

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1014th
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 25 September 1961,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	61
Address by Mr. Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru.	61
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
Adoption of the agenda	
First report of the General Committee. . . .	63

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I have the honour to welcome Mr. Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru, and to tell him how closely we shall listen to the address which he is now going to deliver to us. It is my earnest hope that the words of this eminent Head of State will bring us the celebrated wisdom of the Incas and help us to promote genuine understanding and sincere friendship amongst nations, on the basis of justice and law in peace, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. I give the floor to the President of the Republic of Peru.

ADDRESS BY MR. MANUEL PRADO, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

2. PRESIDENT PRADO (Peru) (translated from Spanish): My visit to the United States in my capacity as Chief of State, made at the kind invitation of its President, would not be complete if I failed to come to the United Nations to reaffirm Peru's fidelity to the principles by which the Organization is guided and Peru's support of the valiant work it is performing.

3. The consternation produced throughout the world by the tragic death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General, still hangs over the Assembly. This soldier of peace lost his life in the pursuit of the noble mission to which he had devoted himself with such integrity and competence in recent years and his death is an irreparable loss to the world. Let my first words, therefore, be an expression of respectful homage to his memory and of praise for his work and his ideals.

4. My country was one of the first to sign the Atlantic Charter and it helped to influence public opinion in America in favour of the Powers which were fighting to prevent the triumph of the Nazis and their philosophy of life.

5. We warmly welcome the convening of the San Francisco Conference at which the foundations of this Organization were laid. We viewed its establishment as the extension to the whole world of the legal prin-

ciples and the concept of solidarity which our Republics had joined in fostering since the time of the struggle for independence and which had been reaffirmed by the Pan-American Conferences. Peru contributed to the inclusion in the San Francisco Charter of provisions for the protection of human rights and the principle of self-determination of peoples and to the statement regarding the inviolability and faithful observation of treaties and international obligations in general.

6. Although, in order to save the Organization, we were obliged to accept the so-called rule of unanimity of the great Powers in the Security Council, we did not resign ourselves to the prospect of a powerless Assembly vis-à-vis a paralysed Council, but thereupon proposed that the Assembly should be notified by the Secretariat when the Security Council ceased to be seized of a particular item. This proposal paved the way for General Assembly resolution 377 (V) entitled "Uniting for peace", which was adopted in 1950 and under which the Assembly may be empowered to deal with matters relating to world peace on the vote of a simple majority of the members of the Council or of the Members of the Organization.

7. Peru, as a founder member of the Organization of American States and as a Member of the United Nations, has always demonstrated its determination, which it takes this opportunity of reaffirming, to comply strictly with the provisions of the Charter by which our Organization is governed, as also with all the international obligations imposed upon us by pacts among the American States, the validity of such obligations being conceded in the Charter itself, Article 52 of which provides for recognition of regional arrangements.

8. With justifiable satisfaction I recall that, during the sixteen years the United Nations has been in existence, there has been no action relating to peace, to the halting of aggression and the punishment of the aggressors, to economic development and international co-operation, which has not had the strong support of the Peruvian delegation.

9. We are now reaching a crucial point in the development of the United Nations. The great strides being made in technical and economic co-operation, in the development of agriculture, in labour and in science, contrast sharply with the retarded pace of progress towards the solution of such vital problems as the threat posed by atomic armaments and the effective implementation of decisions of the Council or, if it fails to take action, of the Assembly.

10. The very survival of the United Nations depends today on our finding the correct approach to these problems and solving them without delay. The attention of the entire world is anxiously focused upon them.

11. Owing to the circumstances which then prevailed, the delegations assembled at San Francisco were obliged to consider the position of the great Powers at a time of transition from the old political order to the fully established rule of law. This accounts for the unanimity rule in the Council and many other features of the Charter which give special privileges to the great Powers.

12. But the march of events and the eloquent lessons of the past few years make it plain that this period of transition will not last much longer. Its end is dictated not only by economic inter-dependence but also by the dangers inherent in nuclear weapons. Mankind has before it a dramatic choice between, on the one hand, the dangers and uncertainty inherent in a policy based on the so-called balance of terror, entailing the risk of universal destruction by accident, error or miscalculation and, on the other, the wise and courageous acceptance of a system of international law which would make it impossible for any State, however great its economic or military power, to evade its obligations.

13. In the past, history consisted of a series of wars which, although they involved a number of Powers, were limited both in their scope and in their effects; furthermore, they were separated by long periods of peace. Today, however, war cannot be localized nor can the havoc it creates be limited. Every conflict is fraught with the danger that at any moment wider interests may become involved and the old instinct to dominate may find expression in the unrestricted use of all the weapons of destruction which science has put into the hands of mankind.

14. Today the atomic problem cannot continue to be the subject of interminable debates in which, as a result of the adoption of indefensibly anachronistic positions, the discussion follows a wavering course of advances and retreats and keeps coming back to the original difficulties. Everyone wants these weapons to be outlawed, but outlawed under complete control. Such control should not be limited merely to certifying that certain weapons have been destroyed; it is imperative that it should also include the inspection of the military equipment which remains intact and which constitutes a potential danger. It must be added that a system of control that could be paralysed by the exercise of the veto in the control body would give rise to mistrust and if such a system should unfortunately be adopted, it would inevitably lead to a new conflict and the destruction of life on the planet. Efforts have been made to eliminate this device in the Council; it should not operate in the organization of the Secretariat either, for it would lead to the paralysis of that body, making it totally ineffective. The veto, whether in the Council, the Secretariat or a body concerned with disarmament, could be used by a Power as a means of evading its international obligations.

15. Within the framework of respect for the equality of States and compliance with the principle of united action, there are many ways of ensuring that the resolutions adopted by international bodies are fair and wise, and do not impair the interests and rights of either the great or the small Powers.

16. The experience gained provides a basis for converting the so-called international emergency force into a permanent body so that it can guarantee collective security and thus make its contribution to the general good.

17. A system of this kind, operating on a universal basis, is essential to peaceful coexistence. It implies the application of the principle of self-determination of peoples in all parts of the world, not only in the continents where new States have emerged but also in Europe, implies its democratic implementation by means of periodic free elections guaranteeing the rule of freedom and justice and respect for human rights. In this way more than one of the serious problems now pending, such as that of the unification of Germany, could be solved to the satisfaction of the conscience of mankind.

18. This problem should be settled as a matter of urgency in order to remove from the international scene a continuing source of unrest which affects all countries and which constitutes a flagrant injustice to the German people, who are undeniably entitled to decide their own fate, particularly as the right to reunification was formally proclaimed by the Allies shortly after victory was won.

19. The tragic times in which we live give immediacy to the principles on which this Organization is based, principles which sum up the efforts and achievements of our culture over a period of centuries. I should therefore like to take this opportunity to call for the effective application of these principles in all continents, including, of course, America. It is essential that in all the countries which make up the membership of the United Nations there should be true internal freedom, which does not exist where people are victimized, where blood and tears flow and sorrow afflicts every home. It is essential that peoples should be able to develop their material and spiritual potentialities in a climate of democracy, without oppression or fear, and that the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be respected.

20. Today we cannot conceive of peaceful co-existence merely in the negative sense that a state of war has not been declared. We consider that peaceful co-existence is incompatible with psychological warfare, hostile propaganda, support of subversive movements or attempts to foster, directly or indirectly, the difficulties which other peoples may encounter in the process of their development. Coexistence, if it is to be termed peaceful, calls for understanding, sympathy and a mental outlook which finds expression in frank and loyal co-operation of every kind and in the renunciation of all claims to political supremacy. I say this because the concept of the total triumph of one system over another implies domination, which is contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter and to the exigencies of the age in which we live.

21. On more than one occasion the Peruvian delegation has drawn attention to the contrast between the industrialized and the non-industrialized States. While the industrialized States enjoy a high level of living, nearly two-thirds of the earth's inhabitants are underfed, deprived by illiteracy of the benefits of culture and a prey to demagoguery and false revolutionary ideas. The United Nations has unremittently urged the great Powers to devote whatever funds they can to the development of the non-industrialized countries. The duty of the privileged nations to assist other countries has been brought into sharp relief by the United Nations and the Organization can serve as the most effective instrument for the fulfilment of that duty.

22. While action to help solve the problem of industrial backwardness can be taken within the general framework of the United Nations, the Organization cannot but welcome the efforts which the great Powers have made on their own account to solve the urgent problems inherent in under-development. Thus there is bound to be general satisfaction at the "Alliance for Progress", initiated thanks to the vision of President Kennedy, an alliance which has just been hailed in the Declaration of Punta del Este and through which American solidarity, already based on common principles, is to be given practical effect as a result of the undertaking given by the United States to supply long-term financial aid and the undertaking given by the Latin American countries to carry out with firmness and resolution the economic and social reforms which their circumstances and their development require.

23. During the last two wars Europe was able to rely on the moral support and the resources of the American countries. Now that Europe has been rehabilitated, the Governments of the European countries are co-operating in the solution of the most urgent problems confronted by Hispano-America and other regions as they pursue their development. If economic aid projects and related efforts are to have the desired results, it is imperative that we should enjoy the benefits of order and international tranquillity.

24. One might say that this hope is justified by a tacit plebiscite. I am sure that if a world-wide referendum were held, it would reflect overwhelming support for this aspiration which is cherished by all the peoples of the earth.

25. In conclusion, I should like to pay a tribute to all the members of this Assembly and to the Secretariat for their unwavering efforts to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Charter. I should like, in particular to congratulate the President on his unanimous election, which constitutes recognition of his outstanding qualities as a statesman.

26. In addressing this august gathering, I am fully aware of the repercussions which my words may have and I pray God that they may prove to be a true contribution to the work which the United Nations is doing to promote justice and peace.

27. The PRESIDENT: I thank the President of the Republic of Peru warmly for the important speech which he has just been good enough to make; there is no doubt that we shall all ponder his words most carefully and earnestly.

28. I shall ask the members of the Assembly to keep their seats while I escort the President of the Republic of Peru from the hall.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4882)

29. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly is now to consider the adoption of the agenda of the sixteenth regular session, the allocation of items and the organization of the session. For this purpose the Assembly has before it the first report of the General Committee (A/4882).

30. I propose that the Assembly should first examine questions relating to the organization of the session. If there are no objections, I shall invite the Assembly to pass to an examination of section III of the General Committee's report. May I take it that the Assembly adopts the recommendations by the General Committee which appear in paragraphs 20 to 23 of its first report? If there are no objections I shall consider them adopted.

It was so decided.

31. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the adoption of the agenda and we can if necessary keep the question of the allocation of items for tomorrow afternoon's meeting.

32. As regards the adoption of the agenda, we shall follow the usual procedure, that is to say we shall first of all consider the inclusion of items in the agenda and, as I have said, their allocation to plenary meetings and meetings of the various Committees, if it is not considered in the course of this meeting, can be left till tomorrow afternoon's meeting.

33. So that the debate may proceed in an orderly manner, I suggest that the Assembly should take account of the decisions by the General Committee set forth in paragraphs 3 to 8 of its first report when considering the Committee's recommendations on the inclusion of the relevant items.

34. If this procedure meets with the Assembly's approval I shall invite members to consider the agenda whose adoption the General Committee has recommended.

35. I suggest that, in accordance with established practice, the Assembly should consider the proposed agenda items by groups, as they appear in section I, paragraph 12 of the Committee's first report [A/4882].

36. At this point I feel I should draw the attention of members of the Assembly to the fact that we are not now considering the substance of the various questions proposed, except in so far as it affects the Assembly's decision whether to approve the inclusion of these questions in the agenda.

37. I now return to paragraph 12 and I must point out that items 1 to 6 have already been considered by the General Assembly. I shall therefore assume that the General Assembly has approved their inclusion in plenary meeting.

38. I now come to the item entitled "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Charter of the United Nations", in which connexion the Assembly is required only to take note of the communication transmitted by the Secretary-General in document A/4875.

39. If there are no objections I shall consider that the Assembly takes note of this communication by the Secretary-General.

It was so decided.

40. The PRESIDENT: We now come to item 8, which is the subject of our meeting this afternoon. Regarding item 9, I would remind you that the general debate has already begun. I can therefore regard the inclusion of these two items as approved by the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

41. The PRESIDENT: That being so, I now come to a group of questions covered by items 10 to 18 inclusive. If there are no observations I shall consider items 10 to 18 included in the agenda.

Items 10 to 18 were included in the agenda without discussion.

42. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the inclusion of item 19, entitled "Question of Disarmament". This item has been examined by the General Committee in connexion with item 72, entitled "The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control", and also with item 73, entitled "Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal".

43. If there are no objections we shall consider the inclusion of these three items in the agenda at the same time. I would recall that in paragraph 5 of its first report the Committee recommends that these three questions be included as separate items.

44. In connexion with the inclusion of item 19, I give the floor to the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

45. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I think that, as regards the sequence in which we discuss items for inclusion in the agenda, we should adhere to the numeral order in which the items are listed in the report itself.

46. So we now have to decide whether or not item 19, on disarmament, should be included in the agenda. Then we have to go on to items 20, 21, etc., dealing with groups of items together, as we usually do.

47. When we get to items 72 and 73, I shall have a number of observations to make.

48. I therefore propose that we discuss items for inclusion in the agenda in the order in which they appear in the report of the General Committee, that is, in the order of item numbers: 19th, 20th, 21st, etc.

49. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections, I am inclined to follow the logical procedure proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union. We shall therefore now consider the inclusion of item 19. We shall consider the inclusion of items 72 and 73 in the order in which they appear in document A/4882.

50. If there are no objections I shall consider that the General Assembly approves the inclusion of item 19 in the agenda.

Item 19 was included in the agenda without discussion.

51. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the inclusion of item 20, relating to the Korean question, and item 21, concerning the peaceful uses of outer space.

Items 20 and 21 were included in the agenda without discussion.

52. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 3 of its report the General Committee mentions that at its 138th meeting it decided to recommend that item 22 be reworded in the manner indicated in the list of agenda items in paragraph 12 of the report. Are there any observations regarding the inclusion of the item thus worded? We shall consider its allocation when we come to deal with the allocation of items to plenary meetings and to the various committees. If there are

no objections I shall consider that the Assembly approves the inclusion of item 22.

Item 22 was included in the agenda without discussion.

53. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the inclusion of item 23 (Question of Oman).

Item 23 was included in the agenda without discussion.

54. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the inclusion of item 24, which deals with the study of the effects of atomic radiation and of item 25, concerning the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

Items 24 and 25 were included in the agenda with discussion.

55. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the inclusion of item 26, which deals with the United Nations Emergency Force.

Item 26 was included in the agenda without discussion.

56. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the inclusion of item 27, entitled "The situation in Angola: report of the Sub-Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV)". I would remind the Assembly that under rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, three speakers may speak in favour of and three against the inclusion.

57. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): In the present context of world affairs, when the gravest international problems are tormenting the world—problems upon the solution of which the very survival of mankind may depend—it is a matter of deep concern to my delegation that the General Committee should have recommended the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of a question concerning the maintenance of public law and order within a sovereign Member State, instead of concentrating on the solution of the crucial issues, in the search for which this Organization should spare no time and no efforts.

58. The Assembly is called upon to deal here with a case which has arisen because of the well-known forces of international subversion and the encouragement of parties who find it expedient, for partisan or selfish purposes, to play along with this international conspiracy against my country, a conspiracy the aim of which is to bring misery, anarchy and chaos to Angola.

59. I feel compelled to repeat from this rostrum the points which I stressed last week before the General Committee [135th meeting] regarding the illegality and inadvisability of the inclusion in the agenda of the item described as "The situation in Angola".

60. What has given rise to this question is solely a problem of the maintenance of public order in a Portuguese province. I had occasion, in the Security Council,^{1/} to point out and prove the incidents in Northern Angola were unmistakably foreign-inspired terrorist acts. Outside Angola the terrorists organized their plan; from outside came the leaders and

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, 945th meeting.

the great majority of the terrorists—the others were recruited locally later through intimidation. From outside the terrorists are receiving political, material and financial support. Incidentally, the area they managed criminally to disturb covers less than 5 per cent of the entire area of that Portuguese province, and the number of local people who joined the terrorists through intimidation is negligible when compared to the mass of the population of the province.

61. It should be patent to all that the inclusion of this item constitutes a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, which specifies clearly that the United Nations shall not "intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State". Despite what may be said in misuse of terminology in order to confuse the issue, no matter comes more essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State than its primary responsibility to maintain law and public order. By traditional right, constitutional law, administration and practice, Angola is a province of Portugal, an integral part of a unitarian State. It was, indeed, this unitarian State that was admitted as a Member of the United Nations. The fact is irrefutably on record. Not even those who are now engaged in a campaign to dismember a Member State can deny that premise. Any attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of Angola is an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Republic of Portugal.

62. Furthermore, the inclusion of the item "The situation in Angola" would run counter to the spirit of well established principles that have been propounded by the most reputable international jurists, especially those of Latin America: it is neither more nor less than a recognition of the fact that the safest policy for peace in international relations is the principle of forbidding States, unilaterally or collectively, to intervene in the internal affairs of other States. There is also the sound doctrine of international law which upholds the territorial integrity of the State. It is seen in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, it was embodied in General Assembly resolution 290 (IV) entitled "Essentials of peace", and it was solemnly proclaimed in 1955 at the Bandung Conference. As has become obvious, the objective of the various delegations which favour the inclusion of this item is the infringement of the territorial integrity of Portugal, a Member State.

63. The inclusion of the item would not only set a precedent which might soon be applied to other Member States but would undermine the authority of the United Nations in that it would be exceeding its functions and thus encouraging the spread of subversion against Member States.

64. As has been seen in the recent past, the renewal of discussions on the situation in Angola can but arouse political passions and bitterness. In following such a path the United Nations would be untrue to its mission—to spread brotherly feelings between peoples and countries, to calm passions rather than set them afire, to promote friendship and understanding among nations rather than push them to the brink of hatred, to let problems be settled in their legitimate way, rather than complicate and delay them by ill considered action.

65. Not only is the United Nations legally incompetent to discuss the situation in Angola; it has no right to discuss it on either political or moral grounds. On

the political side, mention need only be made of the work achieved by Portugal in Angola and other parts of Africa in all spheres of human endeavour and in fulfilling the traditional Portuguese policy of integrating completely, without racial or other prejudice, all national populations on an equal footing so as to promote the formation of multiracial societies—the most constructive way of ensuring peace and harmony in the world of tomorrow. So far as the moral point of view is concerned, it is sufficient to remember that the Portuguese security forces, which have acted exclusively for the purpose of re-establishing law and order in the affected regions, have gone a long way on the road to achieving this aim; that they are now mainly engaged in assisting rehabilitation work and restoring normal conditions.

66. The Portuguese Government is sparing no effort in its attempt to find truly equitable and just solutions for Angola's internal problems. These are based not on violence—which was never the Portuguese way—but on principles of brotherhood and with due regard for the dignity of man. These are stars by which Portugal, throughout its long history, has always set its course. The inclusion of this item would be especially harmful at the present moment, when the Portuguese Government is in the course of implementing important reforms in Angola and other African provinces. As part of a process of evolution, and not of innovation, and despite the disturbances created in Northern Angola, the Portuguese Government has, for instance, just taken the step of abrogating the statute of 20 May 1954 regarding the indigenous populations of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea—the only provinces where it remained in force. This act, which will have far-reaching consequences, underlines the serene confidence of the Portuguese Government in these populations, whose political status has now been brought into line with that of all other Portuguese. Our nation will continue, in this way, to give a helping and encouraging hand to its less developed populations so that they may rise on the ladder of economic, social and political development. For this purpose it has already published other constructive measures, all calculated to cement still further the equality in the nation of all its sons and daughters, irrespective of colour, place of origin, or creed.

67. I should like to place on record the strong reservations that the Portuguese Government feels about the wisdom of any insistence upon the inclusion of this item.

68. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections I shall consider item 27 included in the agenda.

Item 27 was included in the agenda without discussion.

69. The PRESIDENT: Items 28 to 33 all deal with economic questions. Are there any observations on the inclusion of these items?

70. If there are no observations I shall consider them included in the agenda.

Items 28 to 33 were included in the agenda without discussion.

71. The PRESIDENT: Items 34 to 38 deal with humanitarian and social questions.

72. If there are no observations I shall consider these items included in the agenda.

Items 34 to 38 were included in the agenda without discussion.

73. The PRESIDENT: I now come to items 39 to 51 inclusive, which deal with questions falling within the competence of the Fourth Committee. If there are no objections I shall consider them included in the agenda.

Items 39 to 51 were included in the agenda without discussion.

74. The PRESIDENT: Items 52 to 68 inclusive concern administrative and budgetary questions. If there are no objections I shall consider that these items are included in the agenda.

Items 52 to 68 were included in the agenda without discussion.

75. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections I shall consider items 69 to 71 to be included in the agenda.

Items 69 to 71 were included in the agenda without discussion.

76. The PRESIDENT: We now arrive at item 72 of the agenda, entitled: "The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control".

77. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We are discussing the question of including the item concerning nuclear tests in the First Committee's agenda. The Soviet delegation believes this question should be examined under agenda item 19—the question of disarmament. I need hardly say that, as the pioneer and sincere advocate of general and complete disarmament, the cessation of the cold war and of the arms race, the Soviet Government, as is evident from its statements, has nothing against the General Assembly making its contribution to the search for ways to solve the problem of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, which is part of the problem of general and complete disarmament.

78. We wonder, however, whether a separate—I repeat, separate—discussion of the question, in isolation from the problem of general and complete disarmament, is in the interests of peace and disarmament. We are fully convinced that the answer is no, it is not. We feel there is no need at this point to go into the reasons why, in present circumstances, the question of nuclear tests is an inseparable part of a wider problem, that of general and complete disarmament. These two questions have been bound into one indissoluble whole by the actual course of events. A decision about the cessation of nuclear tests cannot now be taken in isolation. And when we hear some people claiming that a separate agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would curb or even put an end to the arms race, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, etc., our answer is that this is all either deliberate deception of the peoples, or at best a delusion.

79. Take a look at what is actually going on around us. In view of the resolve of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States to conclude a treaty of peace with Germany and close the chapter of the last war, aggressive circles in certain countries are openly threatening a new war, have proceeded to a further inflation of military budgets, to the recall of reservists and to the acceleration of armaments production, including nuclear weapons.

80. Unless a programme of general and complete disarmament is carried out, unless the arms race is stopped, an agreement on the cessation of nuclear testing will be of no benefit whatever to the peoples from the standpoint of effectively reducing the danger of war. Furthermore, if taken outside the context of general and complete disarmament, a decision to cease nuclear testing can in present circumstances only play into the hands of the aggressors, dull the vigilance of the peoples and create the impression that there has been improvement in the situation, whereas in reality it would remain highly critical.

81. We cannot be a party to such manoeuvres. The Soviet delegation is naturally in favour of discussing and finding a solution to the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, but we are anxious that this discussion should take place in connexion with the general problem of disarmament and should be really fruitful.

82. If it is recognized that the question of the cessation of nuclear tests cannot be settled apart from the problem of general and complete disarmament, it is perfectly obvious that there is no sense in discussing this question separately from the problem of disarmament and no sense in including in the agenda a question which we know in advance has no chance of being settled satisfactorily because it has been artificially detached from the problem of disarmament. Whatever their motives, therefore, those who are proposing that this question should be discussed separately cannot disregard the fact that it is impossible to discuss or settle it separately. It is, of course, our understanding that each delegation will have a chance to state its position on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests during the discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament.

83. These are the reasons which lead the Soviet delegation to oppose the inclusion of this question in the General Assembly's agenda as a separate item. This is why the Soviet delegation will vote against the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

84. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly, and to express the hope that, under your guidance, the Assembly will achieve positive results in the solution of the important problems which are before it.

85. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests should be discussed, not as a separate question, but within the framework of that of general and complete disarmament. Only the solution of the question of general and complete disarmament will remove the danger of armed conflict for once and for all and bring about the final and unqualified cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons.

86. It is quite obvious that in present conditions the conclusion of an agreement for the long-term cessation of all nuclear weapons tests can be of only limited significance. The experience of the last few years shows that this step would in no way diminish the danger of a nuclear war. The cessation of testing would not prevent the further production and accumulation of nuclear weapons nor would it slow down the continuing arms race, which has again become more intensive through the fault of the Western Powers.

87. We cannot disregard the fact that the aggressive trend of the policy of the leading States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is at present becoming more pronounced and that, as a result, the danger of the outbreak of armed conflict has been still further increased. The gravity of the situation is also accentuated by the course of events in the Federal Republic of Germany, which is once again becoming a danger point which may spark off a military conflagration. The danger constituted by the aggressive "revanchist" policy of the Federal Republic of Germany is further heightened by the fact that, within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, preparations are openly being made to equip the West German army with nuclear weapons.

88. The Western Powers are now trying to create the impression that they are anxious to secure an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. It is well known, however, that it was in fact their obstructive attitude throughout the three-Power conference in Geneva which prevented the attainment of an agreement that would have ensured the lasting and final cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. The Western Powers refused to agree to the final cessation of all nuclear test explosions, as proposed by the Government of the USSR, pressing instead for what amounted to authorization to conduct such tests as they considered necessary for the further improvement of their own nuclear weapons. This is the line which the Government of the United States is still taking. Recently, as you know, the United States and the United Kingdom proposed the discontinuance of test explosions in the atmosphere only [A/4772]. But the futility of that proposal was demonstrated by the fact that the United States, without even waiting for an answer to its proposal, proceeded to undertake a long-prepared series of underground explosions.

89. The insincerity of the Western Powers' position is evident also from the fact that they take no account whatever of the circumstance that, throughout the period of the negotiations on the cessation of testing France, a State member of NATO, was continuing to carry out tests.

90. The feverish nuclear arms race now taking place in the NATO countries and the actions of the Western Powers throughout the course of the Geneva negotiations on the cessation of tests provide convincing evidence that the present position of the Western Powers on the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests is merely an attempt to deceive world public opinion.

91. All these facts compelled the Government of the USSR to decide to conduct test explosions of nuclear weapons. This important decision was called for by the necessity of taking urgent measures to strengthen the security and defensive capacity of the USSR and the other socialist States in view of the increasingly aggressive character of the policy of the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Because of its ultimate effects, this decision also constituted an important step from the standpoint of removing the threat of military conflict and ensuring peace throughout the world. The measures taken were in the interests not only of the peoples of the world socialist system but also of all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

92. The Government of the USSR again emphasized that there is one sure way of reaching a final settlement of the question of nuclear tests. That way is the

attainment of general and complete disarmament, which would mean the complete elimination of all material means for the conduct of war, and consequently, the lasting and final settlement of the question of nuclear weapons tests. The destruction of all types of nuclear weapons would inevitably also lead to the final cessation of all nuclear weapons tests.

93. The fact that an agreement was recently reached between the USSR and the United States on the principles that should govern further negotiations on disarmament opens up—so we believe—new prospects for the resumption of fruitful discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament.

94. At the present time, attention should be concentrated on the speediest possible solution of this question. We are convinced that in the circumstances separate discussion of the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests could only delay a solution of the main question, that of general and complete disarmament.

95. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation cannot support the inclusion of item 72 in the agenda of the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

96. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I regret that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovak representatives have seen fit to express their opposition to the inclusion of this separate item on the General Assembly's agenda. If the item submitted by the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom is not an important, urgent and distinct matter, then words have lost their meaning. The need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests was an urgent matter last July when the two Governments asked that the matter be considered by this Assembly. Now it is doubly urgent, for in the interim, as we all know, the Soviet Union has suddenly begun to explode nuclear devices in the atmosphere. It has done this without regard to the wishes of the Assembly, which has repeatedly urged the nuclear Powers to continue the moratorium on nuclear testing, and it has done so without regard for the fears of humanity—fears of the dangers to health arising from radio-active fall-out, fears of the heightened international tension accompanying a renewed technological race in atomic armament, fears of the evermore destructive character of thermo-nuclear war.

97. Soviet resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests affords a vivid illustration of the dangers of a test-ban moratorium without controls. All the rest of us are victims of this irresponsible action.

98. Now the Soviet Union representative says, in effect, that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests can come about only with general and complete disarmament. How in the name of common sense can this view be seriously maintained? The cessation of all tests under adequate controls is something that could be set in train with very little delay if the Soviet Union would engage in constructive negotiations for a test-ban treaty. There is no valid reason for calling off these negotiations while we grapple with the much more complex task of bringing about general and complete disarmament. It is surely wrong to maintain that until we can do everything to abolish armaments, we should not do anything to control their development and their spread. As the President of the United States indicated this morning, a test-ban treaty is a logical first step.

99. Testing can be prohibited. The job can be done on the basis already established at the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests at Geneva. The technical foundation is there. The treaty proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom on 18 April 1961 [A/4772] and the proposals made since that date by the two Governments make every effort to accommodate Soviet sensitivities on the subject of control, while still maintaining the minimum of verification and inspection required to ensure compliance with the treaty.

100. If the Soviet Union would respond constructively to the proposals which the United States and the United Kingdom made at Geneva, instead of retreating from points on which it had already agreed, we could move immediately towards the permanent cessation of nuclear weapons tests, which all peoples desire.

101. Last year, in its resolution 1578 (XV), the General Assembly urged the States concerned to make every effort to reach agreement as soon as possible on the cessation of tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, under appropriate international control. The Assembly has an insistent concern with the fate of these negotiations. It should have the opportunity to express its views on this subject. Therefore, I urge the Assembly to accept for inclusion in its agenda the item submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom in its present form, in addition to the items already approved for the discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament.

102. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I do not wish to detain the Assembly for more than a few moments on this matter. Normally speaking, indeed, I would not have asked for the floor at all to explain the reason why my delegation, together with that of the United States, has asked for the inclusion of a separate item, entitled "Urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control". Indeed, I am quite confident that the vast majority of the Assembly fully understands the reasons which have moved us to take this action.

103. The General Assembly has, after all, adopted a number of resolutions emphasizing the imperative and urgent need for agreement on the terms of a treaty which would for all time put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons.

104. Without going into the history of the last three years in any detail, may I remind the Assembly that the Government of the United Kingdom has, with those of the United States and of the Soviet Union, throughout this period been engaged in long and patient negotiation in Geneva, which we had hoped would produce—and I would say should have produced already—just such a treaty.

105. The decision of the Soviet Union to break the voluntary moratorium on nuclear weapons testing even while the Geneva Conference negotiating a treaty was still in progress shocked and disappointed us all, as it did, I believe, all those throughout the world who are alarmed by the increase in radioactivity in the earth's atmosphere which has resulted already from the present series of Soviet tests.

106. We believe that an agreement was near. We still believe that it can be quickly reached if only the three Governments would return to the conference

table with the serious intention of concluding this treaty for which the world is waiting.

107. It is with the hope that this Assembly can, by its efforts, further the speedy conclusion of a treaty that we have requested the inclusion of the item.

108. I have listened this afternoon to the speeches of the representatives of the USSR and Czechoslovakia, arguing that this must be included with discussions relating to general and complete disarmament. I would yield to no one in my desire to see rapid progress in that sphere. But I would say that it is folly to throw aside the efforts that have been made in this particular narrow but very important sphere, efforts which could by now have come to fruition, with goodwill on both sides. I believe it is the patent desire of the nations here that we should reach rapid agreement so that risks of pollution of the atmosphere could be rapidly brought to a close.

109. The delegation of the United Kingdom therefore hopes most sincerely that the Assembly will approve the recommendation of the General Committee to include this item in the agenda. When we turn to the question of the allocation of items, we hope that the Assembly will ask the First Committee to consider this item and, in view of its importance and its urgency, place it first upon its agenda.

110. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): The Polish delegation takes the floor to explain its negative attitude towards the item submitted for inclusion in the agenda by the United Kingdom and the United States on the "urgent need" for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective "international control". We hate to detain the Assembly any longer, but the problem seems to be of great importance to us.

111. We do understand the disappointment of all men of goodwill because no such treaty has been signed as yet, and we do comprehend their anxiety because of the renewal of nuclear tests. We know that such an understanding is fully shared also by the other socialist countries.

112. It should be remembered that at many a previous session the Polish delegation repeatedly stood in favour of the cessation of nuclear tests. Indeed, we continue to be in favour of putting an end to all such tests—in the air, under the earth, under water or in cosmic space. But we have always regarded the ban on nuclear tests as part and parcel of a set of broader actions aimed at complete and general disarmament. What we were always striving for was not only to attain this sole goal, which after all is a partial disarmament measure, but to discontinue altogether the arms race and destroy all the means of conducting war.

113. It was always our understanding that the cessation of nuclear tests could be of real importance only within a whole system of measures contrived to ease international tension, to contribute to the feeling of security and to foster the materialization of complete and general disarmament.

114. Actual events have followed a different course. There was no progress in the discussions on general and complete disarmament. To every disarmament proposal submitted by the Soviet Union or the other socialist countries, the Western Powers replied by stepping up the arms race. Had they deemed it fitting to approach some of these proposals in another spirit, the present situation would be quite different.

115. Permit me to cite just one example. As early as 1957, Poland suggested the establishment of a de-nuclearized zone in Central Europe. We were ready to proceed with serious and constructive negotiations on this subject. We emphasized our willingness to consider any reasonable counter-proposals and, as a matter of fact, we did modify our plan in order to meet some of the views expressed on it. It is not our fault that the plan has not been put into practice. Indeed, is it not a fact that the solution of the German problem, of the problem of disarmament and of nuclear tests would have been incomparably easier, if in that most vulnerable part of the globe—in the border zone between the two most powerful military and political groupings—instead of a colossal agglomeration of armed forces and military means, instead of a revenge-seeking "bundeswehr" prepared for nuclear war, we had had a controlled zone free from nuclear weapons and a controlled area of restricted armaments?

116. Now, the atmosphere of the Geneva negotiations would have also been entirely different had the Western Powers not considered the treaty to ban nuclear tests to be just a substitute for an agreement on general and complete disarmament, had they really wanted to arrest the arms race and had they refrained from trying to draw one-sided advantages from the Geneva talks. For how else can we explain the unshakable Western insistence on being assured of the possibility uninterruptedly to test underground? Why have they been so persistent in pressing for the acceptance of their own concept of control?

117. Also, the nuclear tests conducted by France, one of the most important European allies of the United States and the United Kingdom, could not but throw, should I say, a shadow of doubt upon the sincerity of the intentions of the two Western Powers participating in the Geneva conversations, as well as upon the practical applicability of the eventual provisions of the treaty under negotiation. It is remarkable that in recent years the United States and the United Kingdom have never submitted any protests against the French tests, nor have they cast a vote in favour of such protests filed in the General Assembly of the United Nations and voted upon here. Moreover, far from taking a stand against supplying the forces of West Germany with nuclear devices, these two Powers have been all in favour of it.

118. Considering the acceleration of the arms race and the decline in the sense of security of nations, and considering the existing tensions and mistrust, the signing of a treaty on the banning of nuclear weapons tests would mean contradicting the entire line of development of the international situation. As a result, the chances of concluding such a treaty grow smaller and smaller. In the circumstances, the way the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States now propose to discuss the problem of the cessation of nuclear tests is tantamount to leading world public opinion astray. It is bound to make it more difficult to achieve progress in the solution of the most important problem, that of disarmament.

119. The Anglo-American proposal, if adopted, would signify the recommendation of such a cessation of nuclear tests as would leave broad possibilities for further improvement of nuclear weapons. It would by no means bar the way to the development of more and more effective weapons of mass destruction, nor would it restrict the continued growth of larger and

larger nuclear stockpiles. And we must bear in mind, as we do, that the accumulated mass of nuclear arms now under the control of the great Powers is so large that its very existence already implies mortal danger to mankind.

120. Neither can we overlook and most soberly judge the fact that the Western Powers continue to persist in conceiving their whole strategy on the basis of the employment of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly, therefore, is confronted with a dilemma: which way to choose? It could follow the course prompted by the Anglo-American proposal, as accepted by the General Committee, and turn the discussion on the cessation of nuclear tests into a hollow debate, which would only distract our attention from the real task of disarmament and to a great extent poison the atmosphere of our debates. In the opinion of the Polish delegation, that would not bring us nearer to the goal desired by the overwhelming majority of those present here. Therefore, we are opposed to consideration of the problem of tests outside the framework of general and complete disarmament and as a separate item.

121. But the General Assembly can choose another direction and consider the matter, as we have suggested, solely within the context of general and complete disarmament. This is the solution which my delegation supports. It is the only just one and it promises a constructive debate. For we do believe that at its present session the Assembly is called upon to seek solutions taking into account the interrelation of all elements of disarmament—I repeat the interrelation of all elements of disarmament—in order to eliminate the threat of war, in order to ensure the security of all nations, and in order to secure lasting peace for all mankind.

122. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure, three speakers have spoken against and two in favour of the inclusion of this item.

123. I shall put to the vote the inclusion of item 72, entitled "The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The inclusion of item 72 in the agenda was adopted by 85 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

124. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections I shall consider that item 73 is included in the agenda.

Item 73 was included in the agenda without discussion.

125. The PRESIDENT: We now come to item 74 of the agenda. If there are no objections I shall consider that item 74 is included in the agenda.

Item 74 was included in the agenda without discussion.

126. The PRESIDENT: I now come to items 75 and 76. Item 75 concerns the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistani origin in the Republic of South Africa, and item 76 the question of race conflict in South Africa. Does anyone wish to speak in connexion with the inclusion of these two items?

127. Mr. LOUW (South Africa): Unlike other delegations, the delegation of South Africa is not prepared to countenance a deliberate violation of a basic principle of the Charter. I therefore come to this rostrum

for the purpose of protesting once again against the inclusion in the agenda of items 75 and 76, both of which constitute a flagrant violation of the basic principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which specifically lays down that nothing contained in the Charter shall permit the United Nations to interfere in the essentially domestic affairs of a Member State. The two items which it is now sought to place on the agenda clearly constitute such interference.

128. The irony of this situation is that the same Member States that are sponsoring these two items are the first to protest vehemently when the United Nations seeks to interfere in their domestic affairs. One recalls the almost hysterical outburst by Mr. Patel, Deputy Prime Minister of India, on behalf of the Indian Government some years ago when there was the possibility that the United Nations might take action with regard to the Indo-Pakistan dispute. I recall personally the embarrassment of the Tunku of Malaya when, in the course of informal discussions in London in March 1961 at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, I reminded him that discrimination against the permanent Chinese population of his country is actually enshrined in the Malayan Constitution. I can imagine the protests of the Ceylonese delegation if the Assembly were to seek to discuss the present discrimination against the Tamil people of Ceylon.

129. The Indian, Malayan and Ceylonese delegations would, of course, be fully entitled to protest against United Nations interference in their domestic affairs, but they must not seek themselves to interfere in South Africa's domestic affairs.

130. Several devices are employed to try to circumvent the clear injunction contained in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. There is, for instance, the attempt which has been made for several years now to use Articles 55 and 56, relating to fundamental human rights, for that purpose. I have on three previous occasions quoted a unanimous decision of a plenary meeting of the San Francisco founding conference—the decision that those two Articles could not be used to circumvent the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7. Up to the present not a single delegation has attempted to explain away that decision of the San Francisco Conference. I certainly cannot see the United States delegation trying to explain it away in view of the strong attitude taken up by Mr. John Foster Dulles at San Francisco. Mr. Dulles then said:

"However much we intend to carry out within our own countries those great purposes"—this is, the purposes of Articles 55 and 56—"... we do not think that this sort of pledge is within the scope of the Charter ...

"It might be interpreted that you are pledging yourselves to agree ... that the international Organization could intervene in your domestic affairs."

The fears expressed by the late Mr. Dulles are now being realized.

131. Mr. Dulles further pointed out that if the Conference attempted to convert Article 55—which he said did no more than enunciate certain aims and purposes—into a convention by which the States undertook to take action, then they would

"have gone away from the purpose for which this Conference has met, and would have destroyed the

best hope of securing adherence of all nations to the Charter".

South Africa certainly would not have been a Member of this Organization had it not been for the safeguarding clause of Article 2, paragraph 7. Mr. Dulles was here referring to the safeguards in respect of domestic jurisdiction.

132. Then there was the statement by President Eisenhower from this rostrum when he addressed the General Assembly at the fifteenth session [868th meeting] and in the course of his speech, warned that the United Nations should not interfere in the internal affairs of the African States. South Africa is one of those African States. True, there has since then been a change in the United States administration, but it will be interesting to know whether the present administration adheres to the policy enunciated here last year from this rostrum by the previous President.

133. There is another device, which is to argue that the issues contained in these items have acquired an international character. I should like to ask how they have acquired an international character. In what way have they acquired an international character? If that argument is being relied upon, then it is the duty of the sponsors of these two items to take the General Assembly into their confidence. Will they do so?

134. Then there is another excuse which is used for trying to circumvent these express provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, namely, that "world peace is being endangered". This argument is so often being used by those who urge United Nations action with regard to almost any issue that these particular words, "world peace is being endangered", are rapidly losing the meaning intended by the founders of the United Nations. These words are in danger of becoming a "cliché", and when they are applied to South Africa or to South West Africa then they are sheer nonsense. If there were as little danger of world peace being disturbed in other countries as is the case in South Africa then this would be a much happier and a much safer world.

135. A particularly foolish argument in support of placing these items on the agenda is that the Assembly has in past years decided to do so. That argument was again used by the leader of the Indian delegation when these items were discussed by the General Committee last week [136th meeting]. In effect it means that if a wrongful act is repeated sufficiently often it thereby becomes a rightful act. According to that argument a violation of the Charter is validated by repetition. May I also remind the Assembly that decisions of the Assembly do not acquire the force of law, and that the decisions of a particular session are not binding on subsequent sessions.

136. The fact of the matter is that at the instigation of a number of African-Asian countries, acting in concert with Russia and its satellites, a racial issue is being deliberately introduced into the Assembly of the United Nations. The Organization is in this matter being used for the purpose of creating and fomenting racial tension in South Africa. It was deliberately created as the result of a resolution introduced in the Assembly of the United Nations by the Indian delegation in 1946, and encouraged by the introduction of similar resolutions in the following year.

137. Having regard to conditions existing in India, and the discrimination openly practised there and in certain other countries—although ostensibly forbidden

by legal enactments—one can only marvel at this manifestation of self-righteousness.

138. Once again, the Government of South Africa disputes the right of the United Nations to interfere in South Africa's domestic affairs.

139. Once again, South Africa must protest against the violation of a basic principle of the Charter—which was intended particularly to safeguard the rights of smaller nations.

140. Once again, South Africa must deplore the application of a double standard in the proceedings of the General Assembly—one standard for the stronger nations, or for a powerful group of nations, and another standard for the smaller nations that are not associated with a particular bloc of States.

141. While the Republic of South Africa continues to be a Member of the United Nations, we will continue to protest against this intrusion into our internal affairs, and against the violation of a basic principle of the Charter.

142. I ask that my objections to the inclusions of these two items be included in the records of the Assembly.

143. The PRESIDENT: If no other member wishes to speak about the inclusion of items 75 and 76, I shall consider these two items to be included in the agenda.

Items 75 and 76 were included in the agenda.

144. The PRESIDENT: Item 77 concerns the enlargement of the International Law Commission. If there are no objections I shall consider it included in the agenda.

Item 77 was included in the agenda without discussion.

145. The PRESIDENT: With regard to item 78, I would point out to the Assembly that in paragraph 6 of its report [A/4882], the General Committee recommends that this item be reworded to read "Complaint by Cuba of threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba".

146. If there are no objections, I shall consider that item 78, thus reworded, is included in the agenda.

Item 78 was included in the agenda without discussion.

147. The PRESIDENT: We come to item 79, which is entitled "Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, and resolution 1542 (XV) of the General Assembly".

148. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): My delegation wishes to place formally on record certain remarks of the Government of Portugal regarding the proposed inclusion of item 79 in the agenda, an item which has been proposed with a most misleading title. The delegation which proposed the item based its argumentation on what it called the "Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter", and also on an alleged non-compliance with resolution 1542 (XV).

149. It is pertinent to recall here the position we took at the last session when, in a positive violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter, the General

Assembly approved the said resolution. Resolution 1542 (XV) assumed in respect of Chapter XI of the Charter, and particularly in regard to Article 73 e, an interpretation which went clearly beyond the explicit terms of the Charter. It is our firm conviction that, as opposed to Chapters IX and X on the one hand, and Chapter XII on the other, Chapter XI does not place and cannot be understood as placing on Member States obligations which those States themselves either are not willing to undertake or are not allowed to undertake in accordance with, and as a result of, their own constitutional law, which they and they alone are in a position to have authority to interpret and apply.

150. On the other hand, the resolution ascribed to the General Assembly a competence which the Assembly does not possess. In fact, never in the past has the Assembly claimed to have competence to determine the legal and political status of any territory, nor has the Assembly ever claimed to have competence to impose on Member Governments the transmission of information on territories which, having no status subject to international jurisdiction or accountability, fall within the exclusive responsibility of Member States and for whose political status they alone are responsible. The General Assembly is not entitled to question replies from Member Governments in regard to the status of territories under their national sovereignty, and such replies, given in conformity with national and constitutional law, have to be accepted by the Assembly which is not authorized by the Charter to impugn them. The resolution took a different view, and by doing so, it exceeded the competence of the Assembly. This had not been the practice of the Assembly since the very beginning of this Organization.

151. From the fact that the Assembly suddenly assumed a different attitude in reference to one particular country alone, one is entitled to conclude that the Assembly embarked upon a course of action which represented clear discrimination against that country. This was shown during the debate in the Fourth Committee when the report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter and the resolution in question were discussed.^{2/} In reality, although many delegations stated that it should be widely and generally applied, the report, which is a guide for Member States and not for the Assembly as such, was used solely to question the replies of two Member Governments, and in particular the Portuguese reply. It never occurred to delegations that it was for the Government of Portugal to make a proper assessment of the principles of the report.

152. At this stage, I should like to point out that the views I am expressing are not held by my delegation alone. With regard to the correct interpretation of Article 73 and, in the context of its application, with regard to the voluntary obligations stemming therefrom, and, again, with regard to the question of the competence of the General Assembly, many other delegations have in past sessions, including the fifteenth, expressed views similar to those which I have just outlined. Among these delegations have been four of the five permanent members of the Security Council. I do not propose to take up the Assembly's time

^{2/} For the discussion of this item, see Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Fourth Committee, 1031st to 1049th, 1087th and 1088th meetings.

unduly, and I shall therefore refrain from making any quotations. However, all these statements were to the effect that resolution 1542 (XV) was not in conformity with the correct interpretation of Article 73, nor did it come within the competence of the General Assembly, since the Assembly lacked competence in the case.

153. This opinion was also held by many other delegations as recently as the fourteenth session of the Assembly, but, for reasons best known to them, they changed their attitude at the fifteenth session.

154. In connexion with resolution 1542 (XV) it is again my delegation's duty to refer to another point. Whatever interpretation anyone may wish to give to Article 73, and whatever related views anyone may have on the competence of the Assembly, it has been made abundantly clear by us, both in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly, that Article 73 does not apply to Portugal; therefore no obligation may be placed on my Government in connexion with the implementation of that provision.

155. Furthermore, the inclusion of this item would signify, in a sense, that the Organization was trying to prevent the development of multi-racial States—a shocking notion indeed, especially when one considers that multi-racial societies are the most constructive solution to the problem of bringing peace and harmony to the world.

156. Still further, my delegation wishes to point out that resolution 1542 (XV) was approved by the Assembly after a barrage of malicious propaganda against my country, and it is not far-fetched to think that many delegations were influenced by such propaganda. It is certainly pertinent to recall that the statute of 20 May 1954 regarding the indigenous populations of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea was the main pretext for the attacks against the Portuguese Government. Now, in spite of the recent events in Angola, and in the normal process of the evolution of our society, the statute has been terminated and all inhabitants of those provinces have acquired full citizenship.

157. In view of past debates on the matter of the application of Article 73, this new attempt to discuss the same question all over again seems to my delegation to be completely unnecessary. Therefore my delegation wishes to express the most formal reservations about the debate which would arise from the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

158. The PRESIDENT: Has the Assembly any objections to the inclusion of item 79 in its agenda? If not, I shall consider that the General Assembly approves the inclusion of this item.

Item 79 was included in the agenda.

159. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections, I shall consider that items 80, 81 and 82 are included in the agenda.

Items 80, 81 and 82 were included in the agenda without discussion.

160. The PRESIDENT: We now come to item 83, entitled "Question of Tibet".

161. Mr. LAPIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): At the 136th meeting of the General Committee the Soviet delegation protested strongly against the inclusion in the agenda for this session of the so-called question of Tibet. This

is a factitious and, one might say, a still-born question. Attempts to drag in questions of this kind are clearly designed to serve the improper purposes of the cold war, and nothing more.

162. Tibet has always been and will continue to be an inalienable part of greater China. This is a fact of common knowledge. It is equally evident and unquestionable that the People's Republic of China is master in its own house and that its sovereign rights and actions cannot be the subject of discussion in the General Assembly or in any other international organization. The United Nations Charter is based precisely on this principle, which is binding on all organs of the United Nations. The Charter states explicitly that the United Nations may not intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

163. Thus the designs of some Powers to involve the General Assembly into a discussion of the so-called Tibetan question mean nothing more nor less than intervention in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

164. There is no need to refer here to the events in Tibet, which some people would like to use as a pretext for a cold-war discussion. The fact that, in March 1959, the Chinese people duly suppressed the attempt at a reactionary revolt in Tibet, an attempt instigated from outside, can disturb only those who placed special hopes in that revolt.

165. Revolutionary China is proceeding firmly with the abolition of all the vestiges of feudalism and obscurantism from which the Tibetan reaction gained support, and it remains only to wish the great Chinese people success on this path of progress and the strengthening of national unity.

166. There are important questions for the General Assembly to discuss—questions on whose solution depends, to a large extent, the preservation of peace and the lessening of tension in the present international situation.

167. We cannot allow anyone, whoever it may be, to force us at this session to discuss far-fetched and potentially dangerous questions, consideration of which can only impede the adoption of agreed solutions to the really pressing and serious international problems.

168. The Soviet delegation urges that the so-called question of Tibet should be excluded from the General Assembly's agenda, and it will vote against its inclusion.

169. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan): We support the inclusion of this item in the agenda. It will be recalled that it was on the agenda of the last session but that, despite its importance, time did not permit any action to be taken upon it. In view of that, and the further fact that the situation in Tibet remains unchanged, we believe that the Assembly should consider this item at the present session as has been recommended by the General Committee.

170. Mr. WIRJOPRANOTO (Indonesia): The position of my delegation on the inclusion of this item remains unchanged from its position in previous years. Tibet is under the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China. That it is a part of China is a well recognized fact, indeed one which preceded by far the advent of the People's Republic itself. It follows that the pre-

sence of that Government is indispensable to the reasoned consideration of the question in this Assembly. The United Nations cannot hope to resolve, or even to deal effectively with, a matter that so directly involves the People's Republic of China so long as it fails to recognize the legitimate rights of that nation of more than 600 million. It is not by choice of that country that it has no representative to speak for it in this august body. That is the sad and unrealistic choice of the United Nations itself. As we have said before, a prerequisite for effective United Nations consideration of any problem concerning China, especially a part of China itself, is a thorough examination of the critical question of China's representation here—an examination that must lead to the correction of the present impossible and improper situation.

171. We note, too, that the question of Tibet is again brought before the Assembly as one involving the denial of fundamental human rights. These are rights which we of Indonesia claim for ourselves, and which we recognize and uphold for all peoples. We believe in freedom of religion and in the right of all peoples and nations to preserve and develop their particular cultures and their own distinctive modes of life. It is, indeed, not merely the proclamation of these rights but their exercise and enjoyment that is today changing the face of Asia and of Africa. In Asia and Africa, especially, such exercise and enjoyment involves a changing society, a society in ferment. When we speak of fundamental human rights we mean, not the preservation of traditional rights by the few at the expense of the many, or of the special privileges of the few as against those of the many. For us the enjoyment of fundamental human rights must be consonant with social justice for all which, in turn, demands progress towards a new order in the social and economic fields. Inevitably, it will give rise to tensions. It may result in certain dislocations. Often it will necessitate heavy sacrifices, including the temporary suspension of certain human rights. Yet such progress is indispensable in achieving the conditions essential for the actual exercise and the fullest enjoyment of fundamental human rights. We cannot escape this fact of life—yes, even this conflict and burden—if what we really desire to promote universally is social justice for all.

172. So, in considering the question of fundamental human rights, in this case those of the people of Tibet, let us be sure that we are seeking to uphold and promote these rights for all people, and not for just a privileged few. Here, too, we find that we cannot proceed clearly and judiciously without first hearing the voice of the People's Republic of China. In the light of these considerations, the Indonesian delegation opposes the recommendation of the General Committee and will vote against the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

173. Mr. KAMIL (Federation of Malaya): I shall make only a brief statement in support of the recommendation of the General Committee for the inclusion of the item entitled "The question of Tibet", since the reasons behind the joint application of the delegations of Thailand and the Federation of Malaya for the inclusion of the item have been set out in the explanatory memorandum of 18 August 1961 [A/4848].

174. It may be recalled that the question of Tibet was included as an item in the agenda of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. The overwhelming

majority vote in the General Assembly at that session approving the General Committee's recommendation for the inclusion of the item reflected the concern of the General Assembly as a whole at the continued systematic disregard of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people and the sustained attempt to destroy their traditional and distinctive way of life and their religious and cultural autonomy.

175. It may also be recalled that, owing to extreme pressure of work to which the Assembly was subject at the concluding stages of the session, the fifteenth session of the General Assembly found it impossible to consider and take action on the item. On behalf of my delegation, I expressed our deep regret and great disappointment at the fact that the Assembly, at its fifteenth session, was not able, owing to the force of circumstances, to discharge its responsibility in this regard [995th meeting]. I also expressed the hope that, should the situation in Tibet show no signs of improvement, the Assembly should again address itself to this question and should accord the item as high a priority as possible in the order of items to be considered at the sixteenth session.

176. The situation in Tibet, as indicated in the explanatory memorandum, has not improved and remains a source of grave concern. I will not go into the substance of the question at this stage for this should be reserved for the appropriate time and place, when the General Assembly goes into a substantive debate on the item. I would only like at this stage to make a few remarks on some of the observations that have been made both here and in the General Committee, observations which in effect were designed to block the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

177. It has been alleged that the question of Tibet is a cold war item and should have no place in the agenda of the Assembly. The views held by some delegations supporting this argument do not seem to my delegation to be sufficient reason for the exclusion of the item from the agenda. I would be the last to say that the Tibetan item is not controversial, but the mere fact that it is controversial and that the discussion of the item embarrasses some delegations in this Assembly should in no way constitute reason for the Assembly to turn a deaf ear to the events in Tibet. The General Assembly has in the past considered several vital issues involving colonialism, self-determination and observance of human rights, and quite often the debates on these issues have produced considerable controversy and even acrimony. This is the price which the Assembly has to pay in order to ensure, despite objections and barriers created by some Powers, that peoples everywhere are entitled to their right to live in freedom, liberty and justice. My delegation would stress that this right belongs to peoples everywhere, be these peoples subject to traditional colonialism or be they subject to suppression in any other form by any other Power.

178. When we raise our voice against colonialism and the violation of human rights in Africa, we are not doing so simply because the victims are Africans and the oppressors are the Western colonial Powers, but basically because they are questions of the domination and suppression of man by man. If such oppression occurs elsewhere, it is the duty and obligation of the General Assembly to adopt a consistent attitude even if by so doing it will incur the displeasure of certain parties in the so-called cold war.

179. It has also been said that the Tibetan question falls within the domestic jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China and that, under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the General Assembly has no competence to deal with the subject. I do not want at this stage to go into a debate as to whether Tibet is or is not part of China. This juridical issue is completely irrelevant to the question of violation of human rights in Tibet. The Assembly has on many occasions and in respect of many issues considered itself competent to deal with issues to the discussion of which objections have been raised on the grounds of domestic jurisdiction. It is the view of my delegation that the General Assembly has as much right and competence to deal with the Tibetan issue as it has to deal with such issues as Algeria, apartheid in South Africa and Portuguese colonialism in Angola.

180. To be effective as an international machinery for the ensurance of the free exercise of fundamental human rights and freedoms by peoples everywhere, the General Assembly must adopt a consistent attitude, and for this reason I submit that the General Assembly should accept the inclusion of the Tibetan item in its agenda at this session, as it did at the fourteenth and fifteenth sessions.

181. It has been alleged that Tibet is a dead issue. I see no logic in this. To some nations, perhaps, the initial shock of the outrage perpetrated against the Tibetan people may have worn off, but this does not make Tibet a dead issue. The outrage still continues and the people of Tibet are still deprived of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, and, so long as this state of affairs continues, the General Assembly has as much right to deal with the issue now as it had to deal with the issue in 1959.

182. It has also been argued that the Assembly cannot consider the Tibetan issue at this time because of the absence of the representatives of the People's Republic of China. I cannot agree with this argument because the violation of the fundamental rights of peoples is an urgent issue and should be dealt with without delay.

183. The people of Tibet are at the moment suffering from repressive measures and they are looking to us, the General Assembly of the United Nations, in whom they have placed their confidence for the guarantee of their rights and liberties, to take appropriate action consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. This, my delegation feels, is reason enough for the Assembly to have an urgent debate and take urgent action so that the situation in Tibet can be remedied.

184. The vote in the General Committee [136th meeting] recommending the inclusion of this item—a vote of 15 in favour to 3 against—reflects the attitude that the General Assembly should adopt on the inclusion of this item. I would like, in conclusion, to appeal to the Assembly to give its wholehearted support to the inclusion of this item so that the majority obtained in the General Committee should again be reflected in the vote in plenary meeting as our collective concern over the grave situation existing at present in Tibet.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thai-

land, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands.

Against: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Mali.

Abstaining: Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Morocco, Nepal.

Item 83 was placed on the agenda by 48 votes to 14, with 35 abstentions.

185. The PRESIDENT: I now come to item 84, entitled "Population growth and economic development". Are there any observations on the inclusion of this item?

186. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): My delegation has already made known in the General Committee its views concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Population growth and economic development". It then expressed the Argentine Government's serious concern that a proposal should have been made which, if adopted, would place many States in a difficult situation with regard to the world Organization and which, for no compelling reason that we can see, adds a new and undesirable source of discord to the many which unfortunately divide the Members of the United Nations. We do not consider it necessary to reiterate in plenary the detailed reasons for our regret and concern.

187. My delegation, which did not formally oppose the inclusion of the item, is prepared to take part in the debate and uphold its views with the greatest vigour. At this point we wish only to make it clear that what this item is really concerned with is the artificial limitation of births or, to use the current expression, birth control. Although the title does not actually contain this expression, the idea behind the item is made unmistakably clear in the explanatory memorandum requesting its inclusion.

188. In order, therefore, that we should be under no misapprehension with regard to the subject which is in fact to be discussed, my delegation requested in the General Committee that this item should be detached from the general problem of under-development, of which it originally formed a sub-item, and should be dealt with separately.

189. As regards allocation of the item to a committee, my delegation was not opposed to this question of birth control, which is what we prefer to call it, being dealt with by the Second Committee, since the forum in which the discussion is held does not, in our view, constitute a fundamental problem. We wish it to be perfectly clear, however, that while we did not oppose

the allocation of the item to the Second Committee, this in no way implies that we consider it to be purely an economic question. In the view of my Government, the artificial limitation of births has far-reaching human implications and is closely bound up with our people's general philosophy of life. This is the viewpoint we shall uphold with all the vigour we can command when the time comes to take a stand on this very important matter.

190. Mrs. LINDSTROM (Sweden): The General Committee has recommended that the Assembly put on its agenda the item entitled "Population growth and economic development", an item which was proposed by my Government together with our neighbour, Denmark.

191. I know that there were some different opinions in the Committee as to the contents of the matter. The same opinions were presented here a moment ago by the representative of Argentina. But nobody has denied that the question falls within the competence of the United Nations; and no one has argued in the Committee, I am told, for the rejection of the item being proposed at this stage of our proceedings.

192. Those who propose this item consider that it is a fundamental question, that the connexion between population growth in the world and the means of support is so strong that it influences the entire future of mankind and that it motivates a debate in the United Nations.

193. We know that the growth of the population of the world now amounts to 50 million, net, a year. During the 1960's alone the newcomers will amount to as much as the present population of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union altogether, a multitude of people who will try to earn their living from the resources of the same earth and who will want to fight for a better and more dignified life.

194. Is it possible that this vital question does not deserve to be debated in the United Nations? It certainly deserves to be debated. No delegation can claim as a reason for not approving this item that the population question does not concern his own country. Of course, there are many countries in Africa and other parts of the world, including my own, Sweden, where it can be said that the population increase does not constitute any reason for anxiety and where, on the contrary, there are sufficient space and food supplies perhaps even to encourage a population increase in the interest of national development. I read in The New York Times the other day that Argentina is such a country.

195. But these more well-to-do nations must understand that they cannot isolate themselves from the sufferings of other people. They must realize that the earth has now become united, where people have a common responsibility towards each other and where no one is so well off that he is not affected by other people's starvation when it follows in the trail of an over-population which the country concerned wants to, but cannot, stop. So it is for several crowded countries of Asia and the Middle East.

196. As for Latin America, the population problem caused President Kennedy to state in a message to Congress recently: "Latin America will have to double its real income in the next thirty years simply to maintain already low standards of living". Now a representative of this same Latin America states here that population control is not the way to solve

the economic and social problems created by under-development, and he says that he is against birth control.

197. As an answer to that I can quote the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, who said: "Population control does not solve all our problems, but other problems cannot be solved without such a control". That is at least the case for India. This certainly does not mean that the Government should be exposed to any pressure whatsoever in favour of population control.

198. The Swedish delegation regards it as necessary that technical and economic assistance should multiply during years to come and that no prosperous nation should shirk its obligation here. But we also consider that if a nation desires or asks for technical assistance in the form of instructions on population control, the United Nations should not just give a flat refusal. We hope that we shall have the opportunity to discuss this matter most thoroughly in the Second Committee, where I will have the pleasure of meeting the representatives of Argentina and other countries who oppose these views.

199. With these remarks, I appeal to the Assembly to follow the recommendation of the General Committee and include in its agenda the item entitled "Population growth and economic development". This would be consistent with a long-established practice, according to which the General Assembly has always complied with the wishes of a Member State that has asked to have a question included in its agenda. Even those who were strongly opposed to a question or policy used to consent to the question being heard. It might well have been that the argumentation of the party making the proposal was smashed to pieces, but at least he was given an opportunity to defend his opinions.

200. The PRESIDENT: If there is no formal request for a vote or other objection I shall consider that the General Assembly is in favour of including this item in the agenda.

Item 84 was included in the agenda.

201. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection I shall consider that items 85 and 86 are included in the agenda.

Items 85 and 86 were included in the agenda without discussion.

202. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections I shall consider that item 87 is included in the agenda.

Item 87 was included in the agenda without discussion.

203. The PRESIDENT: If there are no objections I shall consider that item 88 is included in the agenda.

Item 88 was included in the agenda without discussion.

204. The PRESIDENT: I now come to item 89, entitled "Question of Hungary".

205. Mr. MOD (Hungary): Since the position of my delegation is well known to everyone, I wish to make only a very brief statement.

206. We are convinced that the inclusion of the alleged "Question of Hungary" in the agenda of the General Assembly is contrary to the Charter and that the discussion of this question will contribute nothing new or useful.

207. This question has been proposed for inclusion by the United States of America merely to divert the General Assembly's attention from the vital questions of our time and to create a cold war atmosphere at a time when the General Assembly more than ever needs to work constructively.

208. It is therefore in the interests of international authority, of the United Nations and of all those who want this sixteenth session to yield positive results that I ask the delegations here present not to vote in favour of the inclusion of this question. Needless to say, my delegation will vote against its inclusion.

209. Mr. YOST (United States of America): As the General Assembly knows the United States delegation proposed, in the General Committee [137th meeting], the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Hungary". Subsequently, the members of the Committee approved the inclusion of the item by a vote of 15 in favour, 3 against and 2 abstentions.

210. As the United States representative said at that time, the question of Hungary is essentially one of unfinished General Assembly business. The item had been included in the agenda of the fifteenth session, but, owing to the deadline which it had set for its adjournment, the Assembly was not able to consider it. In our view, this was a marked omission and one which should be rectified this year. We were, therefore, most gratified that so many members of the General Committee agreed with our point of view and voted by such an overwhelming majority to include the item in the agenda. It is our sincere hope that the General Assembly will do likewise.

211. Since the tragic events of 1956 in Hungary, the United Nations has repeatedly and forcefully expressed its continuing concern with the situation pertaining in Hungary. By overwhelming majorities the General Assembly has adopted well over a dozen resolutions concerning that country; yet the Government of Hungary has consistently and persistently refused to abide by any of the provisions and recommendations contained therein.

212. The United States Government has three principal reasons for seeking the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Hungary": first, the refusal of the Government of Hungary to abide by the provisions of previous Assembly resolutions; secondly, the continued refusal of the Hungarian authorities to grant to the people of Hungary their fundamental freedoms and human rights, including particularly the right freely to choose by whom they wish to be governed; and thirdly, the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the sixteenth session puts the General Assembly in a position to rectify the omission at its fifteenth session when time did not permit a full discussion of this extremely important question.

213. I am confident that a majority of the Members here present will endorse the recommendation of the General Committee by voting to include the question of Hungary in the agenda of the sixteenth session.

214. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to Mr. Mod, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

215. Mr. MOD (Hungary): My delegation does not intend to take up much of the General Assembly's time, but as the United States delegation has seen fit to adduce arguments in favour of including the question of Hungary in the agenda, I too am obliged to speak on this question.

216. I wish to state that all the questions which have been raised are questions about which the Hungarian people and the democratically and freely elected institutions which control that country, have the exclusive right to take decisions. I shall therefore reply briefly and as far as is permissible during the discussion on the agenda, whilst reserving our position of principle.

217. The United States representative has told us in so many words that there have been no free elections in Hungary. Everyone knows, however, that since 1956 three general elections have been held by secret ballot in Hungary on various levels. There have been elections of councils and of legislative bodies. The Hungarian People's Republic is an independent and sovereign country. As an independent sovereign State, Hungary maintains diplomatic relations with a number of countries, including the United States of America, and as such is a Member of the United Nations with equal rights.

218. Does the Charter contain any provision authorizing the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of States whose social system they dislike on the pretext that they are dissatisfied with the results of elections which have taken place? No, the Charter does not contain any such provisions. We have never concealed the fact that there are some States Members of the United Nations whose social structure is in our opinion undemocratic. But that does not entitle us to interfere in the internal affairs of others. Neither have we concealed the fact that there are countries whose electoral system in our opinion is not democratic; the United States, for example. But we do not think that that entitles us to ask for the question to be included in the agenda of the General Assembly. That would be a precedent contrary to one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations.

219. Today it was in Hungary's internal affairs that the United States tried to interfere; tomorrow they will use the United Nations to try their luck on other countries. In repudiating this attempt we are defending the rights of all the small States Members of the United Nations.

220. No one should be deceived by the argument that the sixteenth session should consider the question because the fifteenth session did not do so. We all remember that, with the exception of the United States delegation, which at the last night meeting of the fifteenth session [995th plenary meeting] expressed regret that the General Assembly had not managed to discuss this provocative question, the other delegations sedulously avoided discussing this question, which was poisoning the atmosphere. The General Assembly has thus already made clear by its attitude that the so-called question of Hungary does not concern the United Nations.

221. We have also been accused of failing to comply with the decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly. Allow me, Mr. President, to state once again what my delegation has already said on several occasions. We do not believe the Member State exists that would submit to resolutions couched in terms as insulting as the ones we are considering here. In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, the question which has just been proposed for inclusion in the agenda does not fall within the competence of the United Nations. What we are asking, as we have asked before at previous sessions, is that the General Assembly should not allow the United States of

America to use the People's Republic of Hungary for cold-war purposes. Permit me to express my firm conviction that this question interests nobody and that nobody expects to gain the least advantage by discussing it. The only result would be the deterioration of relations between Hungary and the United States. For these reasons delegations which have the interests of the United Nations and of the People's Republic of Hungary at heart will not vote for the proposal which has been supported by the United States delegation.

222. The PRESIDENT: A vote by roll-call has been asked for on the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Hungary, Indonesia, Mali, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea.

Abstaining: India, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana.

The inclusion of item 89 in the agenda was adopted by 51 votes to 15, with 30 abstentions.

223. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the last two items: item 90, entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations", which the General Committee considered jointly with item 91, entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations". If there are no objections by the Assembly we shall examine these two agenda items simultaneously.

224. I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

225. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to state that the item proposed by the New Zealand delegation, "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations", is not in accordance with the vital interests of the Chinese people or with the interests of the United Nations itself. It is the profound conviction of the Soviet delegation, and not of that delegation alone, that the question of the representation of the Chinese people in the United Nations essentially involves a single issue—the restoration of the lawful rights of the great Chinese nation, a permanent member of the Security Council, that is, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

226. For many years now, the People's Republic of China, the world's largest nation with a population of 650 million has been unnaturally and unlawfully denied the possibility of making its contribution to the work of the United Nations and of exercising its lawful rights. Instead of raising in clear and unequivocal terms the question of rectifying this obvious injustice to the many millions of Chinese, the delegations of some countries though under pressure from public opinion throughout the world, are still trying by every means at their disposal to keep the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations and to engage in intrigues in this connexion. The seat of the People's Republic of China in the General Assembly and its principal organs is being unlawfully occupied by the so-called representatives of the bankrupt Chiang-Kai-shek clique, which was expelled and repudiated by the Chinese people as long ago as in 1949.

227. Twelve years ago the remnants of the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek régime entrenched themselves in the island of Taiwan, an island belonging to the People's Republic of China, and under the military and political protection of the United States of America, which illegally occupied this portion of age-old Chinese territory, they have endeavoured to speak on behalf of the great Chinese people. But everybody knows—and proof of this would be superfluous—that these persons represent no one but themselves. The contrived and unlawful exclusion of the People's Republic of China from participation in the activities of the United Nations does irreparable harm to all the work of the Organization. Its absence from the United Nations gravely impedes the solution of the major international problems of concern to the whole world, such as the problem of general and complete disarmament, the final abolition of the colonial system and the economic development of under-developed countries.

228. The twelve years during which the People's Republic of China has been in existence have shown beyond a doubt that only the Government of the People's Republic of China, enjoying the full support of the entire Chinese nation and constituting its sole legitimate spokesman, can and should represent China in the United Nations. The People's Republic of China and its Government have obtained wide international recognition and have established normal diplomatic relations with forty different States. The authority of the new socialist China and its influence in the settlement of important international problems are growing from year to year, a fact which is gaining increasing recognition among many States Members of the United Nations from Asia, Africa, Latin America and other parts of the world.

229. What obscurity still remains for the New Zealand delegation and those who support it in the question of the so-called representation of China in the United Nations? It is obvious to every right-thinking individual that there is but one China—the People's Republic of China—and its legitimate representatives, and only they, should sit in this hall. Could anyone taking a sober view of the current world scene possibly have any doubts on this score?

230. What is it, then, that requires further study, as indicated in the explanatory memorandum of the New Zealand Government [A/4873]? Obviously, it was necessary for some delegations to put the question in terms of a study so that they will be free to continue to intrigue in this matter, to study it and discuss it

as has been done heretofore, so that they can make yet another attempt to shelve it. But today, as has been recognized by the majority of delegations in the United Nations and as is being stressed by wide circles of world public opinion, no further delay can be brooked in solving the urgent question of restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and of expelling the representatives of the Chiang-Kai-shek clique who are illegally occupying its place.

231. That is why the Soviet delegation cannot support the proposal as formulated by New Zealand, because it would divert us from a solution of the question and fails to come to grips with the basic issue involved in the question of the representation of the Chinese people in the United Nations. The Soviet delegation considers that only a discussion of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, which is how the question is formulated in the Soviet Union proposal appearing as agenda item 91, can contribute to an effective as opposed to a fictitious solution of the question, and will eliminate the danger of further intrigues in regard to this important international problem.

232. These intrigues must be exposed in the interest of the lawful rights of the great Chinese people, in the interest of strengthening the United Nations as a truly international and universal Organization, and in the interest of world peace.

233. Mr. TSIANG (China): This is not the time or the place to go into the substance of this question. I wish merely to state briefly for the record the stand of my delegation in regard to the inclusion of items 90 and 91 in the agenda of the sixteenth session.

234. These two items subject the right of representation of my Government in the General Assembly to question and doubt. For that reason, these items are, in the judgement of my delegation, not receivable by the Assembly.

235. The Government of the Republic of China, which I have the honour to represent here, co-sponsored and participated in the founding conference of the United Nations at San Francisco. The same Government has since that time faithfully fulfilled the obligations of membership. It is the only constitutional and legitimate Government of China. The Charter of the United Nations specifies that the Republic of China should have a permanent seat in the Security Council.

236. The communist régime on the mainland of my country is the product of Soviet subversive and interventionist activities in my country. It is un-Chinese in origin and un-Chinese in character. It has no claim, legal or moral, to represent my people in this Assembly.

237. It remains only for me to say that item 91, proposed by the Soviet Union, is the more objectionable of the two items. It is phrased in such a way as to prejudice this question. A wholesome tradition has been built up in the United Nations whereby all items to be debated are phrased in an objective way; the title should merely state the question to be debated and should not in itself contain the conclusions of the debate. For that reason the Soviet item is, as I have said, by far the more objectionable of the two.

238. Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): The New Zealand Government has been prepared for some years

to envisage a full discussion in the General Assembly of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. In his statement at the thirteenth session, in 1958 [754th meeting], the New Zealand representative observed that the question must be considered sooner or later. While we have voted for the moratorium resolutions as a whole, we have since 1958 abstained from voting against various proposals which have been made for the inclusion of an item dealing with this complex issue.

239. The procedural discussions which have taken place over those years—indeed, over the past ten years—have clearly established two facts. The first is that there has been a growing desire within the General Assembly to consider the question in all its aspects. The second is that the problem of Chinese representation—whatever position one may take on it, and from whatever standpoint one may approach it—is one of the most serious problems which the General Assembly has had to face.

240. There can be no doubt about the great international significance of this issue. It is a highly important question, not merely in the technical, Charter sense but also in the context of world politics. It concerns not only the many millions of people on the Chinese mainland and on Formosa, but also people throughout the world—and particularly in Asia and in the Pacific area to which New Zealand belongs. It affects great-Power status on the Security Council. It bears upon the fundamental interest of the United Nations in the question of disarmament. Moreover, it has profoundly affected, and continues to affect, relations not only within the United Nations itself but also within the domestic political life of important Member States. My Government is convinced that the manner in which this important question is handled could involve the continued existence and viability of the United Nations.

241. Because of the unquestioned importance and gravity of the problem, and because of the developing situation within the Assembly, New Zealand feels that the time has come for a comprehensive examination of the question of Chinese representation in all its aspects. We have reached the conclusion that consideration, both detailed and deliberate, could be of the greatest value in ensuring that the General Assembly dealt with the question in a manner reflecting the serious international significance of that question.

242. With this purpose in mind, my Government has taken care to phrase its request for the inclusion of the item in entirely non-provocative and unprejudicial terms, terms first suggested by India and then used last year by the Soviet Union itself. Both the title of the item we have proposed and the explanatory memorandum [A/4873] accompanying the request have been cast in such a way as to ensure that the General Assembly has a full and unfettered opportunity to consider all aspects and all implications of the question, including its significance for the Organization itself.

243. We were interested to learn that the Soviet Union also considered that an item dealing with this question should be included in the agenda. There can be no doubt that at the present session there is a general desire to hold a full discussion. We are concerned, however, at the terms of the Soviet initiative. Both the title of the item which the Soviet Union has proposed and the explanatory memorandum [A/4874] appear to us to be designed to prejudice the issue of the discussion and thereby to limit, rather than to

encourage, the full and free debate which, we feel, the majority of Members desire. We believe that the Assembly is seeking an opportunity to deal with the full range of the Chinese representation issue. It should not allow itself to be diverted from this course.

244. As the President stated earlier this afternoon, this is not the place to consider the substance of this matter. Our sole concern at the present moment should, as I have already indicated, be to provide an opportunity for detailed and deliberate debate, from which it may be expected that substantive and constructive proposals will emerge. My delegation would accordingly urge that the Assembly deal with the question of the representation of China within the context of the item New Zealand has proposed.

245. If it is the wish of the Assembly to consider both the New Zealand item and the Soviet item together, we would not oppose that course since our objective—to open a full and free discussion—would still be met. No arbitrary limits would be placed on the scope and range of the debate. But we could not

support—and we are sure that the Assembly would never accept—the inclusion of a single item of the type proposed by the Soviet Union, the effect of which could only be to limit and circumscribe our subsequent discussions.

246. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Having taken note of the statements made by the last three speakers, and in the absence of any objection, I shall consider that items 90 and 91 have been included in the agenda.

Items 90 and 91 were included in the agenda.

247. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have come to the end of the debate on the inclusion of the various items in the agenda. We still have to consider whether these items should be allocated to plenary meetings of the General Assembly or to the different Committees. I believe I shall be interpreting the wishes of the Assembly correctly if I postpone consideration of this question until a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.