

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**EIGHTEENTH SESSION**

*Official Records*

**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 153rd  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 18 September 1963,  
at 10.40 a.m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Organization of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General</i> . . . . .	1
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the eighteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Items 1 to 6</i> . . . . .	1
<i>Items 7 to 28</i> . . . . .	1
<i>Item 29</i> . . . . .	1
<i>Item 30</i> . . . . .	2
<i>Items 31 to 72</i> . . . . .	2
<i>Item 73</i> . . . . .	2
<i>Item 74</i> . . . . .	2
<i>Item 75</i> . . . . .	2
<i>Item 76</i> . . . . .	3
<i>Item 77</i> . . . . .	3
<i>Item 78</i> . . . . .	4
<i>Item 79</i> . . . . .	4
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the eighteenth session: item proposed by Albania</i> . . . . .	4

*Chairman: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ  
(Venezuela).*

*Organization of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/158)*

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the observations and suggestions in the Secretary-General's memorandum on the organization of the eighteenth session (A/BUR/158).

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

*Consideration of the agenda of the eighteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/159 and Add.1)*

**ITEMS 1 TO 6**

2. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Assembly had already dealt with items 1 to 6 of the provisional agenda. The Committee would accordingly consider the inclusion of item 7 and the following items in the agenda.

**ITEMS 7 TO 28**

3. The CHAIRMAN pointed out, in connexion with item 12 of the provisional agenda, that Economic and Social Council resolutions 974 B and C (XXXVI) would be dealt with under that item, as suggested in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/159).

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 7 to 28 in the agenda.*

**ITEM 29**

4. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of the reunification of Korea was essentially a domestic problem, which should be settled by the Korean people without outside interference. Its inclusion in the agenda would therefore constitute a violation of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, discussion of the question for the past sixteen years had not led to a solution and had not helped to restore peace and tranquillity in the area. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea had been illegally established, was fomenting hatred and should be abolished. The Commission's report<sup>1/</sup> contained a series of fabrications designed to divert attention from the continued military occupation of Korea. At a time when an atmosphere propitious to the strengthening of international co-operation prevailed, the Assembly should not once again embark upon a fruitless and harmful discussion of a cold war item. Item 29 should not be included in the agenda.

5. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) strongly favoured inclusion of the item in the agenda. The Korean question was not a legacy of the cold war: the establishment of a unified and democratic Korea had consistently been the objective of the United Nations and remained its responsibility.

6. Mr. YOST (United States of America) considered that the item should be retained and that the Assembly should follow the established practice of considering the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. In resolution 1855 (XVII), the Assembly had specifically reaffirmed United Nations objectives in Korea and had requested

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/5512).

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

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

the Commission to continue its work. The fact that those objectives had not yet been achieved was not sufficient grounds for dropping the item from the agenda.

7. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) objected to the inclusion of the item. The United Nations Commission was an illegal body and its report was valueless. His delegation favoured the peaceful unification of Korea without outside interference.

*The Committee decided, by 12 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 29 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 30

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

8. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa) said that discussion of item 30 would be a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. On those grounds, his Government objected to its inclusion in the agenda.

*Mr. Botha (South Africa) withdrew.*

9. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) pointed out that the Government on whose behalf the representative of South Africa had spoken reflected the wishes of the white minority in South Africa. The vast majority of the inhabitants of South Africa, some 13 million, had no spokesman at the United Nations. They would most certainly favour inclusion of the item.

10. Mr. Nur ELMI (Somalia) observed that there had been no improvement in the situation in South Africa in the fifteen years during which the Assembly had been considering it. He supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda and held that the objection put forward by the representative of South Africa was invalid.

11. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) said that the Government which objected to inclusion of the item was not the legal government of South Africa because it had not been accepted by the majority of the inhabitants. He was confident that the Committee would not be influenced by its objection and would retain the item on the agenda.

12. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) declared that, in view of the deteriorating situation in South Africa resulting from the enforcement by the Government of an increasingly repressive policy of racial discrimination, the objection to the inclusion of the item was not justified.

13. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) pointed out that the item had many aspects apart from the vital problem of racial discrimination. He strongly favoured its inclusion.

14. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that the item should be included because it was the duty of the United Nations to consider the flagrant violation of human rights in South Africa, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and because the situation in that country endangered international security. Moreover, inclusion of the item would be consistent with previous decisions adopted by the Assembly.

15. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the General Assembly had adopted more than twenty resolutions on the question of apartheid in South Africa, all of which had been disregarded by the South African Government. At its seventeenth session the Assembly, in resolution 1761

(XVII), had again deplored the failure of that Government to comply with those resolutions, and the Security Council, during its consideration of the question in August 1963, had found that the situation in South Africa was deteriorating. It was therefore essential for the Assembly to consider the item at its current session.

16. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) associated himself with the views expressed in favour of inclusion of the item.

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

#### ITEMS 31 TO 72

17. In connexion with item 33, the CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/159) and suggested that sub-item (b) should be deleted and the remaining sub-items renumbered accordingly.

*It was so agreed.*

18. In connexion with item 61, the CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/159).

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of items 31 to 72 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 73

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. B. N. Chakravarty (India) took a place at the Committee table.*

19. Mr. B. N. CHAKRAVARTY (India) stated that since his Government had requested inclusion of the item, a treaty had been signed banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.<sup>2/</sup> It was his Government's hope that underground tests, too, would be banned at an early date and it therefore maintained its request for the inclusion of item 73.

*Mr. B. N. Chakravarty (India) withdrew.*

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 73 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 74

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 74 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 75

20. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation adhered to its position, made clear in the past, that the United Nations had no authority under the Charter to intervene in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia.

21. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) recalled that the General Assembly had rejected the United Kingdom delegation's argument at previous sessions. Southern Rhodesia was not an independent State, since the type of self-government granted to it was not recognized internationally; it therefore remained a United Kingdom colony which ought to be decolonized in the same way as other African territories.

22. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that, in view of recent events in Southern Rhodesia and the attitude of the Administering Power, the item not only should be included in the agenda but should be given high priority. The United Nations had

<sup>2/</sup> Signed at Moscow on 5 August 1963.

already adopted resolutions which, had they been implemented, would have contributed to a solution of the problem in a manner beneficial to the indigenous inhabitants and to international peace and security; the stubborn refusal of the United Kingdom to comply with those resolutions compelled the General Assembly to retain the question on its agenda.

23. Mr. Nur ELMI (Somalia) agreed with the preceding speakers. Southern Rhodesia was an example of the worst form of British colonialism, because a minority was oppressing the majority of the inhabitants in the name of Her Majesty's Government.

24. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) remarked that Southern Rhodesia would in any event be considered at the current session, since a chapter in the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (item 23) dealt with Southern Rhodesia. He pointed out to the United Kingdom representative that the former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, Sir Edgar Whitehead, had acknowledged the competence of the United Nations by appearing before the Fourth Committee.

25. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) said that the events which had occurred since the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, as also the possibility of a transfer of powers to the Government of Southern Rhodesia in the near future, made it essential that greater attention should be paid to the problem at the current session and that every effort should be made to help the African population, in the interest of peace in Africa and throughout the world.

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

#### ITEM 76

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

#### ITEM 77

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

26. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam had asked to participate in the debate. Since the Republic of Viet-Nam was not a Member of the United Nations and was not automatically entitled to participate under rule 43 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, it was for the Committee to decide whether the request was to be granted.

27. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he must draw attention to the unlawful status of the so-called Observer of South Viet-Nam to the United Nations. There was no possible justification for allowing the person concerned to be present at a meeting of the Committee.

28. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) observed that it was common practice in the United Nations, as elsewhere, for an accused party to be given a hearing. The Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam should be entitled to make known his side of the story.

29. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) pointed out that the question under discussion was a procedural one. Representatives of non-member States could not be allowed to participate in the discussions of the General Committee. It would be for the competent organ to decide in

due course whether South Viet-Nam should be heard in the substantive debate, but the General Committee would be well advised to reject the present request, for its decision would no doubt constitute a precedent.

30. Mr. BASHEV (Bulgaria) associated himself with those views. Rule 43 was quite explicit and made no provision for the attendance of a non-member State at meetings of the General Committee.

31. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) opposed the granting of a hearing on a purely procedural matter to a non-member State. There was no question of hearing the other side of the story, as the representative of China had suggested, since the substance of the proposed item was not under discussion.

32. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that his delegation would support the inclusion of item 77 in the agenda.

33. On the specific point under discussion, he agreed that it was unusual for a non-member State to be heard on a purely procedural matter. Whatever decision the Committee might reach, the right of Viet-Nam to be heard on the substance of the item, if it was included in the agenda, should not be prejudged.

34. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) considered that rule 43 clearly applied only to Members of the United Nations which were not represented in the General Committee. The latter was therefore not competent to hear the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam, but obviously he must be heard later on the substance of the matter.

35. Mr. THORS (Iceland) agreed with the representative of Cyprus on those points. It would be a dangerous precedent for the General Committee to suggest that it was not prepared to respect the rules of procedure.

36. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) said that his delegation favoured the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

37. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that rule 43 did not exclude the hearing of non-member States on questions which closely concerned them; consequently, his delegation considered that the request from the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam should be granted. If a majority of the Committee felt otherwise, the decision adopted must not prejudice the action to be taken by the General Assembly when the substance of the item was considered, since it would be both fair and necessary for the Permanent Observer to be heard at that time.

38. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said that the distinction between the procedural stage and the substantive stage in the consideration of an item was juridically of the greatest importance. Where procedure was concerned, rule 43 was perfectly explicit and the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam was not entitled to participate in the present discussion; but, in accordance with its view that the accused should always be given a hearing, his delegation felt that he should be allowed to speak in the substantive discussion.

39. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) agreed with all the arguments which had been advanced against allowing the so-called Observer of Viet-Nam to speak in the General Committee.

40. Mr. KURAL (Turkey) said that, while he felt it to be rather unjust that the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam should be denied a hearing on the question before the Committee, he must agree with the interpretation of rule 43 expressed by most of the preceding speakers.

41. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that it was precisely from a sense of justice that his delegation opposed the

granting of a hearing to the Permanent Observer of South Viet-Nam, because North Viet-Nam was not represented in the United Nations. The situation was similar to those in which the General Assembly had in the past refused to grant hearing to representatives of North Korea.

42. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) recalled that on the occasions to which the representative of Guinea had referred, North Korea had been invited to attend on the same terms as South Korea—namely, provided that it subscribed to the principles of the United Nations—but it had refused to accept those terms. He considered that it was important to adhere to the spirit and letter of the rules of procedure, but even if a Member of the General Assembly opposing the inclusion of an item in the agenda, rather than requesting its inclusion, was subject to rule 43, the same privilege should not be extended to a non-member State.

43. Mr. BASHEV (Bulgaria) said that the Committee would be violating the rules of procedure of the General Assembly if it voted on the question. If the General Assembly had made no provision in its rules of procedure for non-members of the United Nations to participate in the discussions of the General Committee, it was not for the Committee, a subsidiary organ of the Assembly, to attempt to change the situation.

44. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that, having heard the strong objections of so many members of the Committee, he would not oppose their views. He would stress once again, however, that the Committee's decision should in no way prejudice the question of Viet-Nam being heard on the substance of the item if it was included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no basis for putting the question to a vote if the Committee wished to abide by the rules of procedure. Indeed, the very existence of the so-called Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam was unlawful; it was not provided for in either the Charter or the rules of procedure and the person who was asking to be heard by the Committee was no different from any outside person who might ask to be heard. He could not share the doubts of some representatives about the validity or applicability of the rules of procedure: rule 43 was clear on the point and the Committee must base itself on the legal position. It was obvious that the overwhelming majority of the Committee were opposed to hearing the so-called Observer of Viet-Nam and the Chairman should make a ruling without putting the matter to the vote.

46. The CHAIRMAN explained that there were two questions at issue. One was whether the Observer should be heard by the General Committee. The other was whether he should be heard on the substance of the question when it was discussed by the competent organ. On the first point, he noted that there was a consensus of opinion that the Permanent Observer of Viet-Nam should not be heard. On the second, he pointed out that a decision by the General Committee to that effect would not preclude the possibility of his being heard by the appropriate organ at a later stage if item 77 was included in the agenda.

47. Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon) said that the violation of human rights in South Viet-Nam had constituted a challenge to humanity itself; consequently, the correct forum for discussion of the problem would be the General Assembly, and in accordance with past procedure it should be debated in plenary meeting. He was

confident that the Committee would recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda and that it would be given the highest priority by the General Assembly.

48. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) supported the inclusion of the item and hoped that the Committee would recommend discussion of it as a matter of urgency, since Press reports indicated that the situation in South Viet-Nam was deteriorating.

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 77 in the agenda.*

*Mr. Gunewardene (Ceylon) withdrew.*

#### ITEM 78

49. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation wished once again to express reservations concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Question of Oman". It was not a proper matter for the United Nations to discuss, nor was there any need for such a discussion. At the seventeenth session the sponsors of the item had alleged that the situation in Oman was a threat to peace and security; now they claimed that it was "an essentially colonial problem". The fact was that the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman was enjoying peace and calm, and its internal affairs had nothing to do with colonialism. There was no reason why the United Nations should concern itself with the situation in that territory.

50. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that, in spite of the objections raised by the United Kingdom delegation, the people of Oman were still being denied their right to freedom and independence. The real facts concerning the question of Oman had already been discussed by the United Nations. His delegation supported its inclusion in the agenda.

51. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that his delegation attached considerable importance to the question of Oman. It had been discussed by the Security Council in 1957 and subsequently by the General Assembly. The situation in the territory was of vital concern to the United Nations because it conflicted with the basic principles of the Charter and of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It was quite proper for the General Assembly to discuss the question and his delegation supported the views put forward in the explanatory memorandum (A/5492/Add.1).

*The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of item 78 in the agenda.*

#### ITEM 79

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

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY ALBANIA (A/5498)

52. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the addendum to the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/159/Add.1) listing requests for the inclusion of additional items in the agenda. The Committee would take up first the item proposed by Albania (A/5498) entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations".

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

53. Mr. SHTYLLA (Albania) said that ever since the overthrow of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, the Government of the People's Republic of China had been the only legal representative of the Chinese people. A change of régime in a Member State would normally be a matter of domestic concern, but owing to the obstructive attitude of certain States, particularly the United States of America, it was essential that the question should be taken up by the United Nations and the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China restored. The efforts of the United States to maintain the strange paradox that there were two Chinas were doomed to failure.

54. The People's Republic of China was a socialist and democratic State which was developing impressively and increasing its ties with many countries. It was maintaining and developing good neighbourly relations with other States on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence of States having different social systems. It advocated the settlement of disputes by negotiation, as was borne out by the frontier settlements reached with neighbouring countries such as Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan. It was striving to reach a similar settlement with India. The United Nations could not solve the many problems before it without the participation of the People's Republic of China. He hoped that the General Assembly would redress the wrong which had been done to that country during the last fourteen years and expel from the United Nations the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique. He also hoped that the item would be discussed in plenary session and given priority.

55. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) opposed the inclusion of the item proposed by Albania. At its last two sessions the General Assembly had debated at length the proposal to seat the Chinese Communists and had rejected it decisively. There was no need for the Assembly to repeat the performance at the current session, with its already heavy agenda. It was significant that the Soviet Union no longer sponsored the request for the inclusion of the item but had seen fit to relinquish that role to Albania, which together with the Chinese Communists had become the pariah of the Communist world.

56. The explanatory memorandum submitted by Albania (A/5498), besides repeating the outworn phrases of Communist propaganda, made a number of fantastic statements deliberately distorting the facts. The Foreign Minister of Albania was apparently not aware of the famous open letter addressed by the leaders of the Kremlin to the Chinese Communists in July 1963. That letter made it clear that Albania was merely serving as the mouthpiece for the leaders of the Chinese Communists. The Foreign Minister of Albania could hardly be serious when he spoke of the Chinese Communists pursuing "a consistent policy of international peace and co-operation". The leaders of the Soviet Union gave quite a different picture of the policy followed by the Chinese Communists. In the open letter they had accused the Chinese Communists of playing with the destiny of mankind by their insistence on the inevitability of war.

57. His delegation challenged the statement in the Albanian memorandum that the Chinese Communists enjoyed "the complete and whole-hearted support of the great 650 million-strong Chinese people". Presumably, the Albanian Foreign Minister was unaware of the thousands of people who had fled from the mainland of China and of the millions who had been liqui-

dated because of their resistance to Communist tyranny. To speak of the Chinese Communists as "resolute champions of the rights of all peoples to freedom, democracy and social progress" was equally ludicrous. Tibet was, no doubt, an example of such resolute championship. It was also asserted in the memorandum that the Chinese Communists maintained and constantly developed "good-neighbourly relations ... with other States". Prime Minister Nehru would obviously not subscribe to such an assertion, according to his recent statement to the Indian Parliament.

58. Finally, in the open letter addressed to Peiping by the leaders of the Kremlin, the Chinese Communists had been accused not only of violating the principle of peaceful coexistence between socialist countries but of infringing on the rules that should govern relationships between all States. If the Chinese Communists were thus condemned even in the Communist world, the General Assembly could hardly give its approval to such a régime by including the item proposed by Albania in its agenda.

59. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the absence of the lawful representatives of the Chinese people undermined the United Nations and hampered its activities. The General Assembly should redress the wrongs which had been done to the People's Republic of China and invite it to take its rightful place in the United Nations. The People's Republic of China was entitled to enjoy the rights conferred upon it in the Charter as a founder Member of the United Nations. To fail to acknowledge that fact was a violation of the Charter and constituted a flagrant disregard for the rights of a people that represented one fifth of the world's population. The rightful place of China in the United Nations continued to be illegally occupied by the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, who represented nobody but themselves. Only the Government of the People's Republic of China could speak for China in the United Nations. He hoped that the item would be included in the agenda and that an increasing number of peace-loving States would support the proposal to restore to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights.

60. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that his country did not formally oppose the inclusion of the item in the agenda but felt that, in the light of recent events, its further discussion in the General Assembly would serve no useful purpose. The Government of China was properly represented at the United Nations and the General Assembly should continue to follow the same policy in that regard as it had followed in the past.

61. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) said that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations was one of the most important questions facing the General Assembly. The fact that a founder Member of the United Nations and one of the greatest countries in the world should be illegally excluded from the United Nations was a serious impediment to its work. The time had come to put an end to the injustice being committed against the People's Republic of China. The obstructionist policy pursued by the United States of America in seeking to exclude the People's Republic of China had prevented the United Nations from becoming a "centre for harmonizing the actions of nations" according to the terms of the Charter. His delegation supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda for discussion in plenary session.

62. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) recalled that his delegation had supported the proposal to seat the People's Republic of China ever since Guinea had become a Member of the United Nations. Such a policy conformed to the views of the majority of people, including many people in countries whose Governments opposed the admission of the People's Republic of China; they realized the absurdity of the General Assembly's failure to recognize a régime which had enjoyed effective control of the Chinese mainland since the 1949 revolution. It was ludicrous to object to the fact that the People's Republic of China had a Communist Government when many States Members of the United Nations had such Governments. It was astonishing that the Republic of South Africa should be represented at the United Nations merely by the spokesman of a white minority, while the real representatives of a country like the Chinese People's Republic should be excluded.

63. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was no longer discussing the item concerning the Republic of South Africa.

64. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he was merely quoting South Africa as an example to show how unjust it was to exclude the People's Republic of China from the United Nations. Guinea had fruitful relations with the People's Republic of China and many other countries had increased their ties with it. He hoped that the item would be included in the agenda and that the Assembly would reach a decision which did justice to the People's Republic of China.

65. Mr. Nur ELMI (Somalia) reaffirmed his country's traditional belief that the People's Republic of China should be seated in the United Nations forthwith. He supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

66. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that the People's Republic of China should be represented in the United Nations and that the item should be included in the agenda.

67. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) said that his country had full diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and had supported every effort to restore that country's legal rights. The time was long overdue for admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations in order to achieve the principle of universality and to secure the representation of 650 million people. His delegation would vote for inclusion of the item.

68. Mr. BASHEV (Bulgaria) recalled that at the opening meeting of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly (1206th plenary meeting) the President had mentioned the many important problems facing the United Nations. Those problems could hardly be solved effectively without the participation of the People's Republic of China. His delegation fully supported the inclusion of the item. The absence of the People's Republic of China seriously interfered with the work of the United Nations and impeded the implementation of the tasks laid down in the Charter.

69. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) formally requested that the Committee should take a vote on the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations".

*The Committee decided by 12 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the item proposed by Albania.*

70. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) explained that he had abstained in the vote because he did not wish to prejudice the position to be taken by his delegation when the substance of the matter was discussed in the General Assembly.

*Mr. Shtylla (Albania) withdrew.*

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.