

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 125th
MEETING**

Monday, 23 November 1959,
at 10.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fourteenth session:</i>	
(a) <i>Letter dated 16 November 1959 from the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary;</i>	
(b) <i>Letter dated 20 November 1959 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations . . .</i>	19

Chairman: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fourteenth session:

- (a) Letter dated 16 November 1959 from the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary (A/4285);
- (b) Letter dated 20 November 1959 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (A/4292)

1. The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the members of the General Committee to the letters from the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary (A/4285) and from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (A/4292) in which they requested the inclusion of an additional item entitled "Question of Hungary" in the agenda of the fourteenth session. Before giving the floor to speakers, he recalled the limitations imposed by rule 40 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He suggested that the question of the allocation of the item, if recommended for inclusion, should be taken up after the Committee had decided on the inclusion of the item.

2. Following statements by the representatives of the USSR, Brazil and the United States of America, the CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Hungary and the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary to take places at the Committee table and to participate without vote in the debate.

Mr. Péter (Hungary) and Sir Leslie Munro (United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary) took places at the Committee table.

3. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that his country supported the request of the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary for the inclusion of an additional item entitled "Question of Hungary" in the agenda of the fourteenth session. The request was warranted. The United Nations continued to be seized of the situation in Hungary under General Assembly resolution 1312 (XIII) and the present Hungarian authorities as well as the Soviet Union continued to hold the resolutions of the General Assembly in contempt. On 9 July 1959 the Special Representative had disclosed in a public statement that

he had wished to proceed to Hungary to ascertain on the spot whether the General Assembly's resolutions were being carried out, but had been refused entry by the Soviet and Hungarian authorities. In the explanatory memorandum attached to his request for the inclusion of the item (A/4285), Sir Leslie Munro observed that the withdrawal of foreign armed forces from Hungary had not been achieved and that the framework of repression remained unchanged. Sir Leslie added that, despite the assurances given, since the previous session of the General Assembly some Hungarian freedom fighters had been brought to trial and had subsequently been executed. The end of the reign of terror was apparently not in sight for, according to persistent rumours, there was an imminent possibility of further executions.

4. While it regretted the circumstances which had led to the request for inclusion of the item, the United States delegation felt that every Member of the United Nations should hear Sir Leslie Munro's report and consider what additional measures could be taken to achieve the objectives of the United Nations.

5. Mr. PETER (Hungary) said that the statement he was about to make was governed by a threefold responsibility. Firstly, being under instructions to contribute to the peaceful progress of the Hungarian people, he was bound to take exception to any attempt to use the Hungarian people to serve the ends of the cold war. Secondly, in his devotion to the common cause of the United Nations, he must endeavour to prevent that Organization from becoming a tool of reactionary forces. Lastly, since he was anxious to promote a reduction of tensions in the world, he would approach even the most vital questions in a spirit of conciliation. Accordingly, he asked the members of the Committee not to accept the proposals made in the letters from Sir Leslie Munro (A/4285) and from the Permanent Representative of the United States (A/4292). Even those who felt that any item proposed, however controversial, should be included in the agenda would do well to reconsider their stand in the present case. The request for inscription involved serious political risks. As *The New York Times* had pointed out in an article on 15 November 1959, some Western Powers themselves feared that it might be viewed as an attempt to rekindle the cold war and to worsen the favourable climate created by the Camp David discussions between the Heads of Government of the United States and the USSR. Moreover, in a statement released to the Press on 18 November, the Permanent Representative of the United States had stated that all those responsible, in and out of Hungary, should join in seeking enforcement of United Nations resolutions. The words "in and out of Hungary" were certainly significant and could be construed as a call for subversive activities.

6. Moreover, the request for inscription was contrary to the United Nations Charter and to the General Assembly's rules of procedure. Apart from the fact

that resolution 1312 (XIII) had been adopted in violation of the Charter, it had merely instructed Sir Leslie Munro to report to Member States or to the General Assembly on his mission. Nothing in that resolution warranted proposals to include specific items in the agenda of the Assembly. The letter from Sir Leslie Munro (A/4285)—which, incidentally, made no reference at all to a report—was therefore contrary to that resolution and the proposal contained in it could not be considered valid. As for the letter from the Permanent Representative of the United States (A/4292), it merely supported that proposal. For the reasons given, the General Committee was not at present seized of a valid request.

7. Furthermore, under rule 15 of the Assembly's rules of procedure, only additional items of an important and urgent character could be proposed for inclusion in the agenda during a regular session. The letters contained no evidence that the proposed item was of such a character.

8. Lastly, every question raised in the explanatory memorandum in document A/4285 was exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Hungarian People's Republic. The author of the memorandum contended first of all that "the withdrawal of foreign armed forces from Hungary has not been achieved". There were actually no foreign armed forces in Hungary. The question whether the armed forces of States parties to the Treaty of Warsaw were entitled to be posted in Hungary—a party to that regional agreement—was solely the concern of the States parties to the Treaty. It was further stated in the memorandum that "the framework of repression remains unchanged". However, nationals from most States Members of the United Nations had recently visited Hungary and could testify that the broad masses of the Hungarian people were better off today than ever before. Moreover, no international body was entitled to pass judgement on the constitutional and political system of a Member State, and Hungary was bound to protect its society against subversive acts, even if such acts appealed to some foreign circles. The assertion that "wide-spread concern has been aroused by continuing trials and executions consequent upon the uprising, and by the imminent possibility of further executions..." was inspired by propaganda which systematically distorted the facts. The Hungarian authorities had further been charged with refusal to assent to a visit to Hungary on the part of the Special Representative. Surely the resolutions of the General Assembly were recommendations and, under the Charter, it was for Member States to decide what action they should take. Under the unambiguous provisions of the Charter the recommendation in question was directed against the sovereignty of a Member State. Besides, Hungary had invited all the representatives to visit the country to acquaint themselves with conditions there, provided that they did not presume to conduct an inquiry.

9. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) observed that his delegation had always acted cautiously in deciding whether or not to support requests for the inclusion of certain items. Its position with respect to the question of Tibet was a case in point. However, in 1956 it had supported the inclusion of the Hungarian question, although, to its great regret, the item had been entitled "The situation in Hungary" instead of "Foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary". In its view, the events in Hungary had in

fact been caused by foreign intervention and therefore came under Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. As the General Assembly remained seized of the appeal addressed to it by the Nagy Government,^{1/} Article 2, paragraph 7, could not be invoked in the present case.

10. In view of the communication from the representative of the United States (A/4292), it was not necessary for the Committee to go into the question whether or not the United Nations Special Representative was entitled to propose the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the agenda. It would be noted that that document was headed: "Item proposed by the United States of America".

11. U THANT (Burma) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 1312 (XIII) under which the United Nations continued to be seized of the situation in Hungary. The question whether or not Sir Leslie Munro was entitled to propose the inclusion of the item in the agenda was irrelevant. The letter in which the United States representative supported the proposal constituted, in fact, a request for inclusion. Burma would therefore vote for the inclusion of the item, while reserving its position on the substance of the question.

12. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) said he could not understand some of the Hungarian representative's arguments. Even if one hesitated to admit that there was justification for the request presented by Sir Leslie Munro, the position adopted by the United States delegation left no room for doubt regarding the procedure to be followed. Besides, Sir Leslie Munro's action had been perfectly justified. Under resolution 1312 (XIII) the situation in Hungary remained a question before the United Nations and Sir Leslie Munro had been requested by the General Assembly to deal with a specific question. It was therefore natural and logical that he should undertake to report on his mission to the General Assembly. Furthermore, he was competent because he represented a "subsidiary organ" established in pursuance of Article 7, paragraph 2, and Article 22 of the Charter. According to an authority on the interpretation of the Charter, the General Assembly was free to establish subsidiary organs composed of several Members or of only one person appointed by it. His delegation therefore supported the United States proposal as it would have supported the request for inscription presented by Sir Leslie Munro.

13. Mr. TAMAYO (Bolivia) pointed out that the United Nations was obliged by its very nature to discuss all questions which had a bearing on the international situation. If it was to adhere to its principles, therefore, the Organization must consider the question of Hungary which the United States representative had asked to be included in the agenda. Furthermore, the United Nations had appointed a Special Representative who should be able to present his report to the Member States. If the cold war was to be brought to an end, the necessary steps should be taken to eliminate any continuing source of concern. Accordingly, his delegation would support the request for inclusion of the item in the agenda, which was in conformity with resolution 1312 (XIII).

14. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) objected to the request for the inscription of the item made by the

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Emergency Special Session, Annex, agenda item 5, document A/3251.

so-called Special Representative on the so-called question of Hungary. The United Nations could not consider that question without violating the Charter and, in particular, Article 2, paragraph 7. The request was simply another inadmissible attempt to intervene in the internal affairs of a sovereign Member State, the Hungarian People's Republic. Such an undertaking could only impair the Organization's prestige. Moreover, the explanatory memorandum in document A/4285 was nothing but a tissue of untruths and slanders.

15. In reality, the effort was merely a fresh provocation calculated to poison the atmosphere at the current session of the Assembly and to aggravate the international situation. On 20 November 1959, at its 840th plenary meeting, the General Assembly had unanimously adopted the important resolution on general and complete disarmament (resolution 1378 (XIV)). A large majority of its Members had also voiced their opposition to the resumption of tests of nuclear weapons and to the experimental explosion planned in the Sahara. That was clearly not to the liking of certain quarters, who were merely seeking to prolong a cold-war atmosphere, as they had tried to do in connexion with the so-called question of Tibet.

16. The request of the so-called Special Representative was as illegal and arbitrary as his appointment. Under rule 15 of the Assembly's rules of procedure, the General Committee could consider a request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda only if it was of an important and urgent character. The so-called question of Hungary obviously did not fall into that category. Moreover, rule 15 laid down a specific procedure which could not have a broader application than that of rule 14 concerning supplementary items. Under rule 14, only a Member State, a principal organ of the United Nations or the Secretary-General could request the inclusion of such items. The same restriction therefore applied a fortiori to additional items proposed under rule 15. The fact that those who had actually instigated new provocations against socialist countries had rushed to the support of the so-called Special Representative at the last minute could in no way diminish the illegality of his procedure.

17. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the proposal made in document A/4285.

18. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said that it was inadmissible that a representative of the United Nations appointed by the General Assembly should be described as the "so-called Special Representative"; he requested that the adjective "so-called" should be omitted in the official record of the meeting.

19. The CHAIRMAN asked the Czechoslovak representative if he had any objection to the omission of the adjective in the official record.

20. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) replied that the summary record should faithfully reproduce what had been said during the meeting. He therefore regretted that he could not accept the Chairman's suggestion and must insist on the inclusion in the record of the term which he had used, together, of course, with the point of order of the Brazilian representative.

21. The CHAIRMAN took note of that reply and observed that, in using the expression referred to,

the Czechoslovak representative had not intended any disrespect for the Special Representative.

22. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) expressed regret that the Special Representative's report on the question of Hungary had not yet been circulated. In the absence of the report it was difficult to determine whether there had been any significant occurrences in that country, involving the application of General Assembly resolutions on Hungary, since the adoption of resolution 1312 (XIII). That being the case, he wondered whether the General Committee was in a position to make a recommendation to the Assembly regarding the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the agenda. His delegation also wondered under what provision of the rules of procedure the General Committee could consider Sir Leslie Munro's proposal for the inclusion of the item. Sir Leslie Munro had invoked rule 15 of the Assembly's rules of procedure, but that rule merely established the circumstances in which additional items could be proposed for inclusion in the agenda. It did not state by whom those items could be proposed, and in his delegation's opinion it did not apply to Sir Leslie Munro's proposal. The question was whether the Assembly's rules of procedure allowed a special representative of the United Nations to propose the inclusion of an item in the agenda. In that connexion, rule 13 stated the items which should be included in the provisional agenda drawn up by the Secretary-General. Those items could be proposed by the principal organs of the United Nations, States Members of the Organization, the Secretary-General himself or, under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter, by States not Members of the United Nations. Rule 14 of the rules of procedure dealt with supplementary items and restricted the right to propose the inclusion of those items in the agenda to Member States, the principal organs and the Secretary-General. States not Members of the Organization which wished to avail themselves of the provisions of Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter could request the inclusion of an item only through the intermediary of a Member State, a principal organ of the United Nations or the Secretary-General. Rule 15 of the rules of procedure was also restrictive in that it established a time-limit for the proposal of additional items. It was true that the wording of that rule might give the impression that the inclusion of a new item of an important and urgent character might be proposed by entities other than Member States, the principal organs of the Organization and the Secretary-General. If that were the case, however, the General Committee would have to remain permanently in session and the General Assembly would be completely paralysed. Hence, rule 15 could be interpreted only in the light of rules 13 and 14, so that it must inevitably be concluded that only Member States, the principal organs of the United Nations and the Secretary-General could propose new items for inclusion in the agenda. Sir Leslie Munro, who was the United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary, could be assimilated only to a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, not to a principal organ of the United Nations. He was therefore not competent to propose the inclusion of any item in the Assembly's agenda.

23. His delegation had apparently not been the only one to entertain doubts regarding the validity of Sir Leslie Munro's proposal, since a Member State—the United States of America—had supported the proposal, thereby obviously settling the question of procedure.

In view of the political aspects of the question of Hungary, however, Indonesia would abstain from voting on the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the fourteenth session.

24. Mr. BERARD (France) considered that the action taken by Sir Leslie Munro, United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary, had every legal justification. It was also warranted by the course of events in Hungary during the previous year. His delegation would therefore vote for the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

25. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) strongly protested on behalf of his delegation against the attempt to force the so-called question of Hungary into the agenda. The Committee was confronted with an act of interference in Hungary's internal affairs, which was an obvious violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. In consenting to act as a tool for the instigators of that new scheme of provocation, Sir Leslie Munro had undertaken to spread shameful slanders against the Hungarian Government and people. With respect to the legal aspect of the question, the Soviet Union shared the view of Indonesia, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and thought that Sir Leslie Munro's proposal was clearly contrary to the Assembly's rules of procedure. He would not refer to the slanderous fabrications about the USSR contained in Sir Leslie Munro's letter. In reply to the observations of the United States representative, who had mentioned the events of 1956, he recalled that in 1956 counter-revolutionary elements, with the assistance of the countries which now wished to include the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda, had attempted to abolish the socialist régime and restore the former feudal system in Hungary. The brief period during which they had maintained themselves in power had been characterized by indescribable terrorism. The small clique of reactionaries had been quickly crushed by the Hungarian people with the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Those adventurers and the Western groups which protected them wished to prevent the Hungarian people from continuing their task of building socialism. They were unwilling to accept the improvement in international affairs which had been initiated by Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States and his negotiations with President Eisenhower. They wished to halt the march of history, resist the strengthening of international co-operation and bolster up the cold war. Needless to say, all their efforts were in vain. Those responsible for the manoeuvre were also trying to prevent the Assembly from considering the important questions on its agenda and to disturb the favourable atmosphere which had permitted the adoption of constructive resolutions, particularly with respect to disarmament. In his statement, the representative of the Union of South Africa had no doubt sought to divert attention from events in his country, where the most elementary human rights were being flouted.

26. As Mr. Khrushchev had stated on 18 September 1959 (799th plenary meeting), the Assembly should avoid reviving passions. The inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda would be only a Pyrrhic victory for those States which wished to have it included and which were in the majority. For its part, the Soviet Union was firmly opposed to any resumption of the cold war and hoped that the General

Committee would reject the proposal under consideration. His delegation would vote against that proposal.

27. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the request for the inscription of the question of Hungary, which was perfectly admissible and fully justified. The argument that under the Assembly's rules of procedure the Special Representative was not permitted to propose the inclusion of the item was untenable. Sir Leslie Munro was fully entitled to act as a subsidiary organ of the Assembly, by which he had been instructed to report to Member States or to the General Assembly on significant developments relating to the implementation of the Assembly resolutions on Hungary.

28. It had been asked whether a subsidiary organ could propose the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda. It was true that under rule 14 of the rules of procedure the right of requesting the inclusion of supplementary items in the agenda of a regular session of the Assembly was limited to States Members, principal organs of the United Nations and the Secretary-General. Rule 15, however, on which Sir Leslie Munro relied in submitting his proposal, did not have that restrictive character. If the Assembly had wished to give it that character, it would have done so, as it had done in the case of rule 14. Rule 15 specifically referred to items of an important and urgent character, and it was obvious that the question of Hungary came within that category. Discussion was urgent because the fourteenth session would soon come to an end, and the Special Representative's report was about to be submitted for the Assembly's consideration. Sir Leslie Munro had wished to wait until the last moment before submitting his report in the hope that the situation would improve, and the General Committee should respect his reasons for doing so.

29. It had also been argued that the request for the inclusion of the item was an act of provocation intended only to divert the General Assembly's attention from the recent progress in international relations. The United Kingdom hoped for a relaxation in international tension as much as any other State, but he could not agree that the United Nations should abandon its concern for Hungary when the Assembly's resolutions on that question continued to be ignored. In supporting the request for the inclusion of the item in the agenda, his delegation was acting in conformity with the position taken by the Assembly since 1956.

30. Mr. KING (Liberia) said that he had had some doubts as to the validity of Sir Leslie Munro's request for the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the Assembly's agenda. It was the view of his delegation that the Special Representative might have submitted his report to the Secretary-General who, under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, would have circulated it to Member States. That course had not been followed; consequently his Government had not had the opportunity of studying the report in order to formulate its position.

31. The United States, however, had submitted a request for the inscription of the item. It had been the uniform practice of the Liberian delegation to support a request from any Member State for inscription of an item in the agenda, as a matter of right, without prejudice to its position on the substantive issue in the meetings of the General Assembly. Under those circumstances, his delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Hungary".

Its position on the substantive issues would depend on the report to be submitted by Sir Leslie Munro.

32. In regard to the question of interference in Hungary's internal affairs, Liberia's position was the same as that which it had taken with respect to the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Union of South Africa.

33. Mr. TSIANG (China) observed that three questions had been raised during the debate: the first, whether the Special Representative's proposal was in conformity with the rules of procedure; the second, whether the present situation in Hungary called for a debate on the question; and the third, whether such a debate was appropriate at a time when a relaxation in international tension was apparent.

34. With respect to the first question, the discussion appeared to have shown that Sir Leslie Munro's proposal was completely in order. Moreover, the fact that a Member State had submitted an identical proposal removed any doubt in that connexion. With respect to the second question, the reasons set forth in the Special Representative's explanatory memorandum were sufficient to justify an affirmative reply. The reply to the third question depended on the way in which the subject would be considered. All Member States wanted peace, but peace was incompatible with acts such as those which had been committed by the Soviet Union in Hungary. The United Nations would not serve the cause of peace by tolerating such acts. With those considerations in mind, his delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item "Question of Hungary" in the agenda.

35. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) regretted that the representative of the Soviet Union had seen fit to refer to his country in connexion with the item under discussion. He recalled the Chairman's appeal at the beginning of the meeting that members should limit their remarks to the question before them—a direction to which he had adhered. The remarks of the Soviet Union representative were however out of order. He further recalled that when the inclusion of another item, referring to his country and falling within the scope of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, had been considered by the General Committee, his delegation had objected to its inclusion in the agenda but it had not attempted to impugn the motives of the Soviet Union for favouring its inscription in spite of Article 2, paragraph 7. He added that where Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter was concerned, his delegation's approach was an objective, legal one, as had again been illustrated when the General Committee had considered the inscription of the item relating to Tibet.

36. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines) said that any possible doubt concerning the competence of the Special Representative had been dispelled by the arguments of the United Kingdom representative. Moreover, it was undeniable that the United States representative was in the right in proposing the inclusion of the question of Hungary. As appeared from the explanatory memorandum attached to the United States representative's letter (A/4292), the question at issue was an urgent and important one which the Assembly ought to consider. Lastly, his delegation did not believe that peace could be obtained by stifling the voice of the human conscience.

37. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) said that despite the insinuations of some delegations, there was not, in his opinion, any question of abandoning principles. The countries of the West and of the East had different views on many problems, but that did not mean that they should abuse the United Nations and use it as a forum for acrimonious dispute. He asked whether it was in order for the Western countries to compel the General Assembly to examine questions which might exacerbate the cold war. It was there that the principle lay. Since 1956, the Western countries had tried, at each session of the Assembly, to keep the so-called question of Hungary on the agenda. At the last session they had had to resort to a makeshift and had induced the Assembly to appoint Sir Leslie Munro as its Special Representative on that question and to give him the status of a United Nations organ. The United States delegation itself had been doubtful of the validity of the Special Representative's proposal and had decided, in order to remove similar doubts from the minds of other delegations, to support the proposal itself. That manoeuvre, however, had in no way detracted from the illegality of the Special Representative's proposal. All the circumstances adduced by the Special Representative in his explanatory memorandum (A/4285) were, even if they had been true, exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Hungarian Government. As they happened, however, to be merely gossip, they could not serve as the basis for a decision by the General Committee. For the rest, the presence of foreign troops in Hungary was explainable by the need to ensure the safety of that country in the face of attempted plotting by Hungarian reactionary circles, the threat of the revanchist circles of West Germany and the piling-up of armaments by the countries which were members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization. The Hungarian Government's refusal to assent to any visit to Hungary on the part of the Special Representative was perfectly justified.

38. No manoeuvre would serve to convince the General Committee of the important and urgent character of the additional item proposed by the Special Representative. The overriding consideration for certain delegations was to dispel the atmosphere of relaxation created by the recent adoption of resolutions on disarmament and the cessation of nuclear tests. Such attempts would nevertheless be vain, and the world would not allow itself to be taken in by them.

39. His delegation hoped that the General Committee, by rejecting the request for inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda, would treat those attempts as they deserved.

40. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) was of the view that Sir Leslie Munro had acted in accordance with the terms of reference given to him by the Assembly. The arguments to the effect that examination of the question would merely revive the cold war were hardly valid, because a relaxation of international tension would not be achieved by keeping silent on controversial questions. His delegation would support Sir Leslie Munro's proposal, which it believed to be in accordance with rule 15 of the rules of procedure. It would also support the proposal of the United States.

41. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) was in favour of including the question of Hungary in the agenda. The Special Representative was within his rights in proposing the inclusion of that item, as, under General

Assembly resolution 1312 (XIII), he was required to make a report. In any event, the support given to his proposal by the United States delegation had eliminated any procedural objections. There could be no disputing the fact that a Member State was entitled to lay an additional item before the General Assembly. Furthermore, the question was certainly important, as the Assembly had decided to continue to be seized of it.

42. Sir Leslie MUNRO (United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary) pointed out that to attach the adjective "so-called" to the title of Special Representative did nothing to relieve him of the functions conferred on him by the General Assembly. As soon as a decision was taken on the question under discussion, he would be prepared to transmit his report to the Secretary-General and himself to present that report to the General Assembly.

43. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the argument advanced by several representatives to the effect that the vote on the recommendation for inscription should be based on the letter from the Permanent Representative of the United States (A/4292), suggested that the General Committee should apply that procedure. He put to the vote the proposal for the inclusion of a additional item entitled "Question of Hungary" in the agenda of the fourteenth regular session.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Morocco, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Liberia.

Against: Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Morocco, Indonesia.

By 15 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions, the General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include the item in the agenda.

44. Mr. PETER (Hungary) deeply regretted the result of the vote, which could not fail to have undesirable consequences. The effect of the decision would be to increase the Hungarian people's contempt for the reactionary forces which were trying to use Hungary as a pawn in the cold war.

45. The CHAIRMAN inquired whether any member of the General Committee wished to propose that the question should be allocated to a Committee.

46. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) proposed that the question of Hungary should be examined in plenary meeting without being referred to a Committee.

47. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not take part in the vote on that proposal.

48. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote either.

49. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) requested that the United States proposal should be put to the vote.

By 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, the General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should consider the item in plenary meeting, without reference to a Committee.

50. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) explained that he had not participated in the vote. He said that his use of the adjective "so-called" had been merely to emphasize that in the opinion of his delegation the creation of the post of Special Representative had been contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and had no legal foundation.

51. The CHAIRMAN noted that the representative of Czechoslovakia had had no intention of offending Sir Leslie Munro, who was held in general esteem.

52. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) deplored the violent tone of Mr. Kuznetsov's statement, which was quite out of place in a parliamentary assembly. With regard to the reference by the Soviet representative to the conversations at Camp David, he explained that he welcomed the results which had been achieved there. He did not want the spirit of Camp David to be lost, and the best way of preventing that would be to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly. He had attended all the meetings at Camp David, and nothing had been said there which could justify a refusal to discuss the question of Hungary in the spirit of Camp David. The enslavement of small countries and acts of brutality committed in violation of human rights were contrary to that spirit. He looked forward to the day when the United States and the Soviet Union would work side by side for world peace, but a peaceful world could not be built on anything but acts bearing the stamp of justice. The communiqué published by the two Heads of Government on 27 September 1959 contained a statement to the effect that all international questions should be settled not by force but by negotiation. For those believing in the true spirit of Camp David there could be no reason for not opening the frontiers of Hungary and allowing Sir Leslie Munro to carry out his task. The Soviet Union ought to co-operate with the United Nations in giving effect to resolution 1312 (XIII) rather than oppose it.

53. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not wish to enter into the substance of the question, but that Mr. Lodge could not hide the fact that the matter at issue was connected with the cold war. With regard to the spirit of Camp David, he acknowledged that Mr. Lodge had done everything in his power to contribute to the success of Mr. Khrushchev's visit. During that visit, the Head of the Soviet Government had been asked about the question of Hungary, and his replies had revealed that in his view that question was nothing more than a means of aggravating the international situation. The Soviet Union welcomed the efforts made in the United States to improve that situation but was not unaware of the existence there of certain circles opposed to any relaxation of tension. A distinction should be drawn between questions which might promote such relaxation and those which might well prevent it.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.