

**United Nations Conference on the Representation of States  
in Their Relations with International Organizations**

Vienna, Austria  
4 February - 14 March 1975

Document:-  
**A/CONF.67/10 and Add.1**

**Report of the Credentials Committee**

Extract from Volume II of the *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations (Documents of the Conference)*

## A. REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Document A/CONF.67/10 \* and Add.1 \*\*

*Original: English*  
10 March 1975

1. At its 2nd plenary meeting on 5 February 1975, the Conference, in accordance with rule 4 of the rules of procedure, appointed a Credentials Committee consisting of the following nine members: Belgium, Ecuador, Guatemala, Hungary, Ivory Coast, Philippines, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon and United States of America.

2. The Credentials Committee met on 6 March 1975.

3. Mr. José Plana (Philippines) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee.

4. The Committee had before it a memorandum by the Executive Secretary of the Conference dated 3 March 1975 and Addendum 1, dated 6 March 1975, according to which, as at 6 March 1975:

(a) invitations to participate in the Conference had been issued to 150 States (138 Member States of the United Nations and 12 non-member States). As of 6 March 1975, 81 States were participating in the Conference and 2 States (Iran and Portugal) had sent observers;

(b) formal credentials under rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure had been received by the Executive Secretary of the Conference from the following 76 States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Viet-Nam, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zaire;

(c) the lists of representatives of two States had been communicated to the Executive Secretary by note verbale or letter: Greece and Nigeria;

(d) the credentials of three States had been communicated to the Executive Secretary in the form of cables: Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, Oman and Uruguay.

5. The Chairman invited the members of the Committee to comment on the memorandum of the Executive Secretary.

6. The representative of Hungary stated that, according to the Act of the International Conference on Viet-Nam, there existed two administrations in South Viet-Nam—the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam and the Saigon authorities. In the view of her delegation, it was abnormal, inadmissible and contrary to existing international agreements that the Saigon authorities alone be represented at the Conference. In the view of her delegation, therefore, the powers of this administration could not be interpreted as authorizing it unilaterally to represent South Viet-Nam. With regard to the credentials of the Khmer Republic, the Hungarian delegation wished to state that the Government of Hungary recognized the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia as the sole and legitimate representative of the Cambodian people.

7. The representative of the United States objected to the raising of issues extraneous to the functions of the Committee. In his view, the function of the Committee was confined to the implementation of rule 4 of the rules of procedure of the Conference, that is to say, to examine credentials of representatives and report to the Conference. It was not for the Committee to express itself on the legitimacy or illegitimacy of any Government. The representative of Ecuador also expressed the opinion that the function of the Committee was limited by the rules of procedure to an examination of the credentials of representatives and to report thereon to the Conference.

8. The representative of the Ivory Coast said that his Government favoured universal participation in international conferences, but that it did not believe it should interfere in the internal affairs of other States.

9. The representative of the United Republic of Cameroon said that he supported the views expressed

\* Incorporating documents A/CONF.67/10/Corr.1 and 2 of 11 and 13 March 1975.

\*\* Document A/CONF.67/10/Add.1 of 13 March 1975 was issued: (a) to add to the list of States contained in paragraph 4 (b) above, the following States: Bangladesh, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia; (b) to delete Peru, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia from the list of States contained in subparagraph (c); (c) to delete Bangladesh and Qatar from the list of States contained in subparagraph (d); and (d) to delete a footnote that referred to two countries mentioned in subparagraphs (c) and (d).

by the representative of Hungary and stated that the report of the Committee should reflect the observations of delegations concerning the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam and the Khmer Republic.

10. The representatives of Belgium, Guatemala, Philippines and Thailand associated themselves with the statement made by the representative of the United States.

11. The Chairman proposed that, as an exceptional measure, the Committee should accept the communications of those Governments listed in paragraphs 4 (c) and 4 (d) above, in lieu of formal credentials, and that the substance of the views expressed by the members of the Committee be reflected in the report. Subject to the views expressed in the report, the Committee considered that the delegations present at the Conference should be seated.