

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 19 September 1957,
at 3.15 p. m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the agenda of the twelfth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (continued)	7

Chairman: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

Consideration of the agenda of the twelfth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/147 and Add.1/Rev.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the five additional items which had been submitted for inclusion in the agenda of the twelfth session (A/BUR/147/Add.1/Rev.1).

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE TWELFTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY INDIA (A/3657)

2. The CHAIRMAN called for a decision concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee".

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of the item in its agenda, as sub-item (b) of item 24.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE TWELFTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS ELEVENTH SESSION (RESOLUTION 1133 (XI))

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Horvath (Hungary) took a seat at the Committee table.

3. Mr. HORVATH (Hungary) said that it was not the first time that the Hungarian Government had been forced to protest against interference by the United Nations in its domestic affairs; it had already done so when the eleventh session of the General Assembly had been spuriously reconvened a week before the opening of the twelfth session in order to consider the non-existent problem of Hungary. The Hungarian delegation to the eleventh session had proved by incontestable documents that the report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary (A/3592) had completely distorted the events which had taken place in Hungary in October and November 1957. There were only two ways in which the General Assembly should deal with the Hungarian question; firstly, it should note the interference by certain Western States in the domestic affairs of Hungary and, secondly, it should call upon those States to cease their subversive activities in that country.

4. The entire Hungarian people protested against the attempt to include the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda of the twelfth session. If that attempt succeeded, it would further poison the international atmosphere and divert the attention of the United

Nations from its proper task of preserving world peace and security. His delegation therefore requested the General Committee to delete the item from the agenda.

5. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) strongly supported the objections raised by the Hungarian representative to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. There was no problem of Hungary which required consideration by the twelfth session of the General Assembly. The counter-revolutionary attack which had been fostered by foreign reactionary circles and by remnants of the former régime had been broken by the Hungarian people and by its socialist neighbours. The attempt to include the so-called question of Hungary in the General Assembly's agenda was a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary. The present Government of Hungary had been supported by the Hungarian Parliament, which in turn had been elected by the people in accordance with the Constitution. The Hungarian people wished to call a halt to the nefarious propaganda which had been unleashed against them on the basis of the report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary. Certain quarters in the United Nations sought to have that report discussed in order to assist the counter-revolutionaries both inside and outside Hungary. However, the Hungarian people, jealous of their independence, would oppose any attempt to interfere in their affairs and would resolutely combat the new campaign of rumours which was being launched by the supporters of the counter-revolutionaries.

6. The real task of the General Assembly at the twelfth session was to concentrate on such important matters as the situation in the Middle East, the cessation of nuclear explosions and the slowing down of the armaments race. It should not be diverted from that task by discussing the Hungarian question.

7. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had already protested against the inclusion of the question of Hungary on the agenda of the General Assembly, because neither the Assembly nor any other United Nations body was permitted to interfere in the domestic affairs of States. The efforts to include the item on the agenda of the twelfth session merely constituted a further attempt to foment the cold war within the United Nations. It was intended to distract attention from more pressing issues, such as the dangerous situation in the Middle East and nuclear weapons tests, and would merely serve to poison the atmosphere of the twelfth session. His delegation strongly opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

8. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) recalled that paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 1133 (XI), which had recently been adopted at the eleventh session (677th plenary meeting) by 60 votes to 10, recommended that the question of Hungary be placed on the agenda of the twelfth session. By doing so the

General Assembly had recognized the urgency of the problem and had shown its determination to find a constructive solution. In Hungary people were still being arrested, imprisoned and shot for the simple reason that they sought freedom and independence. It was the clear duty of the United Nations to face the facts and to relieve the sufferings of the Hungarian people. The General Committee should show that it was keeping the problem of Hungary in the forefront of its considerations by recommending that the item be placed on the agenda of the twelfth session.

9. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the attitude adopted by the United States on the question of Hungary was at sharp variance with the principles of the United Nations. The United States delegation had said nothing to justify inclusion of the item in the agenda, and the USSR delegation fully supported the request of the Hungarian delegation that it should not be included.

10. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) supported the United States representative in urging that the item be placed on the agenda of the twelfth session in accordance with resolution 1133 (XI) of 14 September 1957. The tragedy of Hungary was of the deepest concern to the United Kingdom and to most Members of the United Nations. There was no sign that either the Soviet Union or Hungary was ready to comply with the resolutions passed by the General Assembly, and it could not be argued in any circumstances that the problem of Hungary was "non-existent". There was no doubt that the General Assembly should include the item on its agenda.

11. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "The question of Hungary".

The Committee decided by 13 votes to 2 to recommend that the item be included in the agenda.

12. Mr. HORVATH (Hungary) stressed that the decision just taken was against the wishes of the Hungarian people and Government. It constituted a further unjustified attempt by certain representatives to interfere in Hungary's domestic affairs.

Mr. Horvath (Hungary) withdrew.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE TWELFTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY INDIA (A/3663)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Krishna Menon (India) took a seat at the Committee table.

13. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said it was imperative under operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of General Assembly resolution 396 (V) that the United Nations should consider the question of the representation of China. Since the General Committee could not go into the merits of the question, it should recommend consideration of the item by the General Assembly.

14. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the United States Government's views on the question were clear. The Indian proposal should be rejected and the General Assembly should adopt a decision not to consider the matter at its twelfth session. To that effect, he 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 India for the inclusion in the agenda of its twelfth regular session of the additional item entitled 'The representation of China in the United Nations', and

"2. Decides not to consider, at its twelfth regular session, any proposal 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."

15. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) considered operative paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution pointless, as the Committee need merely vote on the Indian proposal, and operative paragraph 2 out of order since it dealt with the merits of the case, which the General Committee was not entitled to do under rules 40 and 41 of the rules of procedure.

16. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed Mr. Menon's views and supported the Indian proposal. The early restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China which represented one-fourth of the human race was imperative. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had consistently maintained a policy of friendship with all nations. It was a stable government which defended the interests of the Chinese people and was dedicated to the maintenance of peaceful international relations. The claim that the Central People's Government was not supported by the people was groundless, as was the charge that the Government pursued an aggressive policy. The People's Republic of China had played an important part in the restoration of peace in Korea and Viet-Nam.

17. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Soviet Union not to go into the substance of the question.

18. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that he should not be prevented from expressing his delegation's views on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. He did not believe that his delegation had violated the rules of procedure by discussing the question of the inclusion in the agenda of the item proposed by India. There were other facets to the problem. The absence of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations prevented the settlement of many international problems and undermined the authority of the United Nations. The fact that some States might dislike the social and political systems in the People's Republic of China should not be allowed to govern the question of that country's admission to the United Nations.

19. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) considered that his draft resolution was in order. Under rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the General Committee was required to make recommendations on each item proposed for inclusion in the agenda. With regard to rule 41, the General Committee was not being asked to decide a political question. It would merely make a recommendation to the General Assembly. The whole question whether the United States draft resolution could properly be considered in the Committee had been settled at the eleventh session of the Assembly (580th plenary meeting), and a precedent had been established.

20. Mr. TSIANG (China) objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the item proposed by India, which was

offensive to the Government of the Republic of China - a founder member of the United Nations which had always fulfilled its obligations of membership. He represented the only legitimate Government entitled to represent China, which had been the victim of Soviet subversion and aggression. The item proposed by India was calculated to legitimize that aggression, and was contrary to the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

21. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against the chairman's failure to apply the rules of procedure to the previous speaker, who had been allowed to speak on the substance of the question.

22. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the item proposed by India. The solution of major international problems, particularly in the Far East, required the participation of the People's Republic of China. Recognition of that country's legitimate rights was an important prerequisite to the fulfilment by the United Nations of its primary task of successfully preserving international peace and security. The People's Republic of China had consistently observed the principle of peaceful co-existence and was a bulwark of peace in the Far East.

23. Efforts to achieve the political and economic isolation of the People's Republic of China had failed, since some thirty Governments had established diplomatic relations with the Central People's Government and many more had economic relations with it. The Central People's Government had been prevented by United States pressure from participating in the work of the United Nations. That abnormal situation should be ended, since the Central People's Government alone was entitled to represent China in the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation considered the United States draft resolution out of order, and felt that it should not be put to the vote.

24. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) felt that the reasons which had prompted the General Assembly at its tenth and eleventh sessions to defer consideration of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations were still valid. Since the question profoundly divided the Member States, as was evident from the present debate, it should not be included in the agenda. For the reasons given, he was unable to support the Indian proposal but would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution.

25. With regard to the procedural position, the Committee had taken action on a similar draft resolution (A/BUR/144) at the eleventh session (108th meeting). The Assembly had subsequently adopted the Committee's recommendation, thus establishing a precedent.

26. Mr. GUNewardENE (Ceylon) supported the Indian proposal, which was quite proper in view of the fact that the General Committee could not go into the substance of the question, as its action was limited under rule 40.

27. There were two views on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. Hence, the matter should be debated. The People's Republic of China had been recognized by a number of countries. Moreover, one-fourth of the human race could not be excluded from the United Nations if that organization wished to fulfil its mission of preserving international peace and security. The people of China must be held

accountable for their actions. That could be done only by admitting their country to the United Nations.

28. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the rules of procedure were being invoked to thwart consideration by the General Assembly of the vital question of the representation of China in the United Nations. The rules of procedure had already been violated at the eleventh session, when an identical United States draft resolution had been proposed. A similar violation should not be allowed to recur at the twelfth session. The General Committee should therefore act on the Indian proposal, which was quite proper, and should take no action on the United States draft resolution, which was out of order.

29. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) considered it would be better not to include the item proposed by India in the agenda. The United Kingdom Government recognized the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the Government of China. The day must come when the question of the representation of China would have to be considered by the General Assembly. However, the time was not yet ripe for such consideration, as the United Nations was deeply divided on the question. A debate would inevitably be controversial and have serious consequences for the work of the General Assembly. The United Kingdom delegation would therefore vote in favour of the United States draft resolution. That draft had been quite properly introduced since a similar draft resolution had been adopted at the eleventh session. Hence, it was within the competence of the Committee to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a resolution in the terms proposed by the United States.

30. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said that for ethical and political reasons Guatemala recognized the Government of the Republic of China. The question of the representation of China had been brought up on previous occasions and had formed the subject of several United Nations resolutions which reflected the views of the majority.

31. With respect to the procedural position, resolution 396 (V) was not binding on the Assembly at its twelfth session. The Indian delegation itself had on another occasion argued that resolutions adopted at one session of the Assembly should not be binding on subsequent sessions.

32. The delegation of Guatemala would vote in favour of operative paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution, although the question could very well be settled by a vote on the Indian proposal. However, it could not support operative paragraph 2, because it went beyond the competence of the Committee as limited by rules 40 and 41.

33. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) thought that the United States draft resolution was in full accord with rule 40, which spoke of "recommendations" in the plural, and therefore did not limit the Committee to one single recommendation on any one item. He could see no valid objection to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, as it would apply only to the twelfth session of the Assembly. He would therefore vote for the draft.

34. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that, precisely because views in the General Assembly on such an important matter were so divided, the General Assembly should, rather than hide from reality, debate the matter thoroughly, as it would be doing in the case of

other highly controversial questions. It was only such a debate that his Government was requesting.

35. He agreed with the Thai representative that the Committee was entitled to adopt more than one recommendation on the same item, but rule 40 made it plain that those recommendations must be confined to inclusion of the item in the agenda, its rejection, or its inclusion in the provisional agenda of a future session. Paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution went outside that scope and was therefore out of order. It was not for the Committee to propose to the General Assembly a substantive decision, which furthermore prejudged the action of the Credentials Committee.

36. He was unable to agree with the representative of Guatemala that General Assembly resolution 396 (V) should be disregarded. It contained a general principle which was binding upon the United Nations until the resolution was officially rescinded, and no recommendation adopted by the Committee could have that effect.

37. He requested that paragraphs 1 and 2 of the United States draft resolution be put to the vote separately.

38. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) remarked that his delegation respected all General Assembly resolutions. However, resolution 396 (V) merely made a recommendation which the General Assembly at the twelfth session was free to accept or not. The General Assembly would be making that decision when it voted on the Committee's recommendation concerning the item under consideration. A majority vote on that recommendation was the only possible way for the General Assembly to deal with an item the very title of which was offensive to a Member State.

39. The CHAIRMAN stated that the use of the word "concerning" in the first statement of rule 40 of the rules of procedure made it clear that the Committee was entitled to make ancillary recommendations, and that both paragraphs of the United States draft resolution were therefore in order.

40. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) remarked that the Chairman's argument would not hold if the French and Spanish texts of rule 40 were considered.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution.

42. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) speaking on a point of order, said that under rule 132 of the rules of procedure the Indian request for inclusion of the item in the agenda should be put to the vote first.

43. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) moved that the Committee should vote first on the United States draft resolution.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States proposal that the Committee should vote first on the United States draft resolution.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

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

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

46. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation was unable to agree with the Committee's decision, which was contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and had been adopted in violation of the rules of procedure and the Committee's normal practices. His delegation reserved its right to speak on the question of the representation of China again in the General Assembly and in other United Nations organs.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE TWELFTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/3664)

47. The CHAIRMAN called for a decision concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Clearance of the Suez Canal: report of the Secretary-General".

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE TWELFTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/3665)

48. The CHAIRMAN called for a decision concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "United Nations Emergency Force: report of the Secretary-General".

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

ALLOCATION OF ITEMS (A/BUR/147 AND Add.1/Rev.1)

Provisional agenda and supplementary list of items (A/BUR/147)

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the allocation of agenda items as proposed in the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/147).

Additional items (A/BUR/147/Add.1/Rev.1)

49. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the additional item entitled "Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee" had already been allocated to the First Committee as sub-item (b) of item 24.

50. Mr. BARCO (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should make no recommendation at the present juncture concerning the allocation of the item entitled "The question of Hungary", but should do so later in the light of developments.

51. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would oppose the allocation of that item to any committee or organ.

52. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) recalled that he had voted against the item, and said he would do so again in the General Assembly.

53. The CHAIRMAN called for a decision concerning the United States proposal that the Committee should postpone its decision on the allocation of the item entitled "The question of Hungary".

The proposal was adopted

54. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the items entitled "Clearance of the Suez Canal: report of the Secretary-General" and "United Nations Emergency Force: report of the Secretary-General", stated that he understood it was the Secretary-General's suggestion that both items should be allocated directly to plenary meetings.

55. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) proposed that the allocation of the items in question be postponed until delegations had had time to study the Secretary-General's reports.

56. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said he had no objection to a postponement. He had recommended that

the two items should be considered by the General Assembly without reference to a Committee because, while they had an important financial aspect, they basically called for political consideration.

57. The CHAIRMAN called for a decision concerning the United Kingdom proposal that the Committee should postpone a decision on the allocation of the items entitled "Clearance of the Suez Canal: report of the Secretary-General" and "United Nations Emergency Force: report of the Secretary-General".

The proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.