

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 423rd
MEETING



Tuesday, 10 December 1963,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 30:</i>	
<i>The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and replies by Member States under General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) (concluded).</i>	253
<i>Agenda items 81, 82 and 12:</i>	
<i>Question of the composition of the General Committee of the General Assembly (continued)</i>	256
<i>Question of equitable representation on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XIII (section VI)) (continued).</i>	

Chairman: Mr. Mihail HASEGANU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 30

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa: reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and replies by Member States under General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) (A/5405, A/5413, A/5414, A/5422, A/5424, A/5425, A/5427, A/5439, A/5449, A/5451, A/5452, A/5454, A/5457, A/5458, A/5472, A/5474, A/5497 and Add.1 and 2, A/5554, A/5563, A/5577, A/5583, A/5588, A/5614 and Add.1-3, A/SPC/80, A/SPC/81, A/SPC/82, A/SPC/83, A/SPC/84, A/SPC/85, A/SPC/86/Rev.1, A/SPC/95, A/SPC/96, A/SPC/L.95, A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2, A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2) (concluded)*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine draft resolutions A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 and A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2.
2. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that nearly sixty delegations had expressed a desire to join as sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 and A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2. Some changes had to be made in those texts, however, to take into account suggestions made to the sponsors.
3. In draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2, in the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 the words "persons persecuted in the Republic of South Africa" should be replaced by "persons persecuted by the Government of the Republic of South Africa". The intention was to provide relief for refugees outside the territory of the Republic of South

Africa as well. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees should be empowered to look after all and any refugees and in particular those from South Africa.

4. Many delegations had stated that they had some difficulty in supporting draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 as it stood. After the unanimous adoption of General Assembly resolution 1881 (XVIII) and the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963,^{1/} it was important that the Committee's debate on the question of apartheid should likewise close with a unanimous vote, so that the Government of South Africa would not have a leg to stand on. Consequently, in a spirit of co-operation and after consulting most of the sponsors, he proposed the substitution of the following single paragraph for operative paragraphs 1 and 3:

"1. Appeals to all States to take appropriate measures and intensify their efforts, separately and collectively, with a view to dissuading the Government of the Republic of South Africa from pursuing its policies of apartheid, and requests them, in particular, to implement fully the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963."

5. Some delegations had pointed out that setting down in two separate paragraphs the two actions requested of Member States might create difficulties; while other delegations had found the original text too precise in that it requested States to take measures on the basis of the recommendations of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. The members of that Committee were convinced that the measures to be taken would necessarily be based on those recommendations; in their opinion, the new text was no different in substance from the original draft resolution.

6. He urged those sponsors who, for one reason or another, but not through any lack of goodwill, had not been consulted to support the new text. He felt sure that the revised draft would be adopted unanimously.

7. Mr. HORVATH (Hungary) said that his delegation had unreservedly supported paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2. His country would abide strictly by the letter and spirit of the resolutions of the Assembly and the Security Council. As a member of the Special Committee it had supported that Committee's recommendations. His delegation would therefore have preferred the original text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 to be adopted. Nevertheless, in a spirit of co-operation, it would agree to co-sponsor the revised text and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

8. Mr. HORAN (Ireland) said that he had not yet spoken in the debate, but that his delegation had never missed an opportunity of expressing the Irish people's and Government's condemnation of the inhuman and im-

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Eighteenth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1963, document S/5471.

*Resumed from the 421st meeting.

moral policies of the South African Government. South Africa's racial policy was contrary to natural law. It was degrading not only to its victims but also to those who had conceived it. There was no doubt at all that it deliberately sought to keep the majority of the population of South Africa in a state of perpetual servitude. The Irish people, who knew the meaning of oppression, condemned it utterly. Ireland was therefore very anxious to play its part in the eradication of apartheid and was prepared to vote for appropriate measures.

9. The unanimous adoption of General Assembly resolution 1881 (XVIII) and the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963 has marked some progress, and a tribute should be paid to the Nordic countries, particularly Norway, for the role they had played in that issue.

10. His delegation was in full sympathy with the sponsors of the two draft resolutions before the Committee. Nevertheless, prior to the statement by the representative of Guinea, it had been wondering whether any useful purpose would be served by adopting these resolutions. If they were carried, the number of resolutions adopted during the current session to end apartheid would be increased to four. The United Nations had already acted with efficacy in adopting the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963 and General Assembly resolution 1881 (XVIII).

11. His delegation shared the solicitude of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2 for the families of the victims of apartheid. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General and the Organization itself might find it difficult to implement the provisions of that resolution. The Secretary-General might even be placed in an embarrassing position. The Irish delegation did not know whether he had been consulted before the draft resolution had been prepared, and thought that the international agencies referred to in operative paragraph 1 could not operate in a country without being authorized and even invited to do so by the country's authorities; it was hardly possible to say whether the South African authorities would extend such an invitation. Nevertheless, in view of the humanitarian aim of the draft resolution, his delegation would vote for it.

12. The preamble to draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2, even in its revised form, still contained a reference to resolution 1761 (XVII) which his delegation had voted against. With reservations on that score, his delegation would vote notwithstanding for draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 in its amended form.

13. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea), replying to questions raised by the Irish representative, said that resolution 1881 (XVIII) dealt with only one particular aspect of the question of apartheid, namely, the trial of eleven South African nationalists. The Security Council had, at the request of thirty-two African countries, considered the threat to international peace and security arising from apartheid, and in so doing, it had not intended in any way to prevent action being taken by other organs concerned with the question, namely, the General Assembly and the Special Committee whose report was before the Special Political Committee. The latter must take action on the question as a whole.

14. The Secretariat had indeed been consulted and was in a position to do what was requested of it. There would be no question of the Secretary-General setting up a special service but to operate, as requested in draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2, through

international agencies, including the Red Cross and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

15. As regards the reference to resolution 1761 (XVII), the basic document before the Committee was the report of the Special Committee which had been established by that very resolution. He would remind those who were concerned about the reference to that resolution that nowhere else was any specific obligation formally recorded. The delegations from Asia, Africa and elsewhere which had come out unequivocally for the need for vigorous measures considered that resolution 1761 (XVII) was too weak in present circumstances. They had agreed to moderate their demands so as not to hamper measures being taken elsewhere, particularly in the Security Council. Nevertheless, they wished it to be understood that they had done their utmost and while they had accepted a compromise, they could not compromise with their conscience. The wording of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 represented the minimum that any African or Asian State could support. For that reason the sponsors were confident that it would be adopted unanimously.

16. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) welcomed the Guinean representative's amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2. His delegation wished to express its appreciation of the spirit of co-operation shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

17. Mr. ORDOÑEZ (Colombia) said that his delegation had always condemned the hateful policy of apartheid which was now a challenge to all mankind and to the United Nations. It was clear that the draft resolutions before the Committee were hardly likely to inspire optimism in Member States which had always striven to bring about a radical change in the racial policy of the Republic of South Africa. The creation of parallel bodies to follow developments in South Africa might impede co-ordinated action and prevent progress in the struggle against apartheid. In virtue of paragraphs 6 and 8 of the Security Council resolution of 4 December 1963 and paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2, the group of experts, the Secretary-General and the Special Committee would each have specific functions. Where paragraph 6 of the Security Council resolution was concerned, he wondered whether it might not be more logical to instruct the group of experts in question to see to it that Member States which had supported police repression in South Africa by sending arms put an immediate end to the sale and shipment of such arms. The group of experts could undertake the task if the countries concerned accepted surveillance for that purpose, thus proving the sincerity of their vote in favour of the Security Council's resolution. Otherwise, paragraph 5 of that resolution would have no practical value.

18. He recalled the difficulties pointed out in the Security Council: where to draw the line between weapons which could be used within the country and weapons needed for national security; and how to distinguish between peace industries and war industries, when in many cases both used the same raw materials. Such considerations perplexed the countries which wished to avoid a racial conflict in South Africa. There was a real danger that the limited effectiveness of the economic measures envisaged in the Security Council's resolution of 4 December 1963, plus a lack of sincerity on the part of certain countries which were continuing

their trade with the Pretoria Government, might bring the Organization's efforts to nought. Secondly, his delegation did not approve of the use of the word "experts" in paragraph 6 of the Security Council's resolution. The word "experts" belonged in the scientific field. In using that term, the sponsors had had in mind a body different in kind from the Special Committee. The group of experts should simply have been commissioned to see whether the economic provisions of the resolution had been applied, not to prepare a new report on the political factors, with which everyone was familiar. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of South Africa was invited, under paragraph 7 of the Security Council's resolution, to avail itself of the assistance of that group in order to bring about peaceful and orderly transformation. But the South African Government would as usual reply that the United Nations was interfering in the country's internal affairs. There was little reason to expect any other response than that implied in the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, for the Government characterized as Communist any attempt to bring about political, industrial, social or economic reforms through the mediation of any foreign Government or international organization. In other words, the very act of circulating resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council would henceforth constitute an offence.

19. He had referred to the Security Council's resolution of 4 December 1963 in order to define his position: that the draft resolutions now before the Committee would not suffice to attain the desired objective, but that he approved unreservedly of the delegations which had submitted them.

20. The Latin American countries were happy to see that the peoples of Africa were bringing to the Organization a new dynamism which would certainly help to advance the political and social rights of all peoples.

21. His delegation would vote for draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2, which invited Member States and organizations to contribute generously to provide relief and assistance to the families of all persons persecuted in the Republic of South Africa for their opposition to the policies of apartheid.

22. Lastly, he protested against the use of the words "bloc" and "group" to designate a certain identity of views on international problems. Those terms, which implied closed geographical, ethnic or cultural communities should be abandoned and replaced by some such expression as "working group".

23. Mr. HALL LLOREDA (Guatemala) said that his country was resolutely opposed to all forms of discrimination, whether political, racial or religious. He therefore supported the revised draft resolution (A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2) and draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2, in the hope that both texts would be adopted unanimously.

24. Mr. HORAN (Ireland) thanked the Guinean representative for his very circumstantial explanations. However, he remained unconvinced that the situation in South Africa constituted a threat to the peace, at least for the moment.

25. When he had spoken of a plethora of resolutions, it had been because, as another representative had said, there could be too much of a good thing. However, his remarks had been prepared before he had heard the Guinean representative's statement.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that if adopted, draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 could have financial implications; the representative of the Secretary-General would therefore make a statement on that subject, in conformity with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

27. Mr. HARPIGNIES (Secretariat) said that adoption by the General Assembly of the revised draft resolution (A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2) would have financial implications, for the penultimate operative paragraph requested the Secretary-General to furnish the Special Committee with all the necessary means for the effective accomplishment of its task. However, on the assumption that the requirements of the Special Committee in 1964 would remain at the 1963 level, the Secretary-General expected to be able to meet them within the total budget appropriation for 1964. Adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 would not therefore entail any additional expenditure.

28. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) stated that his country had always rejected racial discrimination in all its forms and demonstrated its condemnation by supporting all the resolutions on that topic.

29. His delegation thought that draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2, as revised, was fundamental, and regarded draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2 as auxiliary. Before taking up a definitive position on the latter text, his delegation would like to know the Secretary-General's opinion on a particular point. In operative paragraph 1, the Secretary-General was requested "to seek ways and means of providing relief and other assistance, through the appropriate international agencies, to the families of all persons persecuted in the Republic of South Africa for their opposition to the policies of apartheid". Did the Secretary-General believe that, from a practical standpoint, he would be able to do what was asked of him, and could he do it without violating the principles of non-interference?

30. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that the Secretariat had been duly consulted on whether it could implement operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2. Its reply had been in the affirmative, but the representative of the Secretary-General might perhaps wish to confirm that.

31. Mr. HARPIGNIES (Secretariat) said that the Secretary-General had been consulted about operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2. His reply had been "no comment"; in other words, he had expressed no objection to the task that would be entrusted to him.

32. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee had completed its debate on the two draft resolutions concerning apartheid. He put to the vote draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 in its revised form.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2, in its revised form, was adopted unanimously.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would consider draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2 adopted unanimously.

34. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he had no objection but that, because of the reply given by the representative of the Secretary-General, he would prefer to abstain from voting.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2 was adopted unopposed, Mexico abstaining.

35. Mr. JACKLING (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation was glad to have been able to concur in the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/L.102 and Add.1 and 2 and had much appreciated the action of the co-sponsors in amending operative paragraphs 1 and 3 and thus making a unanimous vote possible. As to operative paragraph 1, it would be remembered that in the Security Council the United Kingdom representative had stated at the 1078th meeting that the situation in South Africa did not justify action under Chapter VII of the Charter with respect to threats to the peace and breaches of the peace. His Government's position on that question remained unchanged. The United Kingdom also maintained the reservations it had made to the Security Council resolutions of 7 August 1963^{2/} and 4 December 1963, which it would carry out as fully as was compatible with its reservations.

36. His delegation shared whole-heartedly the humanitarian sentiments of the sponsors of resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2. It had, indeed, voted in plenary for resolution 1881 (XVIII). Furthermore, the United Kingdom Government had drawn the attention of the South African Government to the strength of public opinion in the United Kingdom aroused by the trials. The resolution caused his delegation some doubts, which had already been expressed by the representative of Ireland. It thought that matters of that kind should be left to the initiative of private individuals and non-governmental organizations, and was not sure that the United Nations ought to be involved in such a way. Nevertheless, sympathizing with the sponsors aims, it had not felt called upon to ask for a formal vote on the draft resolution.

37. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had been very pleased by the unanimous vote on resolution A/SPC/L.103 and Add.1 and 2. It considered, however, that the circumstances were unusual and that the resolution should not be regarded as a precedent.

38. Mr. SIDIBABA (Morocco), speaking in explanation of vote, felt bound to point out that the reservations expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom in the Security Council—which had not been the only ones—had been withdrawn before the vote. Just after the Committee had adopted a resolution unanimously it should hardly have been necessary to refer to the reservations expressed in the Security Council.

39. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) sincerely thanked all those who had worked for a unanimous vote. The important thing was not so much to adopt resolutions as to carry them out. It had been quite amply demonstrated that, although apartheid was unanimously condemned by world opinion—a condemnation reflected in the unanimous adoption of three resolutions, two by the General Assembly and one by the Security Council—the next stage must be that of practical execution. He therefore made a special and urgent appeal to the States which still maintained very close relations with the South African Government in all matters to convert the intentions so clearly expressed by the United Nations into action. He hoped that on the present occasion those who held the key to the apartheid problem would not hesitate to use it. The fate of the whole people, and even of international peace and security, was at stake.

40. Mr. JACKLING (United Kingdom) said in exercise of his right of reply that he had had no intention of adding to the reservations expressed by his delegation during the Security Council debate. He had referred only to those recorded in the verbatim report of the 1078th meeting of the Security Council.

AGENDA ITEMS 81, 82 AND 12

Question of the composition of the General Committee of the General Assembly (A/5519, A/SPC/L.101, A/SPC/L.106) (continued)

Question of equitable representation on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council (A/5520 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.104, A/SPC/L.105) (continued)

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XIII (section VI)) (A/5503) (continued)

41. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the request by the Asian and African States which had led to the inclusion of the present item in the Assembly's agenda had been a natural continuation of the struggle of those States to consolidate their independence after decades and even centuries during which their wishes had been suppressed by foreign colonialists. The Soviet Union understood and sympathized with their aspirations for equitable representation on the principal organs of the United Nations. At the General Assembly's fifteenth session it had taken the initiative resulting in the adoption of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)). At the same time it had called for a radical change in the structure of United Nations organs, including the Security Council, so as to secure equitable representation in those organs for three groups of States—the socialist countries, the neutral countries and the countries belonging to Western military blocs. The adoption of that proposal would have given Africa and Asia truly equitable representation and a greater role in the United Nations; he drew the Committee's attention to the statement made in that connexion by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR at the 869th plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The Soviet Union would continue to work for changes in the composition of United Nations organs which would make the Organization reflect the interests of the three main groups of States and enable it to protect the interests of all Member States.

42. The need for such changes had become self-evident, and it was only fair that the new African and Asian States should be properly represented in United Nations organs; recognition of that fact was an integral part of the Soviet Union's well-known policy of supporting the struggle of peoples to win and strengthen their independence. In the circumstances it was surprising to hear the representatives of some Powers suggest that the Soviet Union did not agree on the need to settle the question of such representation. The present preferential position of the Western Powers in the United Nations structure operated to the disadvantage not only of the neutral countries, but of the socialist countries as well. No representative of any socialist country had ever been permitted to hold the office of President of the General Assembly; and for nine of the eighteen years of the Organization's existence the countries of Eastern Europe had been denied their elective seat in the Security Council. Lastly, the settlement of the important question of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations had

^{2/} Ibid., Eighteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1963, document S/5386.

thus far been sabotaged; because the Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, had been working consistently to improve the structure of the principal United Nations organs through recognition of the principle of equal treatment of all States, it could not agree to any further delay in settling that question. It was evident that on the question of representation in the United Nations the vital interests of the socialist countries and the neutral States fully coincided.

43. In the Soviet view, the proposal made by the neutral States and supported by the Soviet Union at the fifteenth session for redistribution of the existing elective seats in the Security Council still offered real possibilities for meeting the wishes of the African-Asian countries for more adequate representation in that Council and in the Economic and Social Council. Since the conclusion of the 1946 agreement on the distribution of the elective seats in the Security Council, the number of Asian and African Member States had greatly increased and that of socialist Member States had doubled, while the number of Latin American Member States had remained the same, and that of Western European Member States almost the same as before. The 1946 agreement should therefore be superseded by a new agreement assigning one elective seat in the Security Council to each of the six main geographical areas of the world—Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. The question of a redistribution of seats in the Economic and Social Council could also be appropriately settled on that basis. He reaffirmed the Soviet position in that regard, as stated in the letter dated 5 September 1963 from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee of the Committee on arrangements for a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter (A/AC.81/SC.1/4/Add.11), and its willingness to help work out an agreement on that basis.

44. The Soviet Union also sympathized with the African-Asian countries' desire to obtain wider representation in the principal organs of the United Nations through an increase in the membership of those organs. However, in the case of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, such an increase would entail revision of the Charter, which in turn required the approval of all five permanent members of the Security Council. That meant that the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must be recognized before the Charter could be amended in keeping with its letter and spirit. In view of the desire of the independent African and Asian countries for immediate action, the Soviet Government had consulted the Government of the People's Republic of China, which was the only legal representative of China and a permanent member of the Security Council. The latter Government had replied that, since China was still barred from participation in the Organization's work, it would make no commitments on any amendments of the Charter relating to the total number of seats in the principal United Nations organs, and that agreement on its part to revision of the Charter while the Chiang Kai-shek representative was present in the United Nations might lead to the creation of a "two-China situation". The Government of the People's Republic of China had thus made it plain that it did not approve of any attempt to settle the question of equitable representation by increasing the membership of the organs in question, and that it favoured instead an equitable distribution of the existing seats in those organs. It was consequently difficult to understand why

certain African-Asian delegations should claim to have its support for their proposals to increase the membership of the Councils before the question of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations had been settled.

45. The Soviet Union supported the demand of the Government of the People's Republic of China for the restoration of those rights and therefore could not vote for any proposal to amend the Charter of the United Nations in the absence of a representative of that Government as a permanent member of the Security Council. If the African-Asian Member States would give that demand their unanimous support, that would remove the main obstacle to increasing the membership of the two Councils so as to give those States proper representation. Under the present circumstances, however, the only practical way to increase their representation was to redistribute the existing seats. His delegation hoped that, in the light of those considerations, an equitable solution to the problem of representation on the Councils could be found.

46. The Soviet delegation agreed with those African and Asian representatives who had pointed out that the question of the composition of the General Committee did not involve revision of the Charter and could therefore be settled by the General Assembly without delay. However, the principle of equitable representation embodied in the relevant draft resolution (A/SPC/L.101) should be extended to apply to the President of the General Assembly. In order to settle a long-standing issue, agreement should be reached at the present session on the establishment of a system of geographical rotation in the election of Presidents of the General Assembly. Since an Asian and a Latin American had presided over the Assembly at its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions respectively, the Presidents at the next four sessions should come in turn from Africa, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Western Europe, and the rotation should then begin again. His delegation was, however, sufficiently optimistic to believe that if the principle of equitable representation was approved by the General Assembly for application to the composition of the General Committee, as proposed in draft resolution A/SPC/L.101, it would be firmly entrenched in United Nations practice. The purpose of his delegation's proposal at the fifteenth session to reconstruct the organs of the United Nations had been to give truly universal scope to the principle of the equality of States and groups of States. That principle was in the interests of a vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations and of all peoples; he was sure that it would triumph.

47. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea), speaking on a motion of order, stated that all members of the Committee, and particularly those from Africa and Asia, had listened with all due attention to the Soviet representative's statement, which ruined all hope of achieving adequate representation of the States of Africa and Asia at the present session. He moved formally that the text of the Soviet representative's statement should be published in full as a document of the Committee. In addition, since the Soviet representative had referred to statements by certain African and Asian representatives, he reminded the Committee that on 30 September 1963 the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Guinea had said in the General Assembly (1220th plenary meeting) that the restitution to the People's Republic of China of its legitimate rights and the just representation claimed by the countries of Africa and Asia were two different questions, which

the Peking leaders had had the wisdom and foresight not to bind together. The Guinean Government had since been informed from an official source that that was in fact the position of the Peking leaders. It had also been informed publicly and solemnly that they were absolutely opposed to the injustice done to the countries of Africa and Asia by their present representation in the different organs of the United Nations. It was perfectly understandable that the Peking Government, not being a Member of the United Nations, could not in the present circumstances enter into any commitment concerning enlargement of the membership of the Councils by amendment. But the Soviet representative seemed to conclude that the Peking Government did not at present accept the idea of enlarging the two Councils by amending the Charter. That was an extremely important statement of position, which the African States wished to examine very carefully so that they could take informed decisions and make representations to the authorities who could play a decisive part in the matter.

The Guinean representative's motion that the full text of the Soviet representative's statement should be circulated was adopted.^{3/}

^{3/} The complete text of the statement was subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/96.

48. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee had just witnessed yet another use of the veto, which the small countries had never ceased to denounce. Once again it had seen a great Power block a move towards what had always been a legitimate aspiration and a legitimate claim for the countries of Africa and Asia. But that Power's arguments had not convinced those countries. In order that delegations might study the statement at leisure and informal groups reach an understanding on the new situation, he formally moved that there should be no meeting before the following afternoon.

49. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a question from Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea), said that the text of the Soviet representative's statement could be circulated in the working languages by noon on Wednesday, 11 December 1963.

50. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that if no decision had been taken by 20 December, it might be necessary to postpone closure of the session so that the discussion could continue until the injustices done to the States of Africa and Asia were remedied.

51. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) formally proposed that the Committee should not meet until the afternoon of 12 December 1963.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.