United Nations if it would free Hungary from the position of being constantly used by the representatives of the United States for their "cold war" purposes. This discriminatory report in itself is another indication of the hostile intentions of the United States Government towards Hungary.

26. I do not want to go into the moral aspect of the problem. I do not want to speak of how detrimental such illegitimate actions are to the Organization as a whole. I think that is self-evident.

27. On the basis of the above considerations, my delegation will vote against the report of the Credentials Committee.

28. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States supports the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4074].

29. Again, as at every session since the 1956 Hungarian national uprising, the report of the Credentials Committee recommends that the General Assembly take no decision regarding the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of the present régime in Hungary. Because it is clear that the present Hungarian authorities are not capable of representing the freedom-loving people of Hungary in the United Nations, the General Assembly has at five sessions allowed the Hungarian representatives to be seated in a provisional status only. By refusing to accept the credentials of the Hungarian representatives, the General Assembly placed the present régime on notice that the Assembly intended to watch the situation in Hungary closely.

30. I should like to recall a few of the things which the United Nations has discovered about the present Hungarian régime in the course of the past two years.

31. In resolution 1004 (ES-II), which was adopted at the Second Emergency Special Session, the General Assembly stated its conviction "that recent events in Hungary manifest clearly the desire of the Hungarian people to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedom and independence". The same resolution condemned the use of Soviet military forces to

suppress the efforts of the Hungarian people to reassert their rights.

32. In resolution 1133 (XI), the General Assembly found, among other things, that "the present Hungarian régime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". In the same resolution, an appeal was made to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the present Hungarian authorities to cease their acts of repression and to comply with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly.

33. On the night of 16 June 1958, in simultaneous announcements in Moscow and Budapest, the world learned of the execution of the former Prime Minister Imre Nagy and the former Minister of Defence Pál Maléter and other Hungarian patriots. The execution of Mr. Nagy was in violation of the pledged word of the present Hungarian régime that it did not seek vengeance, and, significantly, it occurred soon after a visit to Budapest by Mr. Khrushchev.

34. The Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary reconvened on 21 June 1958 and issued a communiqué which contained the following statement:

"The execution of Imre Nagy and of his companions demonstrates that the oppression of the Hungarian people has not abated, and that the reign of terror which began when Russian forces marched into Hungary early in November 1956 continues." [A/3849, Annex I.]

35. Then, on 14 July 1958, the Special Committee issued a unanimous special report. In that report, the Committee, after referring to the continuing repression in Hungary, made this comment:

"...The continued presence of foreign armed forces in Hungary is likely to prevent the expression of the feelings of the people against such procedures by the Hungarian Government." [A/3849, para. 24.]

36. That is what the General Assembly and its representatives have determined to be the present situation in Hungary. The findings that I have mentioned are but a few of the reasons why the General Assembly, under the existing circumstances, should continue to refuse to accept the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of the present Hungarian régime.

37. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in its report [A/4974].

The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

38. Mr. BELOVSKI (Yugoslavia): In voting in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee, my delegation wishes to place on the record the following: first, the position of the Yugoslav Government on the question of the Chinese representation remains unchanged; and, second, the Yugoslav Government and delegation do not approve of the procedure adopted by the Credentials Committee with regard to the credentials of the representative of Hungary.

Mr. Ali Sastroamidjojo (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

39. U THANT (Burma): My delegation has voted for the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee, but this should not be construed as an acceptance of all

its implications. The point of view of my delegation has been made very clear in all relevant discussions in the United Nations in regard to the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China. My delegation wishes to restate once again our conviction that the Government of the Republic of China which is now operating in Formosa does not represent the people of China, does not extend its influence over any part of China, and is in no way likely to be installed on the mainland of China. My delegation is convinced that the Government of the People's Republic of China alone exercises effective control over the mainland of China; and, therefore, we feel that the credentials of the representatives of the Republic of China now based on Formosa are invalid. With these reservations, my delegation has voted for the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee.

40. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted for the approval of the Credentials Committee's report. This vote does not, however, signify any change in the Soviet delegation's attitude to the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations or to the General Assembly's decision regarding the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

41. The Soviet delegation feels obliged to draw the attention of the members of the General Assembly to the question of the credentials of private persons who style themselves representatives of the Republic of China and claim to represent China in the United Nations when, in fact, they represent no one. The Members of the General Assembly are well aware that the so-called Republic of China does not exist. Over nine years ago the Chinese people swept away the crumbling régime of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and established their own genuinely democratic State—the People's Republic of China.

42. The People's Republic of China has achieved great progress in developing its economy and strengthening its national independence, and has become a mighty bastion of peace, not only in Asia but in the world as a whole. No one can deny that China now plays a major role in world affairs, or that China's achievements derive from its evolution into a genuinely democratic and fully sovereign State.

43. The fact that China—a great Power and a permanent member of the Security Council—has not been represented in the United Nations for the past nine years cannot fail to detract from the authority and prestige of this Organization, which is called upon to unite the efforts of all peace-loving peoples in their struggle for a lasting peace.

44. The reason for this abnormal situation in the matter of China's representation in the United Nations is no secret, nor does the United States make a secret of the fact that its attitude to the People's Republic of China is the only obstacle in the way of the restoration of China's lawful rights in the United Nations. The pressure crudely exerted by the United States on the delegations of many countries to prevent the General Assembly from so much as discussing the question of China's representation proves that the United States position in this matter is entirely untenable.

45. It is the Soviet delegation's opinion that the General Assembly should no longer permit the United Nations to serve the interests of United States policy

and should resolve the abnormal situation over China's representation. As a first step in this direction, the General Assembly could repudiate the credentials of the private persons who are the agents of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and who style themselves the representatives of the so-called Republic of China. It is the duty of the United Nations to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations without delay.

46. With regard to the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, the Soviet delegation feels obliged to protest vigorously against the decision, imposed by the United States, casting doubt on the validity of the credentials issued to the Hungarian delegation by its Government. There are no grounds, nor have there been in the past, for doubting the validity of the Hungarian delegation's credentials, which are entirely in order and have been submitted in accordance with United Nations procedure. That delegation represents the only lawful Government of the Hungarian State, with which the majority of States Members of the United Nations maintain diplomatic relations.

47. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic enjoys the confidence and the full support of the Hungarian people. Manifest proof of this was recently furnished by the results last November of the elections to the central and local administrative organs of the Hungarian People's Republic. In answer to the slanderous fabrications of their enemies, the entire adult population of Hungary resolutely demonstrated at those elections that the Hungarian people supports socialism, the people's democratic régime and its Government, and that it will not allow any interference in its internal affairs.

48. The enemies of the Hungarian people, who in 1956 tried unsuccessfully to overthrow the people's régime in Hungary by organizing a fascist putsch, will gain nothing by the campaign of slander which in their impotent rage they are still conducting against the lawful Government of the Hungarian People's Republic.

49. The Soviet delegation is forced to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the hypocritical character of United States policy in the so-called Hungarian question. Here, in the United Nations, the United States representative endeavours to give the impression that his country does not recognize the present Hungarian Government, while, at the same time, United States representatives at Budapest maintain normal diplomatic relations with it. The same may be said of representatives of other countries, who uphold the anti-Hungarian policy of the United States in the United Nations, while their Governments continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic.

50. Such a position can be explained only by the unremitting anti-Hungarian intrigues of the Western Powers and their hostility to the Hungarian people and to its lawful Government.

51. Those who raised the issue of the Hungarian delegation's credentials evidently hoped that this attempt to compromise the Hungarian delegation would enable them to continue their campaign of slander against the Hungarian People's Republic, and would give new strength to the defeated reactionaries both inside Hungary and abroad. But all these hopes and expectations have come to nothing. It is certain that neither

the slanders of the United States representative, and certain other representatives nor their attempts to cast doubt on the validity of the Hungarian delegation's credentials will disturb the normal life of the Hungarian people.

52. The Soviet delegation regards the decision of the Credentials Committee not to rule on the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic as unlawful and contrary to the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

53. Mr. BENABUD (Morocco) (translated from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the report concerning the credentials of the representatives to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. Nevertheless, our affirmative vote cannot be interpreted as altering my Government's position on the representation of China.

Mr. Malik (Lebanon) took the Chair.

54. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) (translated from French): The Romanian delegation voted in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee, but wishes to make the following explanation.

55. First of all, the Romanian delegation considers that the credentials submitted by the persons illegally occupying China's seat here are not valid. As has already been pointed out more than once in the General Assembly, the only Government which has the right to issue credentials for the representation of China is the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, elected in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution which the great Chinese people has established for itself, and which effectively exercises its authority, with the success we are all aware of, over the territory of China.

56. Secondly, the recent discussion of the so-called Hungarian question has once again demonstrated the desire of the initiators of that discussion to poison the international atmosphere and to find numerous pretexts to interfere in the domestic affairs of Member States. The explanation of vote made by the United States representative before the vote was a further illustration of that fact. The Romanian delegation wishes to emphasize that the validity of the credentials of the delegation sent by the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic cannot be challenged. Not to take a decision on this question would amount to ignoring the provisions of rule 27 of the rules of procedure and would in fact constitute interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary. The Romanian delegation considers that the maintenance of this position of refusing to decide on the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, and the activities carried on to that end by several Powers, represent an attitude hostile to the Hungarian people, prejudicial to international co-operation and contrary to both the spirit and letter of the Charter. We all know that such an attitude can only weaken the prestige of the United Nations both in Hungary and in other countries of the world.

57. Mr. EL-MESSIRI (United Arab Republic): I wish to say that we voted in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee, subject to the reservation that this vote is not to be interpreted as a change in our position with regard to the representation of China or the credentials of the representatives of Hungary.

58. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): The Polish delega-

tion voted for the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee, but there are two points in the report with which we are in disagreement and on which I should like to state our opinion. I refer to the questions of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation and the representation of China. As far as the representation of Hungary is concerned, I think that, after yesterday's debate [787th meeting], our position is clear to everybody.

59. I would like to add that in our opinion the real task of the United Nations is to act as a harmonizing and stabilizing factor and to assist in healing wounds and calming international controversies. Unfortunately, in our opinion, the decision on the question of credentials does not contribute toward this end. I think that the question of the legal representation of the Chinese people by the Central Government of the People's Republic of China is also very clear. I am certain that it is clear even for the majority of those who this year still insist on voting for the Committee's decision.

60. We hope that the United Nations will not repeat in the future the erroneous and harmful decisions of last year, and that in the near future the representatives of China will work here in this hall together with us for the peace and well-being of the United Nations.

61. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The views of my delegation on the representation of China have already been stated on previous occasions at this session of the General Assembly and it is unnecessary for me to repeat them now. I should like, however, to say a few words about the question of the representation of Hungary.

62. At both the eleventh and twelfth sessions of the General Assembly [see A/3536 and A/3773], the Credentials Committee considered that on the information available it was not in a position to take a decision regarding the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of Hungary. On both occasions my delegation supported the Committee's recommendation, because in common with many other delegations we had serious misgivings about the status of the representatives purporting to speak for Hungary in the Assembly. The events of the last year have done nothing to remove these misgivings. Indeed, the information available to us about developments in Hungary and, in particular, the latest report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary [A/3849] have strengthened our misgivings and doubts. In these circumstances, my delegation would have been unable to support any recommendation that the Assembly should accept the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of Hungary.

63. We therefore agree with the conclusion of the Credentials Committee that no decision should be taken regarding the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of Hungary, and we voted in favour of the Committee's report.

64. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (translated from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania voted in favour of the Credentials Committee's report. Nevertheless, it deems it necessary once again to explain its attitude on the credentials of the so-called delegation of the Republic of China and the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic.



65. The Albanian delegation cannot recognize the validity of the credentials submitted by the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique; everyone knows that this clique was driven out by the Chinese people in 1949 and has taken refuge in Taiwan under the protection of American bayonets. It must be noted that the great Chinese people are not yet represented in the United Nations.

66. The Central Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate Government of the Chinese people; only its representatives have the right to speak in this Assembly and the organs of the United Nations in the name of the Chinese people. That Government exercises full authority throughout the country, except for the island of Taiwan, which is occupied by the United States. The People's Republic of China is a great world Power; it has now become an important factor in the maintenance of peace in Asia and throughout the world; it pursues a policy of peace based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The efforts made to prevent one of the chief Powers of the world from occupying its lawful place in the United Nations and the organs of the United Nations jeopardize the authority and effectiveness of our Organization. This abnormal situation is incompatible with the fundamental principles of the Charter and will always lead to negative results.

67. As regards the part of the report which deals with the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, my delegation considers it necessary to state that it does not approve of the Credentials Committee's conclusion. My delegation believes that there is no reason to raise doubts or make observations concerning the validity of the Hungarian delegation's credentials, because those credentials are entirely in order and in conformity with the General Assembly's rules of procedure. The Hungarian delegation represents the legal Government of Hungary, and any objection to it artificially raised by the delegations of the United States and certain other Powers is in flagrant contradiction with the Charter.

68. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation voted for the report of the Credentials Committee. This does not mean, however, that the Government of India is in agreement with all the sentiments expressed in this report. Indeed, there are serious differences of opinion on one or two issues.

69. The first of these is in regard to the representation of China. The views of the Government of India are well known on this question, and they stand unchanged. There is, however, one observation that I am asked to make, namely, that this report and the ruling of the Chairman of the Credentials Committee set out therein only prove the point that we already submitted, that the resolution which the Assembly adopted banning the discussion of this question for twelve months [resolution 1239 (XIII)] really anticipates the functions of the Credentials Committee and reduces it to naught. That is clearly proved by this report.

70. Then we come to the matter of Hungary. My delegation was instructed to support the credentials of the delegation of Hungary, as present here, since it represents a country with which we have diplomatic relations and have exchanged ambassadors. My delegation has no desire to reopen the debate that has taken place in this Assembly. We did not take part in that debate for reasons which I shall set out in a moment. How-

ever, since the matter has been opened in the debate on credentials, I should like to make this statement under the instructions of my Government.

71. We regretted the incidents that took place in Hungary in October 1956, and subsequently we expressed our regret with regard to them on various occasions. We have also expressed the hope that the Hungarian people will be able to live in conditions of freedom without fear and without outside interference. We have always been in favour of the withdrawal of foreign forces from every country by every country. But the Government of India is equally convinced that the constant interference by the Assembly, by resolution or otherwise, or by other Powers, into the internal affairs of countries that are Member States and the condemnation of the Governments concerned, will only intensify the cold war and will bring no relief to their peoples.

72. I stated that I would set out the reasons why we did not participate in the debate. My Government was convinced that the debate was following the normal "cold war" procedures and, therefore, in conformity with our practice in these matters, we abstained from intensifying the "cold war" debate. Our policy has been, as far as it is possible and in our power, to promote the purposes, as set out in the Charter, of good neighbourly relations and to make our contribution towards making the United Nations a centre for harmonizing different views and for the relaxation of tensions. The condemnation of Governments with which we have diplomatic and friendly relations would, therefore, be totally opposed to the general approach of the policy of India.

73. We are also convinced that only a friendly approach can lead to understanding and agreement. The resolution that has recently been passed [resolution 1312 (XIII)] is not likely to achieve these satisfactory results, nor is the type of debate that we have had in previous years. We therefore abstained from voting. Indeed, these are the very well considered views of my Government, and if these instructions had come here during the debate they would have been set out here at that time.

74. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): The Czechoslovak delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the Credentials Committee.

75. We must state, however, that we have serious reservations regarding the Committee's report. First, we wish to protest against the Committee's decision to accept as valid the credentials of a supporter of Chiang Kai-shek, who represents no one. There is only one China and its lawful Government, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, is alone entitled to represent the Chinese people in the United Nations. Therefore only the credentials issued by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China can be considered valid.

76. As a great Power, the People's Republic of China is effectively participating, through its peaceable policy, in the struggle of the peoples for peace and security. Without its active participation there can now be no question of progress towards the solution of major international problems affecting peace and security, not only in Asia and the Far East, but throughout the world.

77. The fact that the discriminatory policy, imposed on this Organization for so many years by the United States, has prevented the People's Republic of China from taking part in this Organization's work is a loss, not to the People's Republic of China, but to the United Nations.

78. The Czechoslovak delegation also strongly protests against the fact that in its report the Credentials Committee, on the proposal of and under pressure from the United States delegation, again questions the validity of the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic.

79. The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly has proper credentials, issued by the Hungarian Government in full accordance with its Constitution, and satisfying all requirements. The refusal of the Credentials Committee to recognize these credentials as valid serves the provocative policy of the United States and does not promote that international co-operation which should be the primary aim of the United Nations.

80. Mr. NONG KIMNY (Cambodia) (translated from French): The vote which the Cambodian delegation has cast in favour of the resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee should not be interpreted as a change in our position concerning the question of the representation of China.

81. My Government has recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China. As Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Prime Minister and Chairman of our delegation, said during the general debate [756th meeting], my Government considers that the Government of the People's Republic of China exercises *de facto* authority over continental China and that it is in the interests of our Organization to recognize that fact. It was with this reservation that we voted in favour of the resolution.

82. Mr. KWEEDJIEHOO (Indonesia): My delegation voted in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee. My delegation did so with certain reservations with regard to the representation of China.

83. The attitude of my delegation in relation to the representation of China is well known and remains unchanged. My Government recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China in Peking as the only legitimate Government of China in effective control over the Chinese mainland and over the Chinese people, and my delegation maintains that this Government, being the only legitimate Government, should be represented in this body. To deny this legitimate Government of China representation in the United Nations is a flagrant contradiction of the Charter. It is extremely deplorable because it is a loss, not in the first place for China and the Chinese people, but in my opinion rather for the United Nations itself.

84. Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation voted in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee. In accepting the report as a whole, the Bulgarian delegation considers it necessary to voice its disagreement with two points therein: first, regarding the proposal of the Committee concerning the credentials of the representative of Hungary and, secondly, with regard to the representation of China.

85. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria holds the view that by recognizing the credentials

of the self-appointed representatives of China a serious insult is being inflicted on and an act of great injustice is being done to the great Chinese people, constituting the world's largest population. It is common knowledge that, owing to the hostile policy of some Western countries, and in particular of the United States, towards the Chinese People's Republic, that Republic is not represented in the United Nations. Here there are representatives of the handful of Kuomintang men who have succeeded temporarily in staying on Taiwan, but there are no representatives of the 630 million Chinese people who have liberated themselves from their centuries-old yoke and have taken their destiny into their own hands.

86. The Bulgarian delegation declares once more that it cannot accept as representatives of the Chinese People's Republic anybody but the representatives of the Chinese People's Government. For this reason, my delegation does not approve the report of the Credentials Committee concerning the representation of China.

87. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria cannot agree to the proposal that no decision be taken on the credentials of the representatives of the Hungarian People's Republic. We consider that there are absolutely no grounds for voicing any doubts as to the legitimacy of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation. The aims of the proposal made in the report are entirely transparent.

88. The aims of certain interested circles in some Western countries as regards the Hungarian People's Republic, which use every opportunity to slander the People's Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, are to keep up the spirit of the enemies of the Hungarian people. The dreams of the enemies of the Hungarian people about restoring the old régime in Hungary have been completely shattered.

89. Having all this in mind, the Bulgarian delegation cannot approve the report of the Credentials Committee as regards the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic. We consider that the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly are legitimate and are perfectly in order.

90. Mr. TSIANG (China): My delegation voted for the acceptance of the report of the Credentials Committee although at the time of voting my delegation was keenly aware of possible reservations on the part of some of the delegations present. I will therefore make a brief explanation.

91. The representatives who have come to this rostrum to record their reservations in regard to the credentials of my delegation may be divided into two groups: those who belong to the Soviet bloc and those who do not.

92. To those who belong to the Soviet bloc, I have nothing to say. Their purpose is plain. They wish to strengthen and consolidate the hold of international communism on my country. They regard China as their greatest prize since the October revolution of 1917. They are anxious and eager to use my country as the base for the further conquest of other countries in Asia. This Assembly has chosen not to allow this Organization to be exploited for such a sinister purpose.

93. I should like to say a brief word to those repre-

representatives who have made reservations and yet who do not belong to the Soviet bloc. The representation of China in the United Nations must certainly be Chinese. The communist régime on the mainland of my country is un-Chinese in origin, un-Chinese in character and un-Chinese in purpose. The hopes of the Chinese people and the great traditions of Chinese civilization are centred in the Government which my delegation has the honour to represent here. I am sure that the majority of the representatives would like to see the representation of China remain truly Chinese.

### Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

### AGENDA ITEM 25

#### Effects of atomic radiation:

- (a) Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General on the strengthening and widening of scientific activities in this field

#### REPORTS OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4037) AND OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4064)

94. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the report of the First Committee [A/4037] on this item there is a report of the Fifth Committee [A/4064] on the financial implications of the draft resolution of the First Committee. I ask the representatives to keep this statement in mind as they act on the recommendations of the First Committee.

95. Mr. MATSCH (Austria), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to submit to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee [A/4037] concerning item 25: "Effects of atomic radiation", and the text of a draft resolution unanimously recommended by this Committee.

96. All representatives participating in the debate paid a tribute to the valuable work which has been done by the eminent scientists who served on the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Satisfaction was also expressed that the Scientific Committee had received full support by Governments, by United Nations agencies, by national scientific institutions and non-governmental associations. The fact was stressed that the report of the scientists was unanimously adopted and thus represented a most encouraging example of the best sort of international co-operation.

97. It was contended in the debate that the effect of ionizing radiation on man and the potential dangers of any increase in the level of such radiation were problems which rightly exercised the minds of individuals and of Governments all over the world, and that therefore the work of the Scientific Committee had to be continued.

98. In connexion with the hazards of radio-active contamination of environment resulting from explosions of nuclear weapons, some representatives again drew the attention of the First Committee to the necessity of the cessation of tests of nuclear weapons.

99. While fully recognizing the valuable activity of the Scientific Committee as a centre for the evaluation

and co-ordination of knowledge in the realm of facts on atomic radiation, some representatives reminded the First Committee that it was the International Atomic Energy Agency which had the primary responsibility in that field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. They welcomed the idea that the draft resolution requested the Scientific Committee to consult with the other agencies and organizations concerned on projects within its sphere of activity so as to avoid duplication of work and to ensure effective co-ordination.

100. I have the honour to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee.

101. The PRESIDENT: We will vote now on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4037].

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

### AGENDA ITEM 60

#### Question of the peaceful use of outer space:

- (a) The banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space;
- (b) Programme for international co-operation in the field of outer space

#### REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4009)

102. Mr. MATSCH (Austria), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee on the item: "Question of the peaceful use of outer space" [A/4009] and the draft resolution contained therein.

103. The debate on that item, which was discussed for the first time in the First Committee, reflected the great advances made in science and technology in recent years and the triumph of human intelligence. With the expansion of human activities into outer space, a new era has been inaugurated by adding another dimension to man's existence.

104. All the representatives participating in the discussion stressed the need for international co-operation in the study and exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes. They further demonstrated that the penetration into outer space was a concern of all mankind, and that the competence of the United Nations in this matter was unquestionable. Reference was repeatedly made in this connexion to the fact that the co-operation existing in scientific research for the exploration of outer space within the framework of the International Geophysical Year 1957-1958 had been very successful, and that this work would be continued by the Special Committee on Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions.

105. It was pointed out in the debate that outer space might be used to benefit mankind or to increase the threat to the security of humanity. Many representatives expressed the opinion that realization of the common aim to use outer space for peaceful purposes only therefore involved important military aspects too.

106. A draft resolution submitted by the USSR at the beginning of the debate referred also to military as-



pacts such as the prohibition of launching of rockets into cosmic space for military purposes and the elimination of all foreign military bases on the territories of other countries. In order to facilitate agreement on the narrower question of international co-operation in the use of cosmic space for peaceful purposes, the military aspects were no longer included in a revised draft resolution submitted by the USSR.

107. Other representatives urged that these military aspects should be considered within the framework of disarmament. The solution of disarmament questions, it was said, might even be facilitated and the friendly relations among peoples strengthened, if international co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space became a reality.

108. The debate further showed the complexity of the problem of outer space with regard to its juridical, scientific, technical and political aspects. The idea of the international character of outer space as a res communis omnium seemed to have been generally accepted.

109. Although the benefits mankind could derive from outer space were envisaged in the debate, it was pointed out that it was not yet known in exactly what form it might be possible to use the knowledge derived from exploring space for peaceful purposes. The debate clearly proved the necessity for international action to study and to solve collectively the numerous problems arising from the exploration of unknown infinite space.

110. Twenty Powers introduced a draft resolution which provided, as a first step, for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space and requested that committee to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session on four relevant categories of studies on outer space questions. This draft resolution was revised by the twenty Powers in the course of the debate, which showed that the main difference of opinion between the two positions did not relate to the substance of the work to be started but concerned the composition of the preparatory body to be established. Efforts to come to an agreement in this matter failed.

111. In the revised twenty-Power draft resolution, as submitted to the General Assembly, the important elements of the revised Soviet draft resolution were included and a membership of eighteen countries was proposed for the ad hoc committee. In the view of the twenty sponsors, the eighteen countries proposed represented not only the nations most advanced in outer space technology as well as those having demonstrated an active interest in the peaceful uses of outer space, but they also reflected the membership of the General Assembly.

112. With regard to the proposed composition of the ad hoc committee, the representative of the USSR stated in the First Committee [995th meeting] that the attempt to impose a membership list and compulsory participation in any committee was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Therefore his country would not take part in such a committee. He further stated that, in view of the fact that no unanimous decision was in sight regarding the Soviet draft resolution, the USSR would not press for a vote on its proposal.

113. The twenty-Power revised draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee by 54 votes to 9, with

18 abstentions. After the vote was taken several representatives expressed the hope that it might still be possible to reach an agreement on the composition of the proposed ad hoc committee before the item came before the Assembly, since the participation of the USSR, one of the two countries most advanced in this field, would be most desirable.

114. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The report of the First Committee [A/4009] on the question of the peaceful use of outer space has been submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration. The Soviet delegation considers it necessary first of all to observe that the draft resolution submitted in that report for the Assembly's approval is not the product of agreement and does not reflect the general sentiments and wishes expressed by various delegations during the discussion of the problem of the peaceful use of outer space.

115. An overwhelming majority of the countries represented in the First Committee quite clearly expressed their interest in ensuring the exclusively peaceful use of outer space, and favoured the establishment of international co-operation to that end under the auspices of the United Nations. The general tone of the debate in the Committee gave evidence of a desire to reach an agreement acceptable to all States and particularly to the Soviet Union and the United States, since those countries are engaged in fundamental research on outer space. The negative position adopted by the United States delegation, however, made it impossible to reach such an agreement.

116. The Soviet delegation spared no effort in its search for a mutually acceptable solution. Suffice it to recall that it was on the initiative of the USSR Government that the question of cosmic space was submitted to the General Assembly for consideration [see A/3818 and Corr.1]. In taking that initiative the Soviet delegation submitted specific proposals for a solution of the problem as a whole, including the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the related question of the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries, and the establishment within the United Nations framework of an international organ for co-operation in the study of cosmic space for peaceful purposes.

117. The United States flatly refused to consider the military aspects of the problem of outer space, thus revealing its intention to continue and intensify the rocket and nuclear weapons race which constitutes a threat to peace, and its unwillingness to subject to any sort of review its policy of establishing and expanding military bases on the territories of other countries, which are used by it as instruments of its aggressive policy directed against the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp and as a means of exerting pressure on the countries on whose territories such bases are established.

118. The repeated assertions of the United States representative in the First Committee that United States military bases were, allegedly, of a defensive character and had been established with the consent of the States concerned were rightly subjected to deserved criticism. During the discussion of this question many representatives referred to specific cases in which the peoples and Governments of a number of

countries on whose territories the United States has constructed military bases have long been trying without success to persuade the United States to eliminate those bases.

119. The United States delegation was unable to give any convincing answer to those statements, because it is obvious to everyone that the United States is striving at all cost to maintain and expand its network of military bases, which constitutes a threat to peace in various parts of the world.

120. Realizing that at the present time the United States and the other Western Powers refuse altogether to discuss the question of banning the use of cosmic space for military purposes, and seeking to meet the wishes of the many countries which are interested in the development of international co-operation in matters concerning the peaceful conquest of cosmic space, the USSR delegation took an important step in the direction of narrowing the gulf between the different positions and achieving agreement on at least one question, namely, international co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space. As we know, the military aspect of the problem of outer space was at that point entirely eliminated from the revised draft resolution of the Soviet Union, which proposed the establishment within the United Nations framework of an international committee for co-operation in the study of cosmic space for peaceful purposes. It was likewise proposed that a preparatory group consisting of eleven countries, namely, the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, India, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the United Arab Republic, Sweden and Argentina, should be established to draft a programme and rules for that committee. The draft resolution also laid down the essential functions of the international committee.

121. The Soviet Union's new proposals were regarded by a majority of the delegations in the First Committee as an important step towards the formulation of a compromise solution which would be acceptable to all. The general sense of the discussion which followed was that the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States, as the sponsors of the two draft resolutions, must meet informally and reach agreement on a single text.

122. In the circumstances the United States was obliged to agree to such a conversation. Owing to the obvious unwillingness of the United States delegation to proceed in earnest, however, that conversation actually lasted not more than one hour. The Soviet delegation made a real effort to meet the wishes of the United States on the thorny question of the composition of the preparatory group. Although the composition of the group originally proposed by the Soviet Union was balanced, the Soviet delegation agreed to include one additional Latin American country, thereby giving the Western countries an advantage. The Soviet delegation was prepared to continue the talks in the expectation that mutual concessions would result. The United States, however, did not take any corresponding step. What is more, it hastened to break off negotiations and, without even informing the Soviet delegation, submitted to the First Committee its revised draft resolution in which it proposed the formation of an *ad hoc* committee consisting of eighteen countries, twelve of the seats to be given to countries belonging to the military blocs established by the United States and only six to be given to other countries (three to so-

cialist and three to neutral countries). It is obvious that such a composition would have ensured the domination of the committee by the United States and would not have offered an equitable basis for co-operation among the States members of the committee.

123. The Soviet Union and a number of other States naturally could not and cannot agree to such a one-sided and biased composition of the committee. The Soviet delegation stated in the First Committee [995th meeting] that the establishment within the United Nations framework of an inter-governmental committee for co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space would be possible only if there was agreement between the States Members of the United Nations, particularly between the United States and the Soviet inasmuch as co-operation between these two countries, which have the greatest possibilities for making progress in this important field of human knowledge, is of paramount importance in this connexion. The USSR delegation stated that the attempts of the United States to dictate its will in the matter could lead to no good, and that the USSR would be unable to take part in a committee set up on such an inequitable basis. The representatives of Czechoslovakia and Poland also stated that the composition of the *ad hoc* committee proposed by the United States was unacceptable, and that they would refuse to take part in the work of such a committee.

124. The representatives of the United States and certain other Western Powers are trying to console themselves and others by stating that international co-operation in matters concerning outer space can, supposedly, be made effective without the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp, that the *ad hoc* committee can be established right now and the Soviet Union will eventually change its position and join this committee. Such reasoning is entirely unfounded, and is based on a desire to camouflage the unseemly attitude of the United States and to reassure public opinion, which is alarmed by the failure to reach agreement on the peaceful use of outer space. The delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to state that an *ad hoc* committee with the composition dictated by the United States cannot be an organ of international co-operation and would be doomed to failure, like a number of other committees set up by the United Nations in accordance with the dictates of the United States.

125. Fruitful co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space will be possible only if the composition of the committee which is to lay the groundwork for that important endeavour is satisfactory. The attempt by the United States to force through the membership it prefers by means of an automatic majority is one more example of the United States policy of dictatorial rule, a policy which never has been and never will be successful where the Soviet Union is concerned. The Soviet delegation is authorized to reaffirm that the Soviet Union will not participate in the work of the *ad hoc* committee proposed by the United States, because its membership would be one-sided and would not ensure an objective scrutiny of this important problem.

126. It should be clear to everyone that a committee in which the Soviet Union and other socialist States did not participate could not accomplish anything, and that a year later the General Assembly would find itself in the same position as today. The sad outcome of the attempts by the United States to force the General Assembly to accept for the Disarmament Com-

mission a composition suitable only to the Western Powers is still fresh in the minds of all. As a result, a whole year was lost, and the General Assembly was obliged at the present session to correct the mistake made last year through the fault of the United States. Now the United States delegation is again trying to impose on the General Assembly its own unilateral decision, thus leading to an impasse in the matter of the peaceful conquest of outer space under the auspices of the United Nations.

127. The unwillingness of the United States to co-operate on a footing of equality in the peaceful exploration of outer space is not an isolated case; rather it is a reflection of the generally aggressive course of United States foreign policy, whose salient feature is recourse to pressure and dictatorial methods. Clear manifestations of this policy are to be found in other fields as well.

128. The Soviet delegation considers that in so new and important a matter as the peaceful use of outer space it is essential to act in agreement from the very beginning. Only in that way can a firm foundation be laid for genuine and equitable co-operation in the matter between Governments.

129. As the draft resolution imposed on the First Committee by the United States delegation cannot serve as a basis for such co-operation, the Soviet delegation will vote against it, even though it does not object in substance to some of its provisions.

130. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would like to draw the Assembly's attention to the following point. In the United States Press and in the statements of certain representatives in the First Committee, it was argued that the Soviet Union, in submitting its revised draft resolution, had presumably withdrawn its original proposal for the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes concurrently with the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries. The USSR delegation wishes to reiterate that, important as it is to reach agreement on international co-operation in questions relating to the peaceful use of outer space, such agreement would in no way solve the fundamental problem, namely, the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes and the closely related question of eliminating foreign military bases on the territories of other countries—a problem for which a solution would still have to be found.

131. This problem cannot be simply put aside. It is still with us, and sooner or later it will have to be settled. Accordingly, the Soviet Union's proposal on the matter likewise remains in force. The Soviet Union reserves the right to bring up the matter again at the proper time and place and to seek a positive solution, as the peoples of different countries demand, in the interests of the peace and the security of States large and small.

132. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): We can be sure of one thing: the item which has appeared for the first time on our agenda under the modest title of "Question of the peaceful use of outer space" is here to stay. Every year this problem will be more and more important, more and more vital to the greatness of the human race as well as for its survival. Born out of the search for deadly weapons by human ingenuity, the greatest adventure of our era has begun. We have

embarked upon the road which can lead us to the stars and galaxies or to annihilation.

133. We have just taken the first step, and unfortunately we have already slipped. It was a wrong step, a step on a dangerous road. Up to this point the diplomatic exploration of cosmic space problems was much inferior to the technical exploration. But the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report [A/4009] is erroneous; it does not lead us anywhere. While basic agreement on the substance of the peaceful use of cosmic space has been in fact achieved, there is still lack of agreement on the important problem of the composition of the ad hoc committee to implement the agreement. At this stage of the debate I do not want to go into the details of the matter and the lack of agreement on it. The fact is that the United States did not want to accept a just and reasonable composition for the committee, and here we are, in the first cosmic blind alley. My country has been nominated to serve on the ad hoc committee. We would gladly assume this responsibility under one condition: that both great Powers which have achieved successes in the field of cosmic exploration take part in its work. We have just heard the statement of the representative of the USSR announcing that his country will not under the circumstances accept the proposed committee. In view of this fact I have to declare that my delegation does not see any possibility for fruitful work to emerge from this crippled committee, and therefore will not take part in its work. We hope that this initial deadlock will be overcome in the near future, and that we will soon be able to embark together on this great and noble cause of peaceful co-operation in this field which is even more than international.

134. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I think it is rather a pity that this session of the General Assembly has been characterized so prominently by the attempt of the Soviet Union to make every single subject before the Assembly a source of rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, leaving everyone else out.

135. We believe in the small countries. We believe in having a big General Assembly in which every country has one vote, and we can never fall in with this Soviet plan to divide the world into two Power blocs where there are just the Soviet Union and the United States that do the talking. I regret that Mr. Sobolev's speech was very much in line with that way of thinking.

136. In his speech, the USSR representative raised the question of disarmament in connexion with the use of outer space, and he referred to military bases. All this, of course, is totally unrelated to the question before us, but, as he has raised these points, let me say this to him. Whenever the Soviet Union wishes to talk about realistic measures to ban the use of outer space for military purposes, the United States is ready. We were the first to seek such an agreement. For two years we have repeated our offer to negotiate—most recently, on two occasions in the First Committee [983rd and 994th meetings]. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union has failed ever to respond to our offers. The United States would like nothing better than to make real progress in this important field.

137. Let me say, too, that the sponsors of the draft resolution on outer space adopted the salient features

of the Soviet draft resolution. We took those ideas over and put them in and adopted them as an example of our good will and our desire for harmony. We, the sponsors of this draft resolution, made a number of offers which, I think, can be characterized as generous as regards the membership of the proposed committee. I think that the sponsors sought to meet the Soviet Union more than half way. But when we tried to do this, the answer which we got from the USSR representative was to eliminate from the proposed committee six countries, all of which have a big part to play in outer space—and I do not know why I should not give the Assembly the list of the names of the countries which Mr. Zorin wanted to eliminate from the proposed committee. The names were: Italy, Belgium, Japan, Brazil, Iran and Australia—all of them countries with a contribution to make, but he insisted that they should all be dropped. We even offered to add Romania. We thought that that might make the ad hoc committee more attractive to him. But Mr. Zorin said no.

138. I heard Mr. Sobolev this evening talk about automatic majorities. One of the things that has impressed me here—and, I think, has impressed quite a number of delegations—is the automatic minority which we see performing fairly regularly. I think that if the day ever comes when the Soviet Union gets a majority in this body—and I hope that it will come because it will mean that the Soviet Union has changed its policy and its attitude—he will not call it an automatic majority. It is automatic when the other fellow gets it.

139. The United States supports this draft resolution on the peaceful use of outer space. We think that it should command the unanimous support of the Assembly, and that it could do so were it not for the insistence by the Soviet Union on what we consider to be a distorted and unprecedented composition for the ad hoc committee.

140. The Soviet Union representative has made it clear that he is unwilling to accept a committee the composition of which is based on two criteria: that is, scientific advancement and technical activity, on the one hand, in the field of outer space, and equitable geographical distribution representative of the Members of the United Nations, on the other. If one looks at the list of the members of the proposed committee, one will see that they reflect those two criteria.

141. The Soviet Union insisted on certain conditions regarding the composition which we consider to be entirely incompatible with the principles upon which the United Nations was founded. It insisted, with respect to this new venture in international co-operation, that the world be divided into two hostile camps, or two sides, as Mr. Zorin phrased it. Then the two camps, or the sides, must be represented by equal numbers of countries on the proposed committee. Decisions would be made by voting blocs. There would not be deliberations, there would not be consideration regarding the merits of questions, there would not be independent judgements; there would be simply these blocs that would play follow the leader. I do not think that the United Nations can accept something like that. It is totally inappropriate to an effort of international co-operation to approach this subject on these assumptions of conflict and hostility and power politics. It is clearly undemocratic, and it is out of line with previous decisions of the General Assembly on this ques-

tion. This is a very fundamental difference. The Soviet Union is attempting to create a new position for itself in the United Nations, and it is attempting to do so at the expense of the rank and file of United Nations Members. There is no other way it can be done. When the Soviet representative talks about equality, that is precisely what he means.

142. If this effort succeeds in dividing the world into a group of satellites of the Soviet Union—which does exist—and a group of satellites of the United States—which does not exist, and which will never exist—then the rest of the delegations might as well go home. There would be nothing left here to do.

143. I think that the time to resist these demands is when they start, and that is what the Assembly did when it rejected the Soviet demand for the satellization of the Disarmament Commission last year. We believe that the Assembly will continue to do the same in the future, and that it will prevent the Soviet Union from shrinking the influence of the Assembly to the vanishing point in the same way that it has destroyed the legal authority of the Security Council. That is exactly what is at stake here.

144. The composition of the ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space is more than fair to the Soviet Union and its adherents, and, in spite of the differences which have developed, we still hope that the Soviet Union will recognize these facts and ultimately decide to participate. The work of the committee will proceed in any event, but we hope that it can proceed co-operatively.

145. The United Nations should assume its role in the peaceful uses of outer space now when a new era is starting. This is the reason why the United States asked the General Assembly [see A/3902] to consider the peaceful uses of outer space and to establish a committee which would survey the problems and the resources involved and would recommend at the fourteenth session of the Assembly a programme of international co-operation in outer space which might be undertaken under United Nations auspices and under organizational arrangements which would be suitable and constructive.

146. The proposed ad hoc committee has important work before it. The Soviet Union can make a great and unique contribution to its work. In spite of the differences which the Assembly has witnessed here tonight, we still hope that the Soviet Union will not withhold the great contribution which it can make to international co-operation in this field. The United States, for its part, pledges whole-hearted co-operation in the future work of this committee.

147. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Soviet Union representative who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

148. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation cannot leave unanswered the remarks which have just been made by the United States representative. Once again Mr. Lodge has presented an inaccurate version of the negotiations which took place between the United States and Soviet delegations. I fail to see any reason for this.

149. The First Committee was given an inaccurate account of what took place between the Soviet dele-

gation and the United States delegation, and now, in the General Assembly, assertions are again being made which have no basis in fact.

150. According to Mr. Lodge's account of the negotiations between the Soviet and United States delegations, the Soviet delegation insisted on the exclusion of six countries from the list submitted by the United States—he even named those countries. That is not so.

151. The Soviet delegation did not propose the exclusion of any of the countries mentioned by Mr. Lodge, and for a very simple reason. I feel the General Assembly should know that, in fact, we made another attempt to reach agreement on the matter of composition. And what was the result? The Soviet delegation proposed to the United States delegation the resumption of the negotiations which had been undertaken on the recommendation of the First Committee and interrupted on the initiative of the United States before the First Committee had reached a decision. We proposed that those negotiations should be resumed at the point at which they had been broken off.

152. What was that point? As everyone knows, the Soviet delegation, at the very outset, proposed a preparatory group of eleven members and specified its composition. I have already listed those members: the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, India, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the United Arab Republic, Sweden and Argentina. During the negotiations the United States proposed a committee of thirteen, rather than eleven, countries. To go some way to meet the United States, the Soviet Union agreed to the addition of one more country to the eleven—a country from the Latin American group. As the original list of eleven members included only one Latin American country—Argentina—and Mr. Lodge's list, which did not name specific countries but groups of countries, included two members from the Latin American group, we suggested the inclusion of a second Latin American country.

153. When the entire list had been considered in this way, it was found that there was disagreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on only two groups of countries—the countries of Eastern Europe and those composing the British Commonwealth of Nations. Whereas Mr. Lodge proposed the inclusion of two countries from the British Commonwealth, our list contained only one—India. Mr. Lodge did not regard India as a member of the British Commonwealth. On the other hand, our list included three Eastern European countries in addition to the Soviet Union, while Mr. Lodge proposed two. The negotiations were interrupted at that point. Agreement had not been reached on the group of Eastern European countries and the group of British Commonwealth countries.

154. At a meeting recently after the Committee had adopted its decision, the Soviet delegation naturally proposed that the negotiations should open, or rather be resumed, at the point at which they had been broken off—and not broken off by us. To meet the wishes of the United States regarding the two British Commonwealth countries, the Soviet Union proposed the addition of two British Commonwealth countries—Canada and Ceylon—to the twelve countries it had named. Ceylon is also an Asian country, and its addition would increase the representation of the Asian continent.

155. We thus made concessions regarding all the United States delegation's proposals in this matter. All we asked was that the United States delegation should meet us halfway and include the Eastern European countries we had mentioned. Surely that list of fourteen members includes sufficient representatives of the Western camp? Consider for yourselves: can there be any question, with such a membership of fourteen States, of the Soviet Union—or the Soviet bloc, as Mr. Lodge prefers to call it—holding the upper hand, or dominating or controlling the committee? Obviously not. Even with this membership the Western Powers have a majority, and this amply demonstrates the Soviet Union's desire to find an agreed solution to the issue.

156. We were told that this was not acceptable, and that the United States could not agree to any composition other than the one it had proposed and the Committee had approved. This is an attempt to impose a solution instead of negotiating.

157. We had warned Mr. Lodge, before he submitted his list of eighteen countries, that the question of membership must be settled by negotiation. But what happened? You all know that, instead of negotiations, instead of an attempt to seek an agreed solution, an attempt was made to impose a solution by dictatorial methods, by means of a vote in the First Committee.

158. I would ask the Members of the General Assembly to consider carefully what has happened over this issue and to decide for themselves who intends to impose his will on the General Assembly, and who wants agreement and is genuinely striving to reach agreement by taking into account the other side's point of view.

159. We believe that the Soviet Union has done everything possible in that respect. The Soviet Union therefore states once again that no fruitful co-operation can be expected of a committee whose composition is dictated and not arrived at by mutual agreement. Without such co-operation the committee would be useless and the Soviet Union will not participate in the work of any such body.

160. The PRESIDENT: I wish to say how deeply disappointed I am—and I am sure many of you feel the same way—that this deadlock between the two negotiating countries has not been broken. If, even at this late hour there is someone in this Assembly who can break this deadlock and bring about agreement and a harmonious conclusion to this issue, he will be making a real contribution to the cause of peace. For my part, I can only voice this feeling, and hope that something can be done.

161. I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

162. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Let me begin by saying, in response to the remark made by the President, that we would like nothing better than to break the deadlock. Now I am just going to give the Assembly the factual history of these negotiations. The Soviet Union has tried to cultivate the impression that it has been eminently reasonable, and that the fifty-four Members of the United Nations who voted in the First Committee for the twenty-Powers revised draft resolution, but particularly the United States, have been inflexible and unreasonable and have refused



to negotiate seriously. So let us see exactly what happened.

163. First, the United States gave the Soviet Union its draft resolution several days before the debate began and offered the Soviet Union an opportunity to co-sponsor, and we gave it time to consider the question. One hour later the Soviet Union, without notice to the United States, submitted its own draft resolution. Four days later the Soviet representative finally replied to our approaches, telling us that the Soviet Union preferred the debate to proceed. Now, that was the kind of co-operation which we got at the outset.

164. Second, the Soviet Union submitted its revised draft resolution which deleted the military base issue, but which also specified what States should be on the committee. Again there was no advance consultation. The Soviet slate was carefully arranged to include four members from the Soviet group, four from what it calls Western countries, and four which it regards as neutrals. It was clearly based on the concept of two sides. This was the second example of Soviet co-operation. We welcomed evolution of the Soviet position, and, after consultation with our co-sponsors, we entered into discussions with the Soviet Union to try to produce a joint resolution with a reasonable composition.

165. Third, the United States delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, had private talks with the Soviet Union on 20 and 21 November 1958. We took the position that the committee should reflect technical competence in outer space and the membership of the United Nations. The Soviet Union contended that it must be made up of two sides, and that the Soviet Union should have the right to veto all candidates. We suggested two possible slates, based on our criteria, and fair to the Soviet Union: one of nine members, one of thirteen. The Soviet Union continued to insist on a composition including four communist countries and reflecting the equality of the two-sides idea. It stated that it would not accept any countries from Latin America with which it did not have diplomatic relations, and that it would not accept Australia or Belgium. This produced what in French is called an impasse, a fact which both of us recognized at that time. In fact, that actual word was used at the end of the final discussions, and that was the third example of co-operation.

166. In the fourth place, the co-sponsors had decided to introduce a revised draft resolution with their own slate of eighteen members, with a ratio still more favourable to the Soviet Union, which they did after discussion of the candidates with other members of the First Committee. Then the Committee approved this list by a vote on the pertinent paragraph of 51 to 9. The Soviet Union then stated it would not serve on the committee, even though the Soviet Union and its satellites would have a larger share of seats, a larger proportion of seats than they enjoyed in the United Nations itself. This was the fourth example of Soviet co-operation.

167. Fifth, because of the obvious value of Soviet co-operation in the proposed committee several delegations have made informal efforts since the draft resolution was adopted by the First Committee to ascertain whether some agreement could be reached. The Soviet Union tried to convey the impression in these

conversations that it wished to be on the committee, and that the United States alone prevented its participation. But whenever the Soviet position has been further explored, in each instance it has become clear that it has no intention of negotiating. It continues to insist on the equality of the two sides, and also on the removal of certain Members already elected to the committee. This has been the fifth example of Soviet co-operation.

168. Sixth, in order to provide every possible opportunity for an agreement to be reached, the United States delegation again consulted with the Soviet delegation on Thursday evening, 11 December 1958. I suggested that the committee might be increased by two more members, Romania and Austria. The addition of Romania would have meant that every single State originally suggested by the Soviet Union would be included. But the representative of the Soviet Union rejected this offer. He suggested that any increase would have to be by six members, all, he said, from what he calls "on our side," so that there would be a balance in the committee of twelve on what he regarded as the Soviet side, and twelve on what he regarded as the United States side. He recognized this would sound artificial, and proposed the next day a balanced membership of fourteen. His proposal was to drop Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Italy, Iran and Japan, and to substitute Romania and Ceylon. There is not any question about it. I took his names and I checked them off against the names on our list, and the ones that would be dropped off were these six: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Italy, Iran and Japan. He made it absolutely clear that the Soviet Union wanted to have a balanced slate reflecting an equality of two sides. It was also clear that he still insisted on vetoing Australia, Belgium and any Latin American country with which the Soviet Union had no diplomatic relations, adding opposition this time to Italy, Iran and Japan. The negotiations therefore broke down again, and this was the sixth example of Soviet co-operation.

169. Yesterday morning, to finish this narrative, we asked the Soviet representatives again whether they had reached any new conclusions concerning the suggestions we had made. They repeated their proposal for reducing the number of members to fourteen, on a basis of two sides, and made it quite clear that they could not accept any increase at all in the size of the committee.

170. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

171. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I apologize for taking up the time of the General Assembly with such details, but one cannot remain silent when facts are misrepresented.

172. Mr. Lodge implied that in all the lists proposed by the Soviet Union the Soviet bloc "predominated", as he put it, or was in a majority. I shall again read you the list of the eleven members: the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, India, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the United Arab Republic, Sweden and Argentina. Four of these countries belong to the Socialist camp: the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia; four are Western Powers: the United States, the United Kingdom, France,

Argentina; three are neutral: India, the United Arab Republic, Sweden. How can there be any question of a preponderance of countries associated with the Soviet Union? Besides, after the addition of Mexico, Canada and Ceylon to the list of eleven, can the Soviet Union still be held to have a majority? Everyone can count. The most elementary arithmetic shows which side has a majority and which a minority.

173. And what was the composition of the list of eighteen proposed by Mr. Lodge? Twelve countries (which I shall not enumerate) bound by military agreements to the United States, three countries of the Socialist camp and three neutrals. Consider for a moment: twelve countries on the side of Mr. Lodge, with the possible opposition of three Socialist countries and three neutral countries. Now, we know that the neutral countries seldom vote for one side or the other. On the contrary, they are neutral precisely because they are not aligned with either side and maintain their own individual position. It was for this reason that the Soviet proposals placed a group of neutral countries in a position where they could tip the scales one way or the other.

174. What is wrong with this? Why is it unacceptable? Why does Mr. Lodge consider that the only fair composition is one in which the representatives of the Western military blocs have a two-to-one majority? This is a curious conception of fairness which we do not agree with, and we believe there are many others who will share our view.

175. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4009]. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland.

Against: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea.

The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

176. The PRESIDENT: I call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

177. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): I should like to explain why the Czechoslovak

delegation voted against the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee. Our delegation regrets that, owing to the intransigent attitude of the United States, we were unable to reach agreement on such an important issue as the peaceful use of outer space. The debate on this question in the First Committee showed that there was every opportunity for reaching such an agreement, since the representatives of all the parties concerned held fundamentally identical views on the essential aspects of the problem. The cause of the present unsatisfactory situation lies in the attitude of the United States, which, when there was a chance of unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution on the peaceful use of outer space, declined to discuss the composition of the proposed preparatory group, and tried by obstructionist tactics to impose a one-sided and entirely unacceptable composition, which would have placed members of military blocs associated with the United States in a privileged position. This, incidentally, was clearly demonstrated by the debate which preceded the vote today. For all his efforts, Mr. Lodge failed to prove that the United States had sincerely tried to reach agreement on a composition acceptable to both sides.

178. During the debate on the peaceful use of outer space in the First Committee, the great majority of representatives emphatically maintained that, before international co-operation could be achieved in this new field, it was essential to adopt such organizational measures as would ensure real progress. In that debate a number of delegations also pointed out that, as in the case of disarmament, the United Nations could not achieve any results in the matter of the peaceful use of outer space unless its decisions were unanimous. It is surely obvious that any General Assembly decision on this problem will remain on paper unless it has the approval of the Soviet Union and the United States, the two great Powers actively conducting research in outer space. If the General Assembly is to obtain genuine international co-operation in the study of outer space within the framework of the United Nations, it cannot achieve this by a simple majority vote. Attempts to impose a decision serving the interests of one side alone—in this case the interests of the United States—do not constitute a realistic approach to this problem.

179. The Czechoslovak delegation voted against the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee as it constitutes an attempt to impose a one-sided decision. Our delegation states once again that it will not serve on the Ad Hoc Committee established under the resolution that had just been adopted, since the Committee's present composition precludes the achievement by it of any positive results.

180. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): My delegation shares the view expressed by Mr. Lodge that it is most disappointing that the Soviet Union should in effect declare a boycott of the Ad Hoc Committee provided for in the draft resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom delegation and nineteen others which has just been adopted.

181. As I stated in the First Committee [994th meeting], much common ground was found between the position of the Soviet Union and that of the twenty Powers which co-sponsored the draft resolution. In particular, we were agreed that there was a need for international co-operation in the field of outer space.

That being the case, it is indeed regrettable that the Ad Hoc Committee, capable though it is of doing much useful work without Soviet participation, should be deprived of the valuable contributions which the Soviet Union could make to its work. We regret that the Soviet delegation felt unable to accept the modifications in the composition of the Committee offered to them by the United States delegation on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

182. The Soviet delegation has, it seems to me, advanced no very convincing reasons for their decision to boycott the Ad Hoc Committee. Perhaps the most revealing argument was one used by Mr. Zorin in a statement to the Press on 25 November 1958, when he said:

"It is worthy of attention that of eighteen countries proposed by the United States for the composition of the preparatory committee, twelve countries belong to military blocs created by the United States of America and dependent on it, and only six seats are reserved for other countries, three for socialist countries and three for neutral countries."

The statement continues:

"Thus, in the question of using outer space for peaceful purposes, the United States of America sets itself the task of establishing a committee which would be fully under its control and would not provide any basis for the equal co-operation of States parties to it."

183. Mr. Sobolev and his colleagues here have spoken in the same vein this evening. It is not surprising that in these circumstances the efforts of the United States delegation to reach an agreement with the Soviet delegation failed. This way of looking at the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee seems quite unacceptable to us. We know the Soviet conception that the world is divided into two blocs engaged in mortal strife, but we do not share this view of the international scene.

184. In any case, there seems to us no reason why the Committee should take the form of one group of States under the leadership of the Soviet Union and another group under the leadership of the United States. That is not the way we look at the Committee at all. Indeed, it seems to my delegation really incredible that in relation to a field so vast and so inspiring as that of outer space there should be any thought that it should be affected by the differences between the inhabitants of this single planet. The historians of the future, when they read the proceedings on this item in this Assembly, will find it difficult to understand the considerations which have been behind our failure to reach unanimous agreement on this question.

185. Now that the Assembly has adopted the resolution, I would appeal to the Soviet Union to reconsider their position and examine their own interests—we do not ask them to consider ours—before deciding finally to stand aside from the work of the rest of the world in this field.

### AGENDA ITEM 63

#### Question of Algeria

#### REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4075)

186. Mr. MATSCH (Austria), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General

Assembly the report of the First Committee on the question of Algeria [A/4075] and the draft resolution adopted by that Committee.

187. Many representatives expressed regret that the French delegation was absent from the First Committee when this item was discussed, and that no solution for Algeria had emerged since resolution 1184 (XII) was adopted by the General Assembly on 10 December 1957, recommending pourparlers to achieve a solution in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

188. The political and military events which occurred in Algeria last year were outlined in the discussion, and all speakers expressed their great concern over the situation in Algeria.

189. Many representatives stated that it was the duty of the United Nations not only to advise negotiations to the parties concerned to bring to an end the tragic conflict which, because of its implications, went far beyond the domestic sphere of the territory wherein this conflict was taking place, but also to point out what the orientations of a solution in harmony with the basic right of peoples to freedom and independence were.

190. Some representatives contended that, in conformity with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the United Nations was not entitled to define a final solution in this matter, even if international aspects were involved, because this matter is one of domestic jurisdiction to be decided in negotiations between the French Government and the Algerians; therefore, the General Assembly should use its moral authority merely to make an appeal that negotiations take place with a view to finding a peaceful and just solution.

191. These were, in general, the two positions advocated in the debate.

192. In the draft resolution presented by seventeen Powers and adopted by the First Committee [1023rd meeting], the right of the Algerian people to independence was recognized in the preamble, and in the operative part the General Assembly would urge negotiations between the two parties concerned, the French Government and the provisional Government of the Algerian Republic, with a view to reaching a solution in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

193. Mr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya): Before the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4075] is put to the vote, the delegation of the Federation of Malaya would like to appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution to agree to the deletion of the seventh preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

"Taking note of the willingness of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic to enter into negotiations with the Government of France,".

194. This would enable my delegation and other like-minded delegations that abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because of this paragraph to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

195. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon): The Assembly has just heard the appeal made by the representative of the Federation of Malaya. The sponsors in general, and the Ceylon delegation in particular, appreciate the spirit that animates our colleague from Malaya in

making this appeal. We wish to respond cordially to this appeal in the hope that our acceptance of the proposal of the representative of Malaya will enable not only his delegation but many other delegations to vote for the draft resolution.

196. On behalf of the co-sponsors, I formally agree to the deletion of the seventh paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

197. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): As I understand it, this draft resolution is no longer the property of the sponsors, but is now a draft resolution submitted by the First Committee. Therefore, the sponsors cannot amend it. That is prohibited by the rules of procedure. It is no longer a draft resolution of the Powers which submitted it. It is a draft resolution of the First Committee.

198. Therefore the seventh preambular paragraph can only be deleted by a vote of the Assembly. In my opinion, it is not in accordance with the rules of procedure to amend a draft resolution of a committee merely because the sponsors say so.

199. The PRESIDENT: I understand perfectly the situation which the representative of Cuba has raised. All that has happened is that the sponsors, on reflection, have decided not to insist on this particular text, and obviously they have every right to say so here before the General Assembly; they are not interfering with its sovereignty in any way. It is the General Assembly itself that will have to decide whether or not this paragraph shall be omitted. What the representative of Cuba said is perfectly clear: the draft resolution is not the property of the sponsors any longer; it had been submitted by the First Committee and is the property of the General Assembly.

200. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): All that the General Assembly can do with draft resolutions submitted by Committees is to vote on them. It cannot agree to delete the preambular paragraph in question except by vote, because the opinion expressed therein is that of the First Committee; and all that the General Assembly can do is to reject or accept the recommendations of the First Committee by vote.

201. What the President proposes, therefore, is not in conformity with the rules of procedure. Under the rules of procedure, what the General Assembly can do, in exercise of its right, is to vote on the draft and reject it. This it can definitely do. But what it cannot do is to assume that the draft has not been submitted, because the body which is submitting the draft and which agreed on it is not the General Assembly but the First Committee. They are two entirely different bodies.

202. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): Since the interpretation of the rules of procedure given by the representative of Cuba is absolutely correct, my delegation formally proposes, in accordance with the rules, that a separate vote be taken on the paragraph proposed for deletion, and that this vote be taken by roll-call.

203. The PRESIDENT: Unless the representatives of Malaya and Ceylon contradict me, I take it that they were moving formally the deletion of the seventh paragraph of the preamble. If that is what they want me to put before the General Assembly in view of the re-

marks of the representatives of Cuba and the Dominican Republic, I will put it to the General Assembly in that form. I ask either the representative of Ceylon or the representative of Malaya to tell the Assembly the form they wish this deletion to take.

204. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon): I now formally move the deletion of the seventh paragraph of the preamble.

205. The PRESIDENT: This motion was submitted before the motion of the representative of the Dominican Republic, and therefore I will put it to the vote first.

206. We will now vote on the motion of the representative of Ceylon to delete the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recommended in the report of the First Committee [A/4075]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Laos, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan.

Abstaining: Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jordan.

The motion was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 43 abstentions.

207. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): Our delegation would like to call attention to the condition of the draft resolution now that the seventh preambular paragraph has been deleted as a result of the vote which has just been taken.

208. The seventh paragraph of the preamble, which has been deleted, named two parties. The operative paragraph reads: "Urges negotiations between the two parties concerned with a view to reaching a solution..."

209. Now that the seventh preambular paragraph has been deleted, the operative paragraph makes no sense. Therefore we request that it be deleted from the draft resolution, and propose that this be done by a separate, roll-call vote.

210. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Dominican Republic has requested a roll-call vote on the operative paragraph of the draft resolution. May I ask the representative of the Dominican Republic whether he is moving the deletion of that paragraph or whether he wishes a separate vote to be taken on a part of the paragraph?

211. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): All that I did was to point out that there is no longer any justification for retaining the operative paragraph after deleting the seventh preambular paragraph. There is no logical reason for it.

212. The PRESIDENT: What are you moving for us? Please formulate your proposal.

213. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): The Assembly should decide whether the operative paragraph makes sense or does not make sense by taking a separate, roll-call vote.

214. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): What the representative of the Dominican Republic has requested—and if he has not done so the Cuban delegation requests it—is that a separate vote should be taken on the operative paragraph, and that the words "between the two parties concerned" should also be voted upon separately. Logically, since the seventh preambular paragraph has been deleted, the words "the two parties concerned" should no longer appear in the operative paragraph. Therefore it is necessary to vote separately on the words "between the two parties concerned" and then on the rest of the operative paragraph.

215. The PRESIDENT: I understood the representative of the Dominican Republic to say that he was asking for a separate vote on the operative paragraph of this draft resolution. That is quite proper. I now understand the representative of Cuba amends that request by asking that a separate vote be taken on a part of this paragraph, namely, "between the two parties concerned".

216. You have before you a Cuban proposal, which has priority over the Dominican Republic's proposal, and then a Dominican Republic proposal.

217. I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

218. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): A separate vote has just been requested on the operative paragraph. In accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure I have the right to express my opinion on this way of voting.

219. I wish to state that my delegation would oppose a separate vote either on the whole paragraph or on part of it. I would like the Assembly to understand my delegation's position. Together with other delegations, we agreed to the withdrawal of the seventh preambular paragraph. I hope that in opposing a separate vote we can obtain a sizable majority which will be the true expression of the General Assembly's desire for peace.

220. The PRESIDENT: I did not quite understand the representative of Tunisia. Did he say that he does not want me to put this proposal to the decision of the Assembly?

221. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): Under rule 91 of the rules of procedure, the President has the right to call for a vote on the proposal made by the representative of the Dominican Republic, as amended by the Cuban representative. But I have the right to express my opinion and to say that my delegation is opposed to this way of voting.

222. The PRESIDENT: Rule 91 reads as follows:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately."

That is what the representatives of Cuba and the Dominican Republic have done.

"If objection is made to the request for division, ..."

Objection has obviously been made by the representative of Tunisia.

"...the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are subsequently approved shall be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

It is the last part which is in the mind, obviously, of the representative of Tunisia.

223. I call on the representative of Uruguay on a point of order.

224. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): A request has been made for the deletion, either in whole or in part, of the only paragraph in the operative part of the draft resolution. So that we may be able to vote on this paragraph with eyes open, I feel that we should first vote on other paragraphs of this draft resolution on which the operative part depends. For example, in keeping with our rules of procedure, a separate vote could be taken on the fourth paragraph of the preamble which reads: "Recognizing the right of the Algerian people to independence".

225. The final vote on this matter might depend to some extent on the relationship between the paragraphs, the order in which they stand, and on whether some of them are approved or not. For that reason, I think that the question has been confused by the fact that a separate vote has been requested on the operative part of this draft resolution before we have gone into its preambular paragraphs.

226. If the rules of procedure so permit—and I do not think that the rules of procedure are contrary to reason—I should like to ask that a separate vote be taken on each of the paragraphs for which a separate vote is requested. My delegation, for its part, would like a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph.

227. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Uruguay has asked for a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph and that request is certainly in order. Unless the Assembly overrules me, and it has every right to do that, I shall follow the procedure suggested by the representative of Uruguay.

228. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

229. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): I do not rise to oppose the ruling of the President or to start a debate on this question which has been thoroughly debated in the Committee. I simply want to express my opposition to the requests made by the representatives of Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Uruguay.



230. This draft resolution was examined thoroughly in the Committee. It now stands before the Assembly as one unit. In fairness to the question of Algeria, to its far-reaching importance and to its relevance to the cause of peace in the region and in the whole world, this Assembly should express itself one way or the other on the whole draft resolution.

231. The co-sponsors, through our colleague from Ceylon, accepted in a spirit of conciliation the appeal to delete that paragraph which caused a great deal of controversy in the Committee and was a source of difficulty for many delegations in defining their positions. We did so in a spirit of harmony, and here in the United Nations we are to harmonize our views. But I am afraid that the requests made by our colleagues from Cuba, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic are in a sense disharmony and not harmony.

232. I therefore ask the General Assembly with all humility to take the draft resolution as a whole or to leave it as a whole. This is a matter which does not raise questions of political controversies; it raises an issue of peace or war. It is for the Assembly to take a firm stand on whether it is for peace or for war. This is a very regrettable and serious situation.

233. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the deletion of a controversial proviso, and now we are faced with the destruction of the whole of the draft resolution. This is neither fair to the Algerian question, nor to the cause of peace, nor to the spirit of conciliation that has been displayed. I think that we should be met half-way. It is only fair that this division should be opposed and should not be accepted by the Assembly.

234. The PRESIDENT: Separate votes have been requested on two paragraphs, and I will call for a vote on those paragraphs in the order in which they appear in the draft resolution.

235. Purely in an effort to be helpful, I shall ask the representative of Saudi Arabia and his colleagues if they will consider the possibility of redrafting the operative paragraph in such a way as to make it more acceptable.

236. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I beg to disagree with the procedure the President has just proposed.

237. The situation is quite straightforward. The mode of voting on draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly is regulated by rule 91 of the rules of procedure, which states: "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately". We have two proposals on this issue: the proposal of the Cuban representative to vote separately on certain words of the operative paragraph; and the proposal of the Uruguayan representative that the fourth preambular paragraph should be put to a separate vote. These proposals have one thing in common: they are both motions for division.

238. Rule 91 goes on to say: "If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon". An objection in principle to the request for division was made by the representative of Saudi Arabia, who opposed any division of the vote, either on separate paragraphs or on individual words. His objection therefore applies to both proposals—the Cuban and the Uruguayan. A decision must now be taken on

the question before us: is the Assembly to vote separately on parts of the draft resolution, in view of the fact that an objection has been raised to such a division?

239. The Saudi Arabian representative adduced some very cogent and serious arguments against division explaining that the draft resolution is an integral whole and that individual words and paragraphs cannot be taken out of their context and considered in isolation. That must not be done.

240. I believe, therefore, that the correct procedure would be to take a vote on whether the Assembly wishes parts of this draft resolution to be put to the vote separately.

241. The PRESIDENT: We have now had two speakers against the motion for division: the representative of Saudi Arabia and the representative of the Soviet Union. I understand the representatives from Cuba and the Dominican Republic are in favour of division. We have therefore had two speakers for and two speakers against. Is the Assembly ready to decide on whether we should act on the request for division?

242. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): Our right to oppose the request for division arises from rule 91 which was initially referred to by the representative of Tunisia. The request for division was made by our colleagues from Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Uruguay, that is, there was a motion for separate votes. We have opposed that and we oppose it now.

243. We ask you, Mr. President, to put to the Assembly this question in this form: whether the Assembly is ready to vote on the draft resolution as a whole as it has been passed by the Committee, with the deletion of the last preambular paragraph; or whether the Assembly is willing to accept a division.

244. The second point is in answer to the observation made by the President with regard to the operative paragraph. With the intention of being helpful in disposing of this item as quickly and as judiciously as possible, he has been kind enough to ask whether we are prepared to reconsider the wording of the operative paragraph. Well, we have already applied our minds to this question on several occasions in the debate in the First Committee and in the lobbies of the United Nations. This is not the first time that we have been asked to consider rephrasing that operative part. The co-sponsors have always been quite co-operative and receptive to suggestions, and have been ready to examine any possible way of phrasing the paragraph that might be helpful and acceptable.

245. But the present text is the minimum that the co-sponsors can accept. This is a moderate paragraph; there is no excessiveness in it. It simply states that the two parties concerned should enter into negotiations.

246. Well, we are all agreed that there is a dispute, a dispute which has caused war, a dispute which has brought into the area of Algeria half a million soldiers. This disastrous episode, this great tragedy in Algeria, certainly calls for the parties concerned to enter into negotiations. And this is not only the minimum of the co-sponsors; it must be the minimum of the whole United Nations. This is the minimum requirement demanded of the United Nations when war is raging in one part of the world, a war which may spread out of

the Mediterranean area into other areas and become a world conflagration. The minimum requirement of the United Nations is to appeal to the parties, to call upon them and urge them to enter into immediate negotiations without any agreements, without any conditions. That is what we have suggested.

247. We have not asked that one should recognize the other or should accept certain conditions or certain objectives. It is a free negotiation, a negotiation that has been specified and provided for by the Charter of the United Nations. And now we find ourselves faced with certain efforts to defeat the very procedure that has been provided for in the Charter. This is too much. Let us not end this session by defeating the objectives of the Charter and of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution. This is a war exigency. We have to respond to the situation. This is a question of war; it is not a political controversy to be considered from the point of view of terms and phraseology.

248. We have pondered this question very carefully and very peacefully and very patiently, and have come to the conclusion that our minimum requirement is a recommendation urging the two parties—and I say "two parties"; why should there not be two parties mentioned?—to cease fire. We all know that there is the Provisional Government which can either cease fire or continue the war. If you want the war to be discontinued, you must appeal to the parties which can cease fire. They are the authorities which can continue the war or discontinue it. There is no use ignoring the problem or hiding behind it. In every dispute, and particularly in a war, there are two parties. Why should we then be reluctant to address ourselves to the two parties? Can any delegation which desires a separate vote tell us that there are not two parties? Is France fighting France? Is Paris fighting Paris? Metropolitan France is fighting metropolitan France? No one can deny the fact that there is a war between two separate entities: the people of Algeria on the one hand, and the French Army on the other. There is an organized army led by the Provisional Government of Algeria. Whether that fact is accepted or rejected, there is war between two parties. You appeal to two parties to discontinue the war and to enter into direct negotiations in order to reach a peaceful solution of the question. Is this objectionable? I can only say in all sincerity that if the United Nations were to water down this draft resolution, were to take a separate vote, or to reject that main paragraph, the object of the whole draft resolution would be defeated. And that means only one thing and no other: war. And continuation of war. It is for the General Assembly to choose between war and peace. This is the time when, by our votes, we should make known our attitude as to whether we are for war or for peace. As far as the sponsors of the draft resolution and all their supporters and friends are concerned, we are for peace. Let those who are for war vote differently, or ask for separate votes.

249. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): From the way in which the representative of Saudi Arabia has spoken, it would appear that this problem was created by the delegation of Cuba. But the delegation of Cuba had nothing to do with this problem.

250. The request for the deletion of a paragraph of the draft resolution was not initiated by the Cuban delegation. The deletion of the seventh paragraph of the

preamble was effected in accordance with the rules of procedure. Something then emerged which, in the opinion of the delegations of Cuba and the Dominican Republic, was absurd and contrary to the rules of grammar. If the part reading "the willingness of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic to enter into negotiations with the Government of France" was deleted; if that part, constituting the premise, was eliminated, it would be absurd from a legal, grammatical and logical point of view to refer next to "negotiations between the two parties concerned", since the names of the two parties would no longer appear in the draft resolution.

251. That is why I requested a separate vote. Now there is no doubt, according to rule 91, that any representative has a right to object to a separate vote. I have not denied this. The representative of Tunis has a perfect right to say that he is opposed to a separate vote. And if the majority agrees to vote on the draft as a whole, this is strictly in accordance with the rules of procedure. The Cuban delegation should like, however, to make the following matters clear. First, it has not entered into any negotiations in this matter, nor has it requested any changes. I appeal to the authors of the draft to say whether the Cuban delegation has ever, at any time, approached them to request any amendments. Secondly, the Cuban delegation does not consider itself to be bound by any of the agreements which may have been reached informally, because we voted against the draft and we have twice explained in the First Committee [1020th and 1023rd meetings] why we believe that the United Nations is, because of the nature of the matter, without authority to solve this question in this way. That is why we are unable to cast a favourable vote.

252. Lastly, I wish to point out that in the view of the Cuban delegation this deletion does not constitute any concession, because the vote on the draft resolution in the First Committee was 32 in favour and 18 against, and the two-thirds majority was not obtained. This is a skilful move which I have to admire and which seems to be in the best parliamentary tradition, but we ought to bear in mind that it is a skilful move to obtain four more votes and thus secure the two-thirds majority. For this reason, I agree that in point of fact the Assembly can decide by a vote whether the draft resolution should be voted on as a whole or paragraph by paragraph.

253. The PRESIDENT: The procedural position is actually very simple. Two requests have been made for separate votes on certain parts of the draft resolution. The representative of Tunisia has objected to those requests. The representative of Saudi Arabia has objected to the taking of any separate votes at all. His objection is the more far-reaching one. I shall, therefore, first ask the Assembly to decide whether it wishes to take any separate votes—not just on the parts of the draft resolution that have been indicated by Uruguay, or by Cuba, or by the Dominican Republic, or by any other Member, but on any part of the draft resolution.

254. I now put to the vote the motion that separate votes should be taken on the draft resolution. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Israel.

Against: Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan.

Abstaining: Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

The motion was rejected by 36 votes to 8, with 37 abstentions.

255. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution in the report of the First Committee [A/4075]. The last paragraph of the preamble has been deleted. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Albania, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

256. The PRESIDENT: The result of the vote is 34 in favour and 19 against, with 28 abstentions.

257. I call on the representative of Tunisia who wishes to speak on a point of order.

258. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (translated from French): I am somewhat embarrassed to say this, but I believe there had perhaps been an error in the counting of the votes. According to my calculations there seem to be 35 votes in favour and not 34. I do not wish formally to challenge the results of the vote as announced, but I think there has been an error and I am asking for an explanation in all good faith.

259. Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic) (translated from French): I regret having to say so, but my figures are exactly the same as the Tunisian representative's. Moreover, several delegations near us have exactly the same figure. Could you not re-read the results?

260. The PRESIDENT: Upon verification, it has been found that Pakistan voted "yes" and not "no" as had been recorded.

The result of the vote was 35 in favour and 18 against, with 28 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

261. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

262. Mr. TELLI (Guinea) (translated from French): This morning in the First Committee [1022nd meeting] I had the opportunity to explain the position of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea and the spirit in which it intended to fulfil its obligations during the work of this session. Out of deference to the General Assembly and in order to make our attitude quite clear, we wished, on the occasion of the first plenary meeting in which my delegation has taken part, to express our paramount desire to make a positive and effective contribution to the Organization.

263. That desire has led my delegation to abstain from discussing and voting on a question whenever it has felt that it was insufficiently acquainted with it to cast a vote in full awareness of all the facts. On the other hand, my delegation has not failed to take a decision whenever it has considered that it had a clear understanding of the matter and could vote conscientiously. I think I may say that this attitude, to judge by the unanimity of the welcome so warmly extended to me yesterday, cannot fail to meet with your equally unanimous approval.

264. It is in the light of those observations that my delegation considers it its duty to state that it could not and cannot abstain on questions of colonial policy, especially when they concern the African continent. Those problems concern our own fate and our most legitimate aspirations too closely to make any abstention in such matters seem anything but a pure and simple betrayal of the policy clearly defined by my Government. Those unequivocal instructions of my Government were clearly expressed a moment ago in our vote. That vote was cast in full knowledge of the facts on a subject we are well acquainted with because we have experienced it for seventy years.

265. The Algerian question, which has been debated, has for the last four years been discussed by all the qualified authorities and organs of my country. All the political and trade union organizations, all the youth organizations, our former Territorial Assembly, now the National Assembly of Guinea, our former Government during the period of the *loi-cadre* and the present Government of the Republic of Guinea have taken a clear-cut position on the Algerian problem in favour of a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the conflict. That position, which is approved by all the peoples of West Africa and their political and trade union representatives, is known to France.

266. We would add, in conclusion, that the people and Government of Guinea consider that the liberal policy

so happily initiated in black Africa by General de Gaulle, on behalf of the Government of France, is far more urgently needed in Algeria in order to satisfy the most obvious of the true interests at stake there and to put an end to the conflict. That is the sincere and confident wish of the Government of Guinea, in the clear interests of the French and Algerian peoples.

### Adjournment of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly

267. The PRESIDENT: We have finished the substantive part of our work and we are ready to adjourn.

268. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Mr. President, I am not going to bid you goodbye because you will be here at the resumed session on the Camerons which is going to take place next year. But I do want to express appreciation, on behalf of the United States delegation, for all your efforts and to wish you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year and also to express our thanks to the many staff members of the United Nations who have worked so hard during this arduous session to enable us to carry on our work expeditiously and in good order. All of the secretaries, experts, members of the security force, the interpreters, and everyone connected with the United Nations deserve our hearty thanks.

269. Thank you again, Mr. President, for all of your efforts, and may I thank the Secretary-General for his never-failing courtesy and intelligence, and his kindness to all the representatives of the Member States.

270. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan): On behalf of my colleagues and the representatives of the Arab delegations, I have the honour to convey to the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Charles Malik, our deep appreciation and gratitude for the able manner in which he has conducted the important work of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. We have always recognized in Mr. Malik a man of vast knowledge, of tremendous energy, which he has always put to the service of his fellow men. Those of us who watched him closely at work were highly impressed by his moral courage, his sense of duty, his sense of fairness and his sense of humour, not to forget the efficient and business-like manner with which he has discharged the important and sometimes difficult tasks of his high office.

271. May I repeat that we are deeply grateful to Mr. Malik for putting his vast knowledge and his wealth of experience at the service of the General Assembly, and through it to the rest of the world, to serve the cause of peace and the cause of humanity. May I wish him good health and happiness in the years to come.

272. Before I conclude, I also wish to tender my heartfelt thanks to the Secretary-General, to his assistants, and to those who have in one way or another contributed to the success of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly.

273. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, India, New Zealand, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa, and also on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal, and finally, on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, I should like, before we disperse, to offer you our grateful thanks and a sincere expression of our recognition of the ability,

impartiality and distinction with which you have presided over our debates.

274. To your years of experience at the United Nations, you have added qualities of serenity and good humour which have set an example to us all. We feel that the Assembly is greatly in your debt, Mr. President, and we would like on our own account to convey to you our warm thanks and our very best wishes.

275. Mr. TSIANG (China): Mr. President, you have presided over the thirteenth session of the General Assembly with fairness and courtesy and deep insight into the problems which we have tried to solve. The delegation of China wishes me to thank you and to wish you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

276. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): We are now concluding the work of what might be called the first part of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. At this session the representative of my country had the honour to be appointed to one of the vice-presidencies of the Assembly.

277. Consequently, I have the great honour to be temporarily presiding over the Latin American group, an honour of which I am very deeply conscious at this moment when I address you, Mr. President, at the conclusion of our work for this part of the session.

278. The delegations of the Latin American group, linked in a spirit of continental brotherhood, have asked me to express their profound respect and admiration for the work which has been accomplished by the President of the Assembly, Mr. Charles Malik of Lebanon.

279. At this time we extend to him our best wishes and congratulations. A man of the United Nations, Mr. Malik's name is inscribed in that distinguished legion of men and women who have dedicated their principles and faith to the great cause of this international Organization under the banner of the San Francisco Charter, which is a banner of hope for all men on earth. Three days ago we heard him deliver a brilliant speech here in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the proclamation by the General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In this same hall, from this same rostrum, after a great orchestra had filled the souls of the audience with the inspired message of Beethoven, Mr. Malik, our friend and colleague, described to us the essential meaning of that Declaration.

280. When we speak of human rights, we are reviving the possibility of a new destiny for all peoples, especially those peoples whose part in the drama of the ages has been marked by humility and suffering. Mr. Malik has contributed and continues to contribute towards the accomplishment of this task, and, as President, he has preserved among us and amid the rigours of his work the fair-mindedness which all of us expect of the man whom we appoint President of the General Assembly.

281. Good luck to you personally, Mr. President, and good-luck in everything which you may undertake on behalf of justice, peace and the solidarity of nations for your people and your country, which we all love and respect. And I should like to add the expression of our gratitude and respect in a particular way to the illustrious figure of the Secretary-General, to his Executive Assistant, Mr. Cordier, to all those who have worked together with us at this session, especially interpreters

who translate into so many languages what I, in all humility, am saying here at this moment on behalf of the Latin American delegations.

282. And with this feeling of gratitude, we express the hope that many long and prosperous days await you in the continuation of our common task. This is the best tribute, Mr. Malik, which your Latin American colleagues can pay you.

283. Prince Aly KHAN (Pakistan): This is the first session of the General Assembly that I have had the honour of attending, and I should like to express my gratitude to all of my colleagues of the other delegations who have worked with us in such a close, friendly and co-operative way during this thirteenth session.

284. To you, Mr. President, may I extend warmest congratulations and express great admiration for the very adroit skill with which you have guided our deliberations.

285. May I also on this occasion offer my most sincere thanks to Mr. Hammarskjöld and to Mr. Cordier, and through them to all of the Secretariat personnel. All of them, both those who appear on the scene and those who work so tirelessly on our behalf behind the scenes night and day, more than deserve our deep gratitude.

286. I also thank all of those services of the Press, radio and television which, while not a formal part of the Secretariat, are such an indispensable adjunct to it. It is they who help so effectively to carry our voices to the peoples of the world whom we have the honour to represent.

287. As we now close our session, let us not forget that although in a technical sense we are the representatives of Governments, those Governments are the servants of the people to whom we are all responsible. It is for them that we have laboured. It is to them that we must render our accounting, and it is they who will judge if we have done well.

288. Mr. Ali SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): Mr. President, permit me, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Nepal and my own delegation, to associate myself with the eloquent words spoken by other representatives in well-deserved praise of the able and impartial manner in which you have discharged your heavy duties as President of this session of the General Assembly. If my words now are brief, it is not from any smallness of appreciation but because of the lateness of the hour. We wish you all the best and thank you. Our thanks go also to the hard-working staff of the Secretariat.

289. Mr. COOPER (Liberia): Mr. President, I wish, on behalf of my delegation and the delegation of Ethiopia, to join our voice to those of previous speakers in extending to you our congratulations on the able manner in which you have conducted our meetings. We ask for your indulgence for all the irritations and annoyances we may have caused you by being late at meetings, hesitation to speak at times, and at other times over-zealousness in making long speeches. We also ask for your indulgence for all the unnecessary points of order we have raised. We wish you continued good health, long life and a happy and prosperous New Year.

290. Mr. ESIN (Turkey): Mr. President, on behalf of the Turkish delegation, I beg you to accept our heart-

iest congratulations on the successful termination of this session of the General Assembly under your able guidance, as well as the expression of our gratitude and admiration for the impartiality and wisdom with which you have conducted our work. This session of the General Assembly has dealt with a number of vital problems, some of which have constituted a real challenge to statesmanship, and it has been a triumph for the principles and purposes of the Charter.

291. I wish equally, on behalf of the Turkish delegation, to pay a tribute to the eminent part played by our Secretary-General, who has accustomed us to such a high level of achievement in his work for peace and conciliation, the paramount aim of our Organization.

292. Our heartfelt thanks go as well to Mr. Cordier. Our gratitude, I should like to express also, to all the members of the Secretariat, whose heavy duties are always met with a profound sense of responsibility and an almost magical efficiency.

293. Please accept, Mr. President, on behalf of the Turkish delegation, our heartfelt thanks and our best wishes for the New Year.

294. The PRESIDENT: I may now be permitted to say a few words myself before we adjourn. As has been pointed out by more than one speaker, we are not now closing the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. We are only adjourning the meeting, and we are reconvening on 20 February 1959. So we shall see one another again on 20 February, because there is one item that we shall have to consider then.

295. Although, as I have said, this is not the end of the thirteenth session, it is the end of the major part of its work. Many things come to one's mind at this moment: hard work; moments of elation; moments of frustration; lots of fun; the pleasure of co-operation; the great privilege and honour of having worked with so many people; the honour of the trust that was placed in me; and the real pleasure of developing new friendships and deepening old ones.

296. I shall not now, obviously, give any estimation of what this part of the thirteenth session has accomplished; that is something to be deeply pondered before one passes any judgement on it. However, if I may say one word about the atmosphere of this session as a whole, I can say that there has been a real desire for understanding; a more persistent effort at conciliation—and I repeat the phrase "persistent effort at conciliation"—even though at times it did not always succeed; and a real awareness of the great issues of peace and war at the present moment.

297. I do not believe that as a result of our work at this part of the thirteenth session the general atmosphere in the world has deteriorated. I believe, on the contrary, that we have made a modest contribution to the improvement of the atmosphere in the world. Thus I may say that the cold war has not intensified as a result of our deliberations and decisions. There is an appreciable effort, a persistent effort, at conciliation and understanding. Above all, there is—this is what has emerged from this session—the decisive relevance of the United Nations to the problems of Africa. Having regard to the second part of this session in February next, Africa truly figures in the thirteenth session of the General Assembly more than in any other session so far. If, therefore, any name is to be applied to this



session, I believe it could fairly be called the "African session".

298. I should like to express my profound personal appreciation for the co-operation that I have received from every single Member of the United Nations, from the chairmen of delegations and from the members of delegations. They have all been courteous, kind, understanding and co-operative. Especially I want to mention the Chairman of the Committees, my own colleagues on the General Committee of the General Assembly. I met them often and discussed with them the problems of their Committees. They have discharged their duties most ably and acquitted themselves most honourably. So also have the Vice-Chairman and the able Rap-porteurs of the diverse Committees who have prepared the excellent reports which have been submitted to the Assembly. I must also say a word of appreciation about the secretaries of Committees, who have been most invaluable in helping both the Chairmen and the Rap-porteurs in their work.

299. To the Secretary-General, to Mr. Cordier, to their lieutenants and their assistants, I extend my profound personal gratitude and appreciation for the co-operation and the comprehension and the forbearance which they have always shown towards me. They have done everything to make my task lighter, happier and more fruitful.

300. I cannot fail to mention in particular the interpreters, those hidden wonder workers who enable us to understand each other and to follow the argument as it develops, the précis writers and the verbatim reporters. We should not forget many many other humble workers here in the United Nations who have made our task possible and profitable. I think of the workers in the dining room and in the delegates lounge, and of the telephonists; I think of the guides and the guards, and I also think of the various other men and women who work in the Press, radio and television services. To all these we owe a real debt of gratitude and appreciation for what they have done for us.

301. I was profoundly grateful for the words of congratulations spoken by so many of you in the general debate at the beginning of the session. This is the first time I have had an opportunity of thanking you for them, and also for the words that have just been spoken. Nobody is more keenly aware of one's own limitations, failings, and inadequacies than one's self. But I hold genuine good will towards each and everyone of you. And I believe in the United Nations.

302. I admire the dedication of Mr. Hammarskjöld to his duties, and I believe in the growing importance and dignity of the function of the Secretary-General under his dynamic leadership.

303. I believe in and shall work to the best of my ability for the cause of peace and understanding between nations and between peoples. And, above all, I believe in the abiding value of the friendships and camaraderie that are developed here.

304. Finally, I believe that where the mind is clear and certain and the heart is pure and contrite and the will is firm and good, then man need not fear. He is certainly on the side of God. And so I wish each and everyone of you every good and perfect gift and every happiness and peace.

305. Now we have completed our work, that is to say, the items that are on the agenda. However, in accordance with the decision taken at the 782nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the thirteenth session will be resumed on 20 February 1959 to consider exclusively the question of the future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French Administration and the Cameroons under the United Kingdom Administration. Therefore, the thirteenth session is not coming to a close today.

## AGENDA ITEM 2

### Minute of silent prayer or meditation

306. The PRESIDENT: Now, according to rule 64, a minute of silence should be observed at the end of the session. Although this is not the end of the thirteenth session, still it would be very profitable to spend a minute of quiet, having heard and participated ourselves in a good deal of noise. I assure the Assembly that in February I shall begin that part of this thirteenth session, and close it also, with a moment of quiet and prayer.

307. Therefore, I now invite the representatives to stand for a minute of silence dedicated to prayer or meditation.

The representatives stood in silence.

### Statement by the President

308. The PRESIDENT: I now declare the thirteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations adjourned until 20 February 1959.

The meeting rose at 12 midnight.