

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records

**GENERAL COMMITTEE 117th
 MEETING**

Wednesday, 17 September 1958,
 at 3.5 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General	1
Consideration of the agenda of the thirteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General	
Items 7 to 18	1
Item 19	1
Items 20 to 28	2
Item 29	2
Items 30 to 34	2
Item 35	2
Items 36 to 49	2
Item 50	2
Items 51 and 52	2
Item 53	2
Items 54 to 59	2
Items 60 and 72	2
Item 61	3
Items 62 and 69	3
Item 63	4
Item 64	4
Item 65	4
Items 66 to 68	4
Item 70	4
Item 71	4
Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the thirteenth session: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	6
Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the thirteenth session: item proposed by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	7

Chairman: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).

Organization of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/149)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/149) on the organization of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. The Committee would note the Secretary-General's suggestion that 12 December 1958 should be the closing date of the session.

The Committee decided to recommend 12 December 1958 as the closing date of the thirteenth session.

2. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Economic and Social Council had recommended in resolution 683 F (XXVI) that the General Assembly should devote a special meeting at its thirteenth session to the observance of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the special meeting should be held on 10 December 1958. He suggested that the Committee should so recommend to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

Consideration of the agenda of the thirteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/148 and Add.1/Rev.1)

3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the agenda of the thirteenth session as set out in the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/148 and Add.1/Rev.1). Items 1 to 6 having already been taken up by the General Assembly, the Committee would consider the other items proposed for inclusion in the agenda, beginning with item 7.

ITEMS 7 TO 18

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 7 to 18.

ITEM 19

4. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) proposed that item 19 should be combined with item 66. The appointment of members of the Disarmament Commission was directly related to the question of disarmament and should be dealt with in conjunction with that question.

5. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the proposal.

6. Mr. HAGIWARA (Japan) reminded the Committee that it was the practice for all elections or appointments to committees to be made at plenary meetings even if the establishment or membership of those committees was discussed in one of the main Committees. He would prefer to see item 19 kept separate from the general question of disarmament. The latter item would include the question of the continuation or membership of the Disarmament Commission and would be discussed in the First Committee, but it was preferable that the members of the Commission should be appointed at a plenary meeting.

7. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that adoption of the Romanian proposal would not prevent the General Assembly from considering

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, list of members, agenda and other prefatory matter.

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

the appointment of members of the Disarmament Commission. The First Committee's decision in the matter would not be final since it was subject to the General Assembly's approval. As the result of the First Committee's consideration of the question of disarmament would have a direct bearing on the appointment of members of the Disarmament Commission, it was logical that the two questions should be considered simultaneously.

8. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Romanian proposal that item 19 should be combined with item 66.

The Romanian proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 19.

ITEMS 20 TO 28

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 20 to 28.

ITEM 29

9. The CHAIRMAN said that item 29 took into account the suggestion made in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/148).

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 29.

ITEMS 30 TO 34

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 30 to 34.

ITEM 35

10. The CHAIRMAN said that item 35 took into account the suggestion made in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 35.

ITEMS 36 TO 49

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 36 to 49.

ITEM 50

11. The CHAIRMAN said that item 50 took into account the suggestion made in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 50.

ITEMS 51 AND 52

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 51 and 52.

ITEM 53

12. The CHAIRMAN said that item 53 took into account the suggestion made in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 53.

ITEMS 54 TO 59

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 54 to 59.

ITEMS 60 AND 72

13. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) proposed that items 60 and 72, both of which dealt with the same subject, outer space, should be considered as sub-items under the general heading "International co-operation in the use of outer space for peaceful purposes".

14. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Indonesian proposal failed to take into account certain basic differences in the subject matter of the two items. Item 60 related to the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space. The Indonesian proposal would include the concept of international co-operation but would eliminate the military aspect of the problem, which was equally important. Separate consideration of the two items would assist in the solution of the questions to which they related. He hoped that the Indonesian representative would not maintain his proposal.

15. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that he did not intend to preclude discussion of any aspect of item 60, which could be fully considered under his proposal.

16. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland) supported the Indonesian proposal. Recent experience justified the view that more progress was likely to be made if questions such as those relating to outer space were approached from the technical rather than the political point of view. Item 60 was based on a primarily political concept of the problem, whereas the Indonesian proposal would provide for a less prejudicial approach.

17. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he objected to the Indonesian proposal for the reasons stated by the Soviet representative.

18. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) felt that the Indonesian proposal would facilitate discussion of items 60 and 72. Item 72, relating to international co-operation in the field of outer space, necessarily involved the question of the use of outer space for military purposes. Moreover, simultaneous consideration of the two items would contribute to a more business-like discussion and avoid repetitious debate since the views expressed by delegations would generally apply to both questions.

19. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the new heading proposed was virtually identical with the heading of item 72. He thought it should combine the titles of both items 60 and 72.

20. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that he had sought a common denominator between the two items. The heading he proposed served to emphasize the general desire for international co-operation in the field of outer space.

21. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that he would vote in favour of the Indonesian proposal.

22. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) suggested that items 60 and 72 might become sub-items under the

general heading "Question of the peaceful use of outer space".

23. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal), while supporting the Indonesian proposal, felt that there was no essential differences between the headings proposed by Indonesia and Ceylon.

24. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that the heading suggested by the representative of Ceylon was acceptable.

25. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) maintained his view that items 60 and 72 should be considered separately. However, he would not object to the heading suggested by Ceylon, provided items 60 and 72 remained unchanged as sub-items under the new heading.

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the inclusion of items 60 and 72 in the agenda as sub-items under a general heading, as follows:

"Question of the peaceful use of outer space:

"(a) The banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space;

"(b) Programme for international co-operation in the field of outer space."

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 60 and 72 thus combined.

ITEM 61

27. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that he would vote for the inclusion of the item if the title was altered to read: "Measures aimed at implementation and promotion of peaceful and neighbourly relations among States". The new title would correspond to the heading of the resolution on the subject adopted at the twelfth session of the Assembly (resolution 1236 (XII)), to which the Czechoslovak explanatory memorandum in support of the inclusion of the item specifically referred (A/3847/Add.1), and would recall the text of the preamble of the Charter.

28. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) could not accept the suggested rewording. There was no reason for the Assembly to be bound by the heading of its earlier resolution. The expression "principles of peaceful coexistence" had been accepted by many States and was broad enough in scope to cover all aspects of international co-operation including that specified in the suggested new title.

29. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he found it difficult to understand the political reasons underlying the United States objection to the use of the term "principles of peaceful coexistence". The United States was evidently afraid of the words "peaceful coexistence" since it always took a stand against that conception in general. The concept had been discussed and accepted in past Assembly debates and there was no valid reason to take exception to it at present. All Member States agreed that the Assembly's main task was to foster peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States. They should not be willing to narrow that concept by using

the inadequate expression "peaceful and neighbourly relations". The Soviet delegation strongly favoured the original wording of the item.

30. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) supported the suggested new title as a correct and unambiguous formulation of the common objective, which corresponded to the title of the resolution adopted at the twelfth session.

31. Mr. WALKER (Australia) also supported the United States amendment of the title because it recalled the language of the Charter and covered the objective sought in relations between States with different social systems.

32. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) favoured the amended wording. It came closer to the Charter language and adequately defined the scope of the item.

33. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) supported the inclusion of the item as originally worded. The expression "principles of peaceful coexistence" had acquired political meaning in international discussions and was broad enough to include the concept of peaceful and neighbourly relations.

34. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) also preferred the wording proposed by Czechoslovakia. Resolution 1236 (XII) was in fact a general definition of "peaceful coexistence".

35. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland) felt that the title suggested by the United States was preferable. He did not agree that "peaceful coexistence" had a wider connotation than "peaceful and neighbourly relations"; on the contrary, the idea of good neighbourly relations added something to the concept of peaceful coexistence.

36. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) said that his Government had been a party to the Bandung Declaration and had subscribed to the principles of peaceful coexistence. Nevertheless, in the interest of securing unanimous agreement on the wording of the item and thus contributing to a successful outcome of the debate in the Assembly, he appealed to the Czechoslovak delegation not to insist on the retention of the original title.

37. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) regretted that he could not comply with that request. Twenty-eight States, at the Bandung Conference, had adopted the principles of peaceful coexistence; the term was generally accepted and understood.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the inclusion of item 61 in the agenda under the following title: "Measures aimed at the implementation and promotion of peaceful and neighbourly relations among States".

The Committee decided, by 13 votes to 5, with 1 abstention, to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 61 under its new title. 1/

ITEMS 62 AND 69

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

39. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) wished to place formally on record his Government's objection,

1/ The representative of Japan subsequently requested that his delegation be recorded as having voted in favour of the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

based on Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, to the inclusion of items 62 and 69 in the agenda of the thirteenth session.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 62 and 69.

Mr. Jooste (Union of South Africa) withdrew.

ITEM 63

40. The CHAIRMAN announced that a Member State had requested that the Committee should postpone consideration of item 63 until its next meeting.

It was so decided.

ITEM 64

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

41. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that India, which had for the second time sponsored the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda, continued to be convinced of the necessity of United Nations discussion of the question of Antarctica. However, in view of the heavy agenda for the session and the fact that a conference of twelve nations, not including India, had been called on the initiative of the United States to discuss the question, it would be more appropriate to defer consideration of the item until the Assembly's fourteenth session. Accordingly, India was prepared to withdraw the item and to reintroduce it for inclusion in the agenda of the fourteenth session.

Item 64 was withdrawn.

Mr. Krishna Menon (India) withdrew.

ITEM 65

42. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) reaffirmed that his Government did not consider the Assembly competent to deal with the item. As in the past, the Assembly would be exceeding its powers by including the item in its agenda; it would be acting in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, and would be exacerbating tensions rather than facilitating the pacific settlement of disputes. Assembly debate of the question of Algeria would be not only ineffectual, but harmful; it would benefit nobody, and certainly not the Algerian people. It would be particularly ill-advised at the present session since the French Government was committed to resolve the question by methods which it had carefully worked out and was determined to achieve a reasonable solution. In the circumstances, France would not participate in the Assembly debate in any way if the item were placed on the agenda. Inclusion of the item would be contrary to the Charter and to the interests of the Algerian people.

43. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that his Government believed that the discussion of the Algerian question would infringe the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7. It would therefore reserve its position on the question.

44. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that his delegation had joined with twenty-three others in urging the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the thirteenth session because the dispute between France and Algeria was an international dispute which directly affected peace and security in North Africa and the establishment of new ties of co-operation between the West and the recently independent countries of Asia and Africa. The question had been discussed at earlier sessions and there could be no doubt of the Assembly's

competence to deal with the item. Moreover, the wish expressed by the Assembly at its twelfth session (resolution 1184 (XII)) that pourparlers would be entered into with a view to a solution had remained unfulfilled and hostilities were continuing. It was essential for the Assembly to attempt to ease the prevailing tensions and to work towards a just solution.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 65.

ITEMS 66 TO 68

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 66 to 68.

ITEM 70

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Esin (Turkey) took a place at the Committee table.

45. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) said that the position of Turkey and of the Turkish population of Cyprus was well known. His Government had spared no effort to bring about a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the Cyprus question, among those directly concerned. In conformity with that spirit, it would not object to the inclusion of the item, placing its faith in the wisdom and sense of justice of the General Assembly, for acting as a general guide within the limits of its legal possibilities.

46. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that although Article 2, paragraph 7, barred the United Nations from intervening in the internal affairs of the United Kingdom in respect of Cyprus, his Government had no objection to discussion of the international aspects of the question which came within the Assembly's competence. The United Kingdom delegation had no objection to the inclusion of the item and would take part in the discussion.

47. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that, as the United Kingdom representative did not object to the inclusion of the question of Cyprus in the agenda, she felt that there was no reason for her to explain why Greece had had to ask again this year for the consideration of the question of Cyprus. But she observed that the United Kingdom representative's remarks regarding the applicability of Article 2, paragraph 7, were not valid: the question of competence had been settled by earlier decisions of the Assembly to include the item in its agenda. In any case Article 2, paragraph 7, did not apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories and under Article 10 the Assembly was empowered to discuss all international questions.

48. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that he would not object to the inclusion of the item if it was acceptable to the United Kingdom. His delegation wished however to enter a reservation in respect of the Assembly's competence under Article 2, paragraph 7.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 70.

Mr. Esin (Turkey) withdrew.

ITEM 71

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

49. Mr. SIK (Hungary) said that his Government considered the activities of the Special Committee on

the Problem of Hungary, including its latest report, to be unlawful. They constituted a violation of the Charter and unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. The United Nations had never been competent to deal with the question of Hungary and the inclusion of that item in the agenda of the present session would further aggravate the situation.

50. No purpose would be served by debating the latest report of the Special Committee. The criminal proceedings taken against certain of its citizens by a sovereign State were not a subject for debate; moreover, the trials and related events were now terminated and discussion of them would be out of date. There might be some justification for an Assembly debate if the situation in Hungary constituted a threat to the peace. But the facts were that law and order reigned in the country; the Government was undertaking a task of peaceful reconstruction and settling controversial matters with other States, regardless of their social systems, by means of negotiation. The question of Hungary was an international one only to the extent that official agencies and illegal organizations of the United States were still attempting to overthrow the present social order. Hungary had not, however, asked the United Nations to intervene because it did not wish to divert attention from more serious questions representing a threat to world peace. The Australian request for the inclusion of the Hungarian item was a diversionary manoeuvre and should be rejected.

51. Mr. WALKER (Australia) explained that his delegation had proposed the item for inclusion on the agenda because it believed the United Nations could not overlook the events that had recently taken place in Hungary. The Assembly would surely wish to consider the additional report which the Special Committee it had appointed to investigate the Hungarian question had found it necessary to prepare.

52. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of the item as a provocative attempt to use the United Nations as a forum for propaganda against the socialist countries and to divert attention from the pressing problems created in the Middle and Far East by the actions of the United Kingdom and the United States. Discussion of the question of Hungary would, moreover, involve intervention in the domestic affairs of a Member of the United Nations within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

53. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that his delegation warmly supported the inclusion of the item. Having served on the Special Committee on Hungary, he was deeply aware of the extent to which events in that country had stirred public opinion and believed that the Assembly was in duty bound to discuss the question. The Assembly's competence in the matter had already been established and, as the question involved the protection of human rights, with regard to which the Charter was explicit, Article 2, paragraph 7, could not properly be invoked.

54. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) said that his delegation considered discussion of the Hungarian question in the United Nations an unwarranted interference in the affairs of a Member State. Discussion of the item not only would serve no useful purpose but would also be harmful to international peace and understanding. The

situation in Hungary was peaceful and attention might more usefully be centred on other areas where peace and security had been threatened by United Kingdom and United States intervention.

55. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item since there was still no indication that the Soviet Union or the present Hungarian régime were willing to comply with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its eleventh session. The latest report of the Special Committee made it clear that severe repression continued. The Assembly had more than once asserted its competence to discuss the question and in view of the gravity of the situation should have an opportunity to study the latest report.

56. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that while his delegation favoured Assembly discussion of any matter likely to constitute a threat to peace or to affect the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, he felt that the Committee should consider whether any useful purpose would be served at the present critical juncture by discussing the question of Hungary. The matter had been considered by the Special Committee and by the General Assembly during the previous year and resolutions had been adopted; further debate was likely to exacerbate tensions rather than to produce constructive results. It might be argued that an opportunity should be provided to air public opinion, but the Special Committee's report had been circulated to all Member States, which were consequently aware of the facts. Although his delegation would not oppose inclusion of the item, it would appeal to members of the Committee to consider the expediency of discussing such an issue at the present time.

57. Mr. TSIANG (China) could not accept that argument. The United Nations was morally bound at least to make an attempt to assist the Hungarian people, even if it should prove unsuccessful.

58. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the statement he had just made, the representative of Ceylon had very pertinently questioned the political expediency of raising the so-called question of Hungary in the General Assembly. That statement had made it clear that many representatives fully realized that to raise the question could serve only to worsen the atmosphere in the Assembly and to distract it from the solution of really important international problems.

59. At the same time it was no accident that Chiang Kai-shek's agent, the representative of those now engaged in acts of aggression in the Far East, should show interest in having the question discussed, in order to poison the international atmosphere and to worsen relations between States. The choice of the moment at which to stir up a new anti-Hungarian and anti-Soviet campaign revealed that those were the aims of its instigators.

60. It was not the first time that the representatives of the Western Powers, and primarily the representatives of the United States, had raised that question in the General Assembly. No one nowadays could any longer be misled by the spread of slanderous fabrications, long since refuted on the part of the enemies of the Hungarian people. On the present occasion the pretext used by the representatives of Australia

and Uruguay and their henchmen to intensify a campaign of slander against the Hungarian People's Republic was that of the sentences imposed by the Hungarian court on State criminals and traitors to the Hungarian people. The representatives of the United States and of the delegations supporting it should remember that the administration of justice was the domestic affair of every sovereign State. The Government of Hungary, and that Government alone, had the right to deal with traitors to the homeland, as prescribed by the domestic laws of the Hungarian People's Republic.

61. Discussion of the so-called question of Hungary in the General Assembly constituted open intervention in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State—the Hungarian People's Republic, whose Government had repeatedly protested in the strongest terms against the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of a question which was a purely domestic concern of the Hungarian people. The attempt by the representative of Uruguay to object to a reference to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter was made in vain, for under that Article of the Charter the question was not subject to discussion in the United Nations.

62. The reluctance to face those facts testified only to the intention of the United States Government to use the United Nations as a cover for its subversive activities against countries which had established, and which maintained, social and political systems that were not to its liking. Attempts to use the United Nations for such ends conflicted with its Charter.

63. In view of the foregoing, the delegation of the Soviet Union categorically opposed, and would vote against, the inclusion of the so-called item entitled "The situation in Hungary" in the agenda of the present session; it urged the members of the General Committee to recommend that the General Assembly should not include that item in its agenda, and thus contribute to the creation of a business-like atmosphere at a session at which a great many important international problems were to be considered.

64. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly supported the inclusion of the item. The latest report of the Special Committee on Hungary showed that the Soviet Union and the Hungarian authorities were continuing to act in complete defiance of the many resolutions adopted by a majority in the General Assembly. The present régime in that country had been forcibly imposed and was still maintained by Soviet forces which continued to deprive the Hungarian people of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the face of the continuing refusal of the Soviet and Hungarian authorities to co-operate with the Special Committee, the General Assembly should consider further measures to secure the withdrawal of alien troops and alleviate the plight of the Hungarian people.

65. Mr. HAGIWARA (Japan) said that while he agreed that restraint should be exercised in any discussion in the United Nations, he felt that uneasiness between Member States was more likely to be occasioned by the manner of such discussions than by the nature of the question discussed. His delegation believed that any question which had created international tension should be the subject of debate and in that belief had

supported the inclusion of such items as the questions of Algeria, Cyprus and problems relating to South Africa. His delegation would therefore vote for the inclusion of the question of Hungary.

66. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) considered that the General Assembly was already committed to a discussion of the Hungarian question and must rely on members to exercise restraint in the debate. His delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item.

67. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) said that his delegation did not in general favour the retention of an agenda item that had been repeatedly discussed without satisfactory results but felt that in the present case there were higher values involved than the peaceful conduct of the business of the General Assembly. Technically, it was the duty of the Assembly to discuss the question of Hungary because the Special Committee had submitted a further report. What was more, if the Assembly were to refuse to discuss the matter it would be untrue to the task assigned to it under article 55 of the Charter. When human rights and fundamental freedoms were in danger, the Assembly was bound to take up the matter. The representative of the Soviet Union had said that the administration of justice was a domestic affair. If the proceedings in Hungary could be called administration of justice, there might be some grounds for his objection, but since it was known that thousands of persons were continuing to suffer from the denial of fundamental freedoms, the General Assembly was fully competent to discuss the matter.

68. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that his delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item on the agenda. The suggestion put forward by the representative of Ceylon and other members would confront the General Assembly with a moral issue in that it would find itself in the position of supporting foreign interference in the affairs of a sovereign State and of appearing to be indifferent to the violation of fundamental rights. In any case, since the issue was still pending, discussion could not be avoided.

The Committee decided by 15 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 71.

69. Mr. SIK (Hungary) said that neither the statements made nor the votes taken altered the fact that the question under discussion was a purely domestic matter. His delegation continued to believe that any discussion of the item by the General Assembly was contrary to the Charter.

Mr. Sik (Hungary) withdrew.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/3915)

70. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to take a decision concerning the inclusion of an additional item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/3915), entitled:

"The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests."

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 THIRTEENTH
SESSION: ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UKRAINIAN
SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC (A/3920 and Add.1)

71. The CHAIRMAN further announced that the
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had requested the
inclusion in the agenda of an additional item entitled:

"The Organization of an international public health
and medical research year ."

He suggested that its inclusion should be considered
at the Committee's next meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.