

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 129th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 27 September 1960,  
at 8.45 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the fifteenth session and allocation of agenda items (continued) . . . . .</i>	13
<i>Items 83 to 85 . . . . .</i>	13
<i>Item 86 . . . . .</i>	13
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the fifteenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .</i>	17

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

Consideration of the agenda of the fifteenth session and allocation of agenda items (A/BUR/152 and Add.1; A/4474, A/4495, A/4501) (*continued*)

**ITEMS 83 TO 85**

**The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 83 to 85 in the agenda.**

**ITEM 86**

1. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that his country was opposed to the inclusion of item 86 (Representation of China in the United Nations). The reason was not, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union had alleged in his memorandum (A/4474), that the United States took "a negative attitude towards the State system established by the people of China". It was the view of the United States that at the heart of the United Nations lay the spirit of tolerance and that, under the Charter, every nation had the right to establish the system of its choice, provided only that it lived up to the Charter. However, Communist China had consistently flouted the Charter. It was unnecessary to dwell on the well-known instances of that attitude: the aggression in Korea, which had been condemned by the General Assembly, and the consequences of which were still making themselves felt; the persistent use of violence and threats of war in attempts to overcome the Republic of China on Taiwan; the subversive activities and guerrilla warfare continuously promoted in several countries in south Asia. There were other, newer developments of the same nature; he would quote only three examples.

2. First, the Chinese Communists had not been content with their subjugation of Tibet, an action which had been debated and deplored by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session. From Tibet, they had sought to push southward and, by means of armed incursions and seizure of territory, extend their control over the land and citizens of other nations. Those activities partly explained why certain peoples in

that part of the world were now showing rather less enthusiasm for the representation of Peking in the United Nations.

3. Secondly, the Chinese Communist authorities had for several months been proclaiming an extraordinary doctrine: they claimed not to fear a world-wide thermo-nuclear war since, in their view, it would end in the triumph of communism over the whole world. In its April 1960 issue, Red Flag, the Chinese Communist Party's official publication, wrote: "On the debris of a dead imperialism"—by that the author no doubt meant most of the States represented on the General Committee—"the victorious people would create with extreme rapidity a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalistic system ...". Such a cult of fanatical violence was unique, even among the Communist countries.

4. Lastly, in connexion with the Congo crisis, which meant so much to the future of Africa and of the United Nations, the Peking Government had openly expressed its contempt for the Organization. An official statement of 14 September 1960 contained such phrases as "the acts of aggression and intervention in the Republic of the Congo carried out under the flag of the United Nations by imperialism headed by the United States", "the United Nations forces under the control of the United States", or again "Mr. Hammarskjöld, always at the beck and call of United States imperialism".

5. Thus Communist China, which was 8,000 miles from the Congo and had never had relations of any consequence with it or with the neighbouring area, had seen fit to attack and vilify the United Nations and the Secretary-General for their activities designed to promote peace and order and advance the welfare of the Congolese people. It was impossible to contemplate seriously the admission to the United Nations of a country which so vehemently attacked the steps taken in accordance with the mandate of the Security Council and the General Assembly. There could be no doubt that, if they were now sitting in the United Nations, the representatives of Peking would be pushing as hard as they could to frustrate the action taken by the United Nations to safeguard the freedom and independence of the new African nations. Many of the latter had just been admitted to the Organization, to the United States' great satisfaction. Those new States had been welcomed because they had been judged peace-loving and able and willing to carry out the obligations imposed by the Charter. That was by no means the case with the leaders of the People's Republic of China, who had proved, furthermore, that they were impervious to any outside influence. Thus, to admit them to the United Nations would not alter their reprehensible attitude in any way; moreover, it would be inconceivable to exclude the Republic of China which, despite all the difficulties it had en-

countered, had remained faithful to the Organization and to the Charter.

6. For all those reasons, the United States delegation proposed that the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

The General Assembly

1. Decides to reject the request of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the inclusion in the agenda of its fifteenth regular session of the item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations";

2. Decides not to consider, at its fifteenth regular session, any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

7. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that in requesting the inclusion of the item in question in the agenda, the Soviet Union was trying to make the United Nations a party to its own acts of subversion and aggression against China. When it referred to the so-called "State system" established on the Chinese mainland, the Soviet delegation omitted to trace its origin or to explain the reasons for its survival. He had already had occasion at the fourth, fifth and sixth sessions of the General Assembly to set forth the facts; after examining those facts, the General Assembly had found, in its resolution 505 (VI), adopted on 1 February 1952, "that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics obstructed the efforts of the National Government of China in re-establishing Chinese national authority in the three Eastern Provinces (Manchuria) after the surrender of Japan and gave military and economic aid to Chinese communists against the National Government of China". The General Assembly had also determined "that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in its relations with China since the surrender of Japan, has failed to carry out the Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 14 August 1945".

8. After being thus installed by Soviet intervention, the Communist régime had maintained itself on the Chinese mainland only through the military and economic aid which the Soviet authorities continued to supply. A recent example of such aid was to be found in the fact that the 170,000 shells fired by the Chinese Communists on Quemoy and the other off-shore islands during President Eisenhower's visit to the Republic of China had all been made in the Soviet Union.

9. The Soviet delegation also referred to the "outstanding successes" supposedly achieved by the Chinese Communists in various fields. He wondered whether that was a reference to the people's communes in which, according to an Indian eye-witness, Mr. Chandrasekhar, "human beings were reduced to the level of inmates of a zoo" and in which "the absence of intimacy and solitude was more terrifying than all hells put together". Or perhaps the Soviet delegation meant the brutal suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Tibet, condemned by so many delegations at the General Assembly's fourteenth session.

10. The Communist régime in mainland China was contrary to all the ideals and principles set forth in the United Nations Charter. Nothing could be more ridiculous than to claim, as the Soviet delegation did, that the régime had "consistently pursued a peaceful foreign policy". The Chinese Communists had been condemned as aggressors in Korea by the General Assembly in resolution 498 (V), which was still in force. They had also precipitated the war in Vietnam and were currently, as in the past, assisting the Lao Communists in their armed rebellion against the Government of Laos. By resorting to force in their frontier disputes with India, the Chinese Communists had for the first time in 3,000 years disturbed the peaceful relations between India and China. Nevertheless, they had been franker than the Soviet delegation: in the issue of Red Flag of 16 April 1960, they had stated quite unambiguously that war was inevitable and even desirable. On their own admission, that was the doctrine of Lenin, which inspired all Communists, hungry for world domination, as well as the Soviet Union, even though the latter took shelter behind the façade of "peaceful coexistence".

11. Such a mode of thought was, however, foreign to the Chinese people, and the Communists could not speak on that people's behalf. The Chinese people had made its real wishes quite clear, whenever it had been able to do so. Of the Chinese prisoners of war in Korea, 14,000, that is, 75 per cent, had freely chosen to be repatriated to Taiwan and not to the mainland. Refugees had fled and were continuing to flee from mainland China, where 20 million opponents of the régime had been massacred and another 25 million imprisoned or shut up in labour camps. There had been uprisings in many provinces. Only the Government of the Republic of China, elected under the Constitution freely adopted by the Chinese people, could speak on China's behalf internationally and in the United Nations in particular. It was one of the founding Members of the Organization, and had scrupulously fulfilled its obligations under the Charter. Its right to be represented in the Organization was incontrovertible and subject to no discussion.

12. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized the necessity of including in the agenda the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. It was an urgent question and should have been settled long since. Every year the situation became more ridiculous: a great world Power, with a population larger than that of any other country, was refused the right to take part in the work of the United Nations, while usurpers, long ago driven out by the Chinese people, continued to sit in the Organization. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China would help to improve the international atmosphere, to end the cold war and to facilitate the settlement of fundamental international problems such as disarmament, upon which the fate of mankind depended. The pretext that the time was not ripe for a settlement of the question was altogether baseless. The Organization's task was to facilitate the settlement of international disputes, not to hamper it. The absence of China from the United Nations was a dangerous consequence of the cold war and an open infringement of the Charter; it undermined the very foundations of the idea of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between States with

different political and social structures. The Organization's prestige was suffering as a result of it.

13. The representative of the United States had tried to show that the People's Republic of China was not worthy to recover its rights in the Organization, and had alleged that his country objected, not to the political régime of the People's Republic of China, but to its behaviour. It was not for the United States to tell other States how to behave, especially as the behaviour of China could in no way be compared with that of the United States, just described so eloquently by one Latin American country in particular. No one denied the United States' right to sit in the Organization, even if its behaviour was not above reproach.

14. With regard to the instances given by the United States representative, there was no need to recall the circumstances in which adoption of the illegal resolution relating to the Korean war had been imposed upon the General Assembly some years previously. Subsequent events had demonstrated the attitude of the Korean people towards China and towards the United States. He asked why, if the Korean people regarded China as an aggressor, it had driven out the United States protégé in South Korea; and how it had come about that the Chinese units had been withdrawn from North Korea while United States troops continued to occupy the southern part of the country.

15. As for Tibet, that was an integral part of Chinese territory, and the questions relating to it lay within the competence of the Government of the People's Republic of China. There was no connexion between the question under consideration and that of Tibet. Similarly, any statements which the Chinese leaders might make on war and peace had nothing to do with the representation of China in the United Nations. If the matter of statements by political leaders were to be discussed, various statements made by certain leaders in the United States—the President and the Secretary of State in particular—seemed difficult to defend.

16. The United States did not like China to criticize its attitude and the attitude of other States Members of the United Nations with regard to the Congo, or United Nations activities in that country. Several African leaders had not hesitated however to criticize the operations in the Congo, and it did not follow that the African States concerned should be excluded from the Organization. The American thesis was ridiculous: any State which was a Member of the Organization was entitled to criticize both other Member States and the Secretary-General. Moreover, certain African States which were in a good position to know what the situation in the Congo really was, and to judge of the interests of the Congolese people, had justifiably insisted that China should recover its lawful rights in the United Nations. The Head of State of Ghana had spoken to that effect. All those considerations made it quite clear, therefore, that the United States delegation's objections were without foundation.

17. That, indeed, was not really the substance of the question. The United States did not want a large socialist State, the largest country in the world, in the Organization, because it saw in that a danger to its own policies. In fact, the presence in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China would endanger the monopoly of the United States, which preferred that the Chinese seat should continue to be

occupied by usurpers in its own pay. But that state of affairs was contrary to the interests of the United Nations as well as to those of international peace and security, and was also damaging to the interests of the Chinese people. The Soviet Union would accordingly vote against the United States draft resolution, which would prevent the Organization from remedying a serious defect in its own composition. The United States had repeatedly declared that it had the prestige of the United Nations at heart. Depriving China of its opportunity to sit in the Organization was an odd way to defend that prestige. It was high time to abandon a policy which was preventing the United Nations from fulfilling its tasks as a world organization.

18. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that fourteen new Member States had just been admitted to the Organization. But the United Nations would never be a real world organization until China took its rightful place within the family of nations. There was no justification for denying the most thickly populated country in the world the right of taking part in the examination of international questions of vital importance. Those questions could not be discussed effectively without China, which could and should exercise a great influence on world affairs. It was time to face the facts and to end an abnormal situation which had been dragging on for ten years. The existence of divergent opinions on the subject was an additional argument in favour of including the item in the agenda. An equitable solution should speedily be found. His delegation advocated inclusion of the item in the agenda, and would vote against the United States draft resolution.

19. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) recalled that his country had recognized the People's Republic of China, with which it maintained diplomatic relations. His delegation was convinced that the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations would contribute to the application of the principle of universality and would render the Organization's work more effective. Nearly all the independent States of the world, many of which had recognized China, were now Members of the United Nations. It was certain that the major international problems, such as disarmament, could never be really settled without the participation of that country. He would support the Soviet Union's proposal and would vote against that of the United States.

20. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) thought that a distinction should be made between the question of principle and the circumstances in which the problem currently presented itself. In regard to principle, his delegation thought that a problem of such importance ought to be examined by the General Assembly. China was one of the greatest Powers of the world, and its participation in the consideration of major international problems would be extremely valuable. But in existing political circumstances, because of the attitude adopted by the People's Republic of China towards the United Nations and towards the principles set forth in the Charter, it would not be appropriate to examine the question.

21. He asked for a separate vote on each of the two paragraphs of the United States draft resolution. He would abstain from voting on the first, and would vote for the second.

22. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that his country's position remained unchanged. Ceylon had recognized China. His delegation thought that refusal to include the proposed question in the Assembly's agenda would deprive 600 million human beings of the opportunity of being heard in the Organization. Yet it was vitally important that they should be represented in the examination of problems as serious as that of disarmament. It was obvious that no agreement on disarmament could be effective without the participation of the People's Republic of China. In the interests of world peace itself, the presence of that powerful country in the United Nations was desirable, given that each Member State was required to respect the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations as set forth in the Charter and to conform to the Organization's discipline. Those were some of the reasons why the General Assembly should examine the question so that a decision in the matter might be taken. He would support the Soviet Union's proposal.

23. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation's position was well known and remained unchanged.

24. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) remarked that the debate in the General Committee was following the same pattern as in the past. The fifteenth session of the Assembly had rightly been described as historic because of the importance of the questions to be considered and of the presence of a great many Heads of State and it was disturbing that the question of the representation of China was still being approached in a cold war spirit although the climate should be favourable to conciliation.

25. The arguments adduced by the United States to justify its opposition to the inclusion of the item in the agenda were somewhat difficult to sustain. The United States had asserted that the internal régime of China was not the reason for its opposition, but all that the United States representative had said subsequently contradicted that initial assertion. The Romanian delegation knew nothing about China's alleged contempt of the United Nations, but it might legitimately be asked what view the Chinese Government could be expected to take of an Organization that persisted for years in deluding itself with so sorry a fiction as that of Taiwan. It was clear that the position the Organization had taken was not likely to inspire respect in the Chinese people. The argument that China should not be reinstated in its rights because it had criticized the Secretary-General's activities was no less odd. The Secretary-General's activities had been the subject of very sound and serious criticism. The Soviet Union had called for a radical reform of the Secretariat to prevent its being used to serve the interests of any one Power or group of Powers.

26. It was equally surprising that the United States Government should oppose consideration of the question of the representation of China by the General Assembly when many countries of Africa and Asia held a contrary view. The United States seemed to know the interests of those countries better than their authorized representatives. The absence of China deprived those areas of any representation among the permanent members of the Security Council. The need to settle the question was recognized not only by the people of Africa and Asia and by world public

opinion, but even by the representatives of groups which did not want it discussed. The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Herter, had recently stated that if an agreement was reached on disarmament, China would have to be asked to subscribe to it. As for the procedural aspect of the question, rule 40 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly was quite clear: there was nothing in it to prevent the General Assembly from considering any item if it so desired.

27. His delegation would support the request for the inclusion of the question of the representation of China and would vote against the United States draft resolution.

28. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that the Committee has to consider once again a request for the inclusion in the agenda of an item concerning the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations. At the current session it had been put forward by the delegation of the Soviet Union. The Government of the United Kingdom had carefully weighed the considerations and arguments involved. It had come to the conclusion that the balance of those considerations remained essentially unaltered from previous years and that, in consequence, there was nothing to justify a change in the United Kingdom's attitude to the question.

29. The United Kingdom, it was true, recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the legitimate Government of China; it had done so for some years. But, in its approach to the question under discussion, it had to set against that the practical and overriding consideration of what was best for the United Nations. The question had to be asked whether, in view of the deep divisions of opinion within the United Nations, discussion of the question of Chinese representation could possibly take place without fundamentally damaging the Organization itself. The Government of the United Kingdom had, as he had indicated, concluded that those divisions of opinion remained so obdurate that no possible good could come of airing them in a substantive debate. It would be wrong to jeopardize what hopes there might be of positive achievements during the current session by deliberately introducing at the outset an element of such basic discord.

30. In those circumstances his delegation once again considered that the best course would be to postpone discussion. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution which had been introduced by the representative of the United States.

31. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) considered that in view of the circumstances surrounding the opening of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly it was more necessary than ever to proceed cautiously. The presence of leaders of important States and the pressure of public opinion were evidence of the general desire for an easing of international tensions and the solution of urgent problems, particularly in the economic and social fields. One of the basic functions of the United Nations was to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations and it was essential that every effort should be made to prevent any deterioration in the international climate, particularly in view of the resolution unanimously

adopted by the Disarmament Commission<sup>1/</sup> and a general desire for a resumption of negotiations.

32. In the circumstances, it might well be asked whether consideration of the item before the Committee, instead of improving the climate of understanding and peace, might not result in bitter debate. One fact was particularly significant: in recent years it was India that had requested inclusion of the item. The Indian Government's sense of responsibility was beyond question and the members of the Committee might well bear its position in mind and consider whether it was not better to refrain from recommending inclusion of the item.

33. For those reasons his delegation would vote in favour of paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution and abstain on paragraph 2 which, in its opinion, went beyond the scope of the provisions of the rules of procedure.

34. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) pointed out that the admission to membership of fourteen new States which had only recently emerged from colonial rule had enhanced the representative nature of the United Nations and brought it closer to the ideal of universality that was the very basis of its existence. The absence of China, a country with a long tradition of struggle against colonialism and imperialism, was therefore felt all the more keenly. It was difficult to see how the United Nations could tolerate the absurd situation in which a country with the largest population in the world, which had made tremendous progress in all fields in recent years and was a factor of stability and peace in the Far East and in the world as a whole, was not represented in the United Nations because its seat was being held by persons who represented nobody but the commander of the United States military base at Taiwan.

35. The United States representative had said that China's attitude was a threat to peace. That was a very flimsy argument. Neither facts nor legal arguments could seriously justify the exclusion of China. On the contrary, its exclusion was contrary to international law and to the Charter itself. The manoeuvres aimed at postponing consideration of the item were no novelty, but repetition of the same errors and the same injustices justified nothing. It had also been argued that China did not fulfill the conditions for admission to membership in the United Nations. It was an odd fact that the very States which were guilty of interference in the internal affairs of China and were occupying the Chinese territory of Taiwan, were posing as champions of the Charter.

36. China had been criticized for expressing its views on the situation in the Congo, a country from which it was geographically remote. But the United States was also interested in Taiwan and the Congo, neither of which was close to its borders and no one would suggest that that was a reason for excluding the United States from the United Nations. China was a great country without which no important question could be settled and it should be a matter of gratification that it was interested in all the major questions of international politics. China was being prevented from occupying its legitimate seat in the United Nations not by reason of its qualifications or its attitude but by the attitude of the United States Govern-

ment, which was afraid to allow all Member States to discuss the substantive issue.

37. Mr. TSIANG (China), exercising his right of reply, pointed out that the United States was not occupying Taiwan. It was merely providing the Chinese Government with military and financial aid and all the organs of government were functioning legally without the slightest interference from the United States.

38. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the position taken by the United Kingdom, which recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China but opposed its admission to membership in the United Nations. It was curious to hear the United Kingdom representative argue that the Committee should be careful not to add a controversial issue to the Assembly's agenda when the United Kingdom had voted in favour of including the question of Hungary, which would inevitably lead to sharpening bitter debate. Presumably, the United Kingdom felt that the situation was not the same in the case of Hungary as in the case of China. The truth was that the United Kingdom could not oppose the position of the United States, which did not want a substantive discussion of the question of the representation of China and had submitted a draft resolution to that effect.

39. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should vote on the United States draft resolution first, in accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure.

*The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

40. The CHAIRMAN put the United States draft resolution to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 11 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 12 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.*

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/4495)

41. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) recalled the circumstances in which the General Assembly, meeting in emergency special session, had adopted a resolution (1474 (ES-IV)) without opposition, and noted that the United Nations had for two months been constantly concerned with the Congo situation and with taking the necessary action to assist that country. It was clear from the explanatory memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union (A/4495) that in proposing the inclusion of the additional item in the agenda, the USSR wished to overturn the policy decisions taken by the General Assembly. The outcome of the debates held in the Security Council and at the emergency special session of the General Assembly showed the falseness of the assertion that there had been a "failure to carry out the Security Council's resolutions". The United States delegation would not object to keeping the question under consideration but it thought it inappropriate to recom-

<sup>1/</sup> DC/182.

mend its immediate inclusion, and it could not in any case endorse its wording.

42. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) considered that the Congo question was so important that the Committee could not prevent its being discussed at the right time and in the right body whenever that proved necessary. The wording of the item, however, was such that he found it difficult to support its inclusion. He therefore proposed that the wording should be amended to read: "The situation in the Republic of the Congo". He was also unable to accept the terms of the explanatory memorandum, which contained references he was unable to endorse.

43. Mr. FEKINI (Libya) said that it was clear from the long and serious discussions of the question both in the Security Council and at the emergency special session of the General Assembly that the major concern of everyone was to see the independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Congo safeguarded. He agreed with the previous speakers that the proposed wording was unjustified in view of the debates and decisions of the fourth emergency special session. If it was found necessary to resume consideration of the question, he would be prepared to accept the new wording proposed by the representative of Ceylon.

44. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the Soviet Government had submitted its item concerning the Congo before the emergency special session of the General Assembly had been convened. The United States representative's observation was not, therefore, justified by the actual sequence of events. That was an important fact and explained the proposed wording of the item. After the question had been considered at the emergency special session, various points of view had been expressed and attempts had been made to evade the settlement of certain questions which had been raised during the debate but on which various Governments had not chosen to take a position. The Soviet Union and other countries had abstained from voting on the draft resolution for the reason that they did not approve of some of its provisions. Recent developments had shown that the action taken under United Nations auspices had not produced the desired results. The situation in the Congo had not improved. The country was still torn by internal strife. The lawful Government had in effect gone underground and irresponsible leaders were attempting to seize power by force. The Command of the United Nations forces remained indifferent to the grave situation which had developed. The Western Powers, in turn, were using the Security Council's resolutions as a screen for their actions, which were detrimental to the interests of the Congo. They wished to create a situation in which they could continue to exploit the country's natural resources exactly as they had done when the Congo had been a Belgian colony.

45. The facts showed that the question of the Congo was far from settled. The General Assembly could not remain inactive in such a situation, the more so as conditions were favourable for the achievement of a settlement since many countries were represented in the General Assembly by their Heads of State, who were capable of taking any major decisions that might be required. The Soviet Union therefore considered it necessary to have the item placed on the Assembly's agenda. With respect to its wording, the Soviet dele-

gation was prepared to accept the formula proposed by the representative of Ceylon; the main thing was that the substance of the question should be discussed. It would be for the General Assembly or the Committee to set a date for the discussion.

46. He was surprised at the position taken by the United States, which wanted to postpone discussion of the question indefinitely. The United States no doubt hoped to settle the matter itself. If the political independence and territorial integrity of the Congo were to be strengthened and the Congolese people defended against aggression and colonialism, the General Assembly could not ignore the situation prevailing in the Congo.

47. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) pointed out that the Soviet Union had requested the inclusion of the item on the very day when it had been decided to convene an emergency special session. During that session a resolution had been adopted and a decision taken to set up a committee composed of Asian and African representatives. It was too early as yet to say how the resolution was being applied, but the essential point, to his mind, was that no African State had requested the inclusion of the Congo item. It would therefore be inappropriate to include the item before it was known whether the circumstances warranted it or not.

48. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled the provisions of the resolution which he had submitted jointly with all the African representatives and a number of Asian representatives and which had been adopted at the fourth emergency special session (resolution 1474 (ES-IV)). The Members of the United Nations were entitled to be regularly informed of the action taken under the resolution, which had been adopted by an overwhelming majority including all the Asian and African Member States. That information could only be supplied by the persons who had been appointed by the Secretary-General to carry out the mission in the Congo and who enjoyed the fullest confidence of the Member States. In the circumstances he considered that the matter should be left as far as possible to the discretion of the Secretary-General. He was not opposed to the inclusion of the item concerning the Congo in the agenda or to its discussion, provided that that was fully warranted. He endorsed the wording proposed by the Ceylonese representative, which corresponded exactly to the expression used in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

49. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) expressed doubt as to the usefulness of immediate discussion of a question which had just been fully and exhaustively debated by the General Assembly at its emergency special session and on which a resolution had been adopted without opposition. For his part, he considered that the political forces in the Congo should be given time to resolve their differences by themselves, with the assistance of the United Nations. However, the question might be left pending, so that the General Committee could recommend its inclusion in the agenda, under the heading proposed by the Ceylonese representative, if such a step seemed desirable.

50. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) supported inclusion of the question under the heading which had been proposed by the Ceylonese representative and accepted by the USSR delegation. It was true that the situation in the Congo had been discussed in the Secu-



rity Council and the General Assembly, but the fact was that the situation had not yet been stabilized. The United Nations had assumed very heavy responsibilities in the Congo and the Secretary-General himself had emphasized that the responsibility for giving him guidance rested with the Members of the United Nations. The possibility of continuing its examination of the situation should therefore be left open to the Assembly.

51. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that he was not sure that the Soviet representative was aware of the precise situation. He had thought that the Soviet delegation might see fit to withdraw its request for inclusion of the item, as it had withdrawn its draft resolution at the emergency special session. After the discussions which had taken place at that session, it had clearly become much less necessary to resume consideration of the question. The general opinion seemed to be that the question should be left pending so that the General Committee might consider it again, if necessary, and his delegation supported that position. His delegation had no objection to the wording proposed by the Ceylonese representative.

52. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) pointed out that the United States representative had expressed the wish that the question should be discussed in the presence of the new African members. The testimony of authorized persons and the statements by the President of the Republic of Ghana, Mr. Nkrumah, and the President of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Nasser, among others, confirmed the fact that the situation in the Congo had by no means returned to normal, and that the United Nations Command was not acting to restore the rights of the legitimate Government. It was therefore important to reopen the debate on the question.

53. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) considered that the situation in the Congo remained dangerously tense and that, as a result of interference by the colonialists and imperialists, the country had become the scene of conflicts which might have dangerous repercussions and threaten the country's integrity and independence. The United States delegation opposed raising the question at the current time because it feared that the Secretary-General and the United Nations might be attacked; that was a curious attitude, since if anything was wrong it would be better to discuss matters openly. The efforts made so far by certain United Nations bodies had not led to a favourable solution or made it possible to reinforce the stability of the new State. The United Nations had not only permitted the Belgian troops to help those who were fomenting disorder but had favoured attempts to overthrow the legitimate Government. As the African representatives had pointed out, the United Nations should continue to devote great attention to the question, since it was essential to restore order and stability in the Congo.

54. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) recalled that all the decisions taken by the Members of the United Nations had been unanimous and that they had been based on reports by the Secretary-General dealing not only with the steps he planned to take but also with the use of the troops made available to him by the various Governments. The Secretary-General could certainly not be reproached for not having allowed those troops to be used by the Government of the Congo as it saw

fit. The Secretary-General had acted only within the limits authorized by the Security Council. His delegation considered that the action taken in the Congo had been in conformity with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council on 14 and 22 July and 9 August,<sup>2/</sup> and supported resumption of the discussion on the question at a later date, when that was found to be necessary.

55. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) proposed that the debate on the item under discussion should be adjourned, under rule 120 (c) of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. He explained that he had in mind only a temporary adjournment.

56. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the proposal was wholly inappropriate. As the debate had already taken place, the time had come to vote on the question of inclusion of the item. The situation in the Congo had not been stabilized and the General Assembly should therefore consider it. A precedent existed in the case of the Suez question, which had been discussed at the General Assembly's regular session after being considered at the first emergency special session. Moreover, rule 120 applied to the Main Committees of the General Assembly and not to the General Committee, which was dealt with only in chapter VI of the rules of procedure.

57. Mr. TSIANG (China) supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal. At its fourth emergency special session the General Assembly had adopted a very full resolution (1474 (ES-IV)), which was now being implemented. If obstacles to the application of that resolution were encountered, or if there were new and unforeseen developments, the General Assembly should be informed of them. In the meantime it should take no action.

58. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) said that rule 120 of the rules of procedure was not applicable in the case under consideration. Under rule 40 of the rules of procedure, it was the function of the General Committee to decide on the inclusion in the agenda of the questions proposed. It was required to make recommendations on that subject and should decide on such recommendations by a vote. A decision regarding the priority to be given to the question might be postponed to a later date.

59. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) supported the motion for adjournment. If the question was included in the agenda hardly a week after the adoption of the resolution at the emergency special session, the false impression would be created that the resolution had not been acted upon. It would be well to wait for its results without prejudging them.

60. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela), speaking on a point of order, called attention to the fact that if a new proposal by the Chairman or a member of the General Committee would be needed in order to resume debate on the question under discussion, once the decision to adjourn it had been taken, such a decision would amount to a rejection of the request for inclusion. A different procedure had been usefully employed in the case of agenda item 68: the debate

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1960, resolutions S/4387, S/4405 and S/4426, respectively.

had been suspended and then resumed at a later meeting of the General Committee.

61. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom), Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria), Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon), Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania), Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. BARCO (United States of America), Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), Mr. ILLUECA (Panama), Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) and Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) took part, the CHAIRMAN put the United Kingdom representative's proposal to the vote.

*The Committee decided, by 11 votes to 7, with 1 abstention, temporarily to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion.*

62. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

63. The CHAIRMAN put the United States representative's proposal to the vote.

*The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

The meeting rose on Wednesday, 28 September, at 1.10 a.m.