

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1087th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 20 December 1961,
at 9 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 79:</i> <i>Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV) (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the Fourth Committee</i>	1165
<i>Agenda item 39:</i> <i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued)</i> <i>Report of the Fourth Committee</i>	1166
<i>Agenda item 20:</i> <i>The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea</i> <i>Report of the First Committee</i>	1171
<i>Agenda item 78:</i> <i>Complaint by Cuba of threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba</i> <i>Report of the First Committee</i>	1174
<i>Agenda item 95:</i> <i>United Nations Year for international co-operation</i>	1174
<i>Agenda item 89:</i> <i>Question of Hungary</i>	1174
<i>Adjournment of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly</i>	1179

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 79

Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV) (concluded)*

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I suggest that before embarking upon agenda item 39 we should first consider a question which seems to me a simple and easy one and which relates to the election of the members of the Committee established un-

*Resumed from the 1083rd meeting.

der the resolution [1699 (XVI)] which was adopted yesterday [1083rd meeting] by the General Assembly with regard to the question of the non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV). The members of the Assembly will recall that in accordance with paragraph 3 of this resolution the Assembly has established a Special Committee of Seven members who must be elected by the Assembly itself.

2. The Chairman of the Fourth Committee has just informed me that that Committee has elected the members of the Special Committee and I shall now call on her to read out the list of these members.

3. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), Chairman of the Fourth Committee: As the President has just stated, among other reports presented to the Assembly yesterday [1083rd meeting] relating to information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, was the report [A/4998] concerning the item: "Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and resolution 1542 (XV) of the General Assembly".

4. The General Assembly adopted the resolution which appeared in paragraph 19 of the report, and under paragraph 3 of that resolution [1699 (XVI)], the Assembly decided to establish a special committee of seven members to deal with certain problems concerning Territories under Portuguese administration. At its 1257th meeting this afternoon, the Fourth Committee held elections by secret ballot to elect the seven members, in accordance with the requirements of operative paragraph 3 of the resolution.

5. I have the honour, as Chairman of the Fourth Committee, to inform the General Assembly that as a result of these elections the following countries have become members of the Committee of Seven: Bulgaria, Ceylon, Cyprus, Colombia, Guatemala, Guinea and Nigeria.

6. May I request the President to be good enough to ask the Assembly to approve the action taken by the Fourth Committee? I also wish to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Assembly to the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1] on the matters considered by it too late for action to be taken on them yesterday along with the other reports of the Fourth Committee.

7. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The General Assembly has just heard the list of the members elected by the Fourth Committee to form the Special Committee of Seven. If there are no objections, I shall consider that the General Assembly has confirmed the elections which took place in the Fourth Committee this afternoon [1257th meeting].

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 39

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued)

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

8. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In paragraph 16 of its report [A/4997/Add.1] the Fourth Committee expresses a desire to continue the discussion of agenda item 39 at the resumed session of the General Assembly. I now put this recommendation of the Fourth Committee to the General Assembly.

9. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): My delegation is opposed to the recommendation of the Fourth Committee that this part of the item dealing with Non-Self-Governing Territories be carried over to the resumed session. The matters which are immediately concerned were brought up at the last minute, in the closing days of the session. The main body of the item has been dealt with and it seems to us that, as a matter of principle, it is unsound to burden a resumed session with matters which are, in effect, new items brought up at the last minute in the main session of the Assembly and that, if this procedure were followed, there would be no end to the sessions of the Assembly and we would proceed indefinitely as individual delegations felt that items were deserving of consideration.

10. We in no way wish to imply that the items covered by the draft resolutions mentioned in the report are not deserving of consideration. They do raise very serious questions about the entire role of the United Nations in connexion with Non-Self-Governing Territories and deserve the most thorough debate. But in our view, that debate should take place at the next session of the General Assembly. We feel that it would be a mistake to attempt to deal with these items at the resumed sixteenth session, which will deal, as the General Committee decided the other day, with the problems of Angola and of Ruanda-Urundi. For that reason, we object to the addition of this particular item to the agenda of the resumed session.

11. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): In the opinion of my delegation, we ought not to extend the list of subjects to be considered at the resumed session beyond the two items relating to Angola and Ruanda-Urundi; that, I believe, was the intention of the General Committee, and I support that Committee's view, that we ought not at this time to add these two subjects.

12. In particular, we ought not to add two subjects which have been raised at the very last moment and without proper notice. My delegation therefore opposes the proposal to add these two particular subjects to the agenda of the resumed session.

13. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) (translated from French): I must apologize for having insisted on intervening in this discussion. In view of the little time available to us, I shall be as brief as were the two speakers who preceded me. I simply wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that we have twice been compelled to come to the rostrum in order to explain that on certain particular questions votes have been taken in the Fourth Committee, usually following conversations and compromises which endeavoured to give satisfaction to the great majority of delegations, and that twice these questions have

been brought up again here. It will have been noticed that paragraph 17 of the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1] mentions the fact that the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States of America reserved the positions of their Governments with regard to the consideration of the two draft resolutions in question. This means that certain delegations, including my own, submitted two draft resolutions to the Fourth Committee, as mentioned in the report, and that in a spirit of conciliation and in order to expedite the work of the Committee we saw fit to defer to a wish expressed by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom and to request that consideration of these two draft resolutions should be postponed until the resumed session next month.

14. It will therefore be understood that my delegation cannot allow this attempt to present the attitude of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom as a spontaneous move for eliminating the discussion of item 39 to pass unchallenged. I wish to state that the question will be considered and that it is important that each delegation should know that it was in order to please the United Kingdom and the United States that we agreed that consideration of this question should be postponed until the resumed session in January. It is only right that this fact should be known.

15. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I believe the question just submitted by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom to be contrary to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, for item 39, which the Fourth Committee has not yet had time to consider, is on the agenda of the sixteenth session of the Assembly. As we know, those agenda items which have not yet been discussed will be considered by the Fourth Committee and the resumed session of the Assembly. Therefore, if the representatives of the United States or the United Kingdom wish to delete an item from the agenda, let them submit a formal proposal for the deletion of item 39 from the agenda of the sixteenth session, and then we will take a vote.

16. As the President of the General Assembly rightly pointed out yesterday, a two-thirds majority is needed to delete any item from the agenda which has been approved by the sixteenth session. Therefore, the question of our objecting to the discussion at the resumed session of a particular item does not arise at the moment. All the items not discussed at the sixteenth session and not deleted from the agenda of the sixteenth session remain on the agenda of the resumed session. If you wish to delete any item, you must submit a formal proposal for the deletion of item 39 from the agenda, and we can then take a vote.

17. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (translated from French): I shall be brief. Having been privileged to attend both the meeting of the General Committee and those of the Fourth Committee, I feel that the matter is quite clear. When the General Committee made its recommendation [143rd meeting], the majority of its members felt that it was necessary to suspend the session and to resume it in order to consider the two items on the agenda relating to Ruanda-Urundi and Angola, because technical reasons had prevented the consideration of those two items. The General Committee—or at least the majority of the Committee—felt that at its resumed session the General Assembly should limit itself to those two

items. At that meeting of the General Committee, we were told that in deciding which items should be kept on the agenda we should let ourselves be guided by considerations of urgency rather than of importance, since all questions were important per se.

18. On the other hand, the majority of the members of the Fourth Committee considered that item 39 should be kept on the agenda of the resumed session.

19. The problem is a simple one: it is a matter of voting on whether or not item 39 should be kept on the agenda. However—and this is why I asked to speak—I am not in agreement with the representative of the Soviet Union when he speaks of a two-thirds majority vote. In fact, the relevant provision in this instance is rule 22 of the rules of procedure, according to which "Items on the agenda may be amended or deleted by the General Assembly by a majority of the Members present and voting". It is this rule which must be applied to the case in point.

20. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): Very briefly, I want to say, in reply to the comments of the representative of Mali, that he must have misunderstood the position of the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Fourth Committee. It is true that we were opposed to the draft resolutions to which he refers, and that they were clearly opposed in that Committee. But we did not ask that they be carried over to the resumed session. I think that paragraph 17 of the Fourth Committee's report [A/4997/Add.1] makes it quite clear that we reserved our decision on the question of their being carried over to the resumed session.

21. With regard to the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union, it is not a fact that item 39 of the agenda was not reached in the course of the discussions of the Fourth Committee. Many days were spent, in the course of the discussions of that Committee, in dealing with the problems of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. A number of resolutions were submitted, and adopted by the Assembly, covering the problems of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The only problems that were not reached for full discussion were those raised by the two draft resolutions submitted in the last two days of the session.

22. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I be permitted to explain the position? I have no request before me for the deletion of a question; I have simply a report of the Fourth Committee, paragraph 16 of which contains a recommendation. As is the practice in respect of all recommendations made by Committees, I propose to put the explicit and clear recommendation in paragraph 16 of the report of the Fourth Committee (A/4997/Add.1) to the vote; it reads as follows:

"In the light of these recommendations, the Chairman announced that she would convey to the General Assembly the desire of the Committee to continue the discussion of agenda item 39 at the resumed session of the General Assembly."

I intend to request the Assembly to take a decision with regard to this paragraph.

23. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, I should like to make one comment on the statement made by the representative of France in which he tried to prove that the General Committee has already decided to

propose something about the agenda and has, in some way, limited the General Assembly as regards the agenda for the resumed session. As one who took part in the work of the General Committee, I should like to recall that that Committee did make a recommendation about certain particular items, which by that time were perfectly clear, and those items were reported to the General Assembly. All the remaining items were still being debated in committee, and the General Committee could not make any recommendations for that reason. The General Committee accordingly could not prejudge a decision on any of the remaining items.

24. Secondly, I should like to draw your attention, Mr. President, to your own comment and the view which you have just expressed. The fact is that there is no need to confirm a decision of a Committee, since no proposal has been submitted for the deletion from the agenda of item 39, the discussion on which has not been completed. There is, therefore, no reason for us to confirm once more that item 39 is still on the agenda. It remains on the agenda without any such confirmation. All that we can do is to take note of the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1]. Such, indeed, is the case. The report of the Fourth Committee has been submitted to us: it contains the views of the Fourth Committee on how to discuss item 39, and we must take note of that. But this item remains on the agenda of the sixteenth session, because no one has proposed its deletion from the agenda.

25. That is all that I wish to say, and I trust that you, Mr. President, will act in this matter in accordance with the rules of procedure.

26. Lastly, I also want to say in connexion with the statement of the representative of France that his reference to rule 22 of the rules of procedure is irrelevant, because rule 22 refers to the original approval of the agenda by the Assembly. It refers to the approval of the items on the provisional agenda which is circulated before each Assembly, and this rule states that:

"Items on the agenda may be amended or deleted by the General Assembly by a majority of the Members present and voting."

27. Thus, rule 22 refers exclusively to the original approval of the agenda. But, if it has been decided to adopt the agenda, any decision involving a change in a proposal already adopted requires a two-thirds majority, in accordance with rule 83.

28. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would point out that in its report [A/4997/Add.1] the Fourth Committee has expressed a desire which it addresses to the General Assembly. That desire consists not only of a request that item 39 of the agenda should be discussed but also that it should be discussed at the resumed session. If there had been no formal opposition to this recommendation of the Fourth Committee, I should not put it to the vote but should merely ask the Assembly to take note of it. This desire of the Fourth Committee has, however, met with formal opposition and I am compelled to ask the Assembly to vote on paragraph 16 of the report of that Committee.

29. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, I am very sorry to take up so much of your time and the time of the Assembly, but this is a very important question because the decision on it will determine our approach to similar questions.

30. I must say that what you have just explained to the General Assembly only confirms the view which I took the liberty of expressing before you spoke. Indeed, if you wish to put this question to the vote simply because objections have been raised to the views of the Committee as set forth in its report, this means that you want to put to the vote a proposal for the deletion of the item from the agenda. Because otherwise, as you said yourself, you would have simply taken note of the report. You explained that the reason why you wish to put the matter to the vote, is only because there are objections.

31. But what do the objections raised against item 39 of the agenda mean? They mean objections to keeping this item on the agenda, i.e., a request to delete this item from the agenda. If, therefore, you wish to put the matter to the vote, I would ask to have a vote taken to determine who is in favour of deleting item 39 from the agenda.

32. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I ask the representatives who have opposed the suggestion of the Fourth Committee to state whether they are requesting that item 39 should be deleted from the agenda of the resumed session?

33. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): It was the view of my delegation that the President correctly stated the issue before, when he said that the issue before the Assembly at this stage was whether or not to approve the recommendation of the Fourth Committee that item 39 be left on the agenda for the resumed session. We were perfectly prepared to have that issue brought to a vote.

34. It seems to us that the representative of the Soviet Union has incorrectly stated the issue when he said that it was a question of the exclusion of an item. There are a number of items on the agenda of the Fourth Committee which, unless some action is taken here to continue them to the resumed session, will not be on the agenda of the resumed session. I think that is perfectly clear and I do not see why the issue should be put in the reverse, that this item must be the subject of a vote to exclude it from the agenda of the resumed session, when, so far as I know, all that is on the agenda of the resumed session at the present time are two items, Ruanda-Urundi and Angola, and the question before the Assembly is whether to add to that agenda or not.

35. However, if the President, in his wisdom, wishes to have the issue put another way and to have it put in the form that item 39 should be considered terminated and excluded from the agenda of the resumed session, we are perfectly willing to propose that motion. If the President so desires, we will propose it. But I repeat, it seemed to us that the President had correctly formulated the issue when he said the issue was whether or not to approve paragraph 17 of the Fourth Committee's report [A/4997/Add.1], which would add to the agenda of the resumed session item 39.

36. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before calling on the next speakers, I should like to ask whether the United States representative is formally requesting the deletion of item 39?

37. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): If it is the wish of the President that we should put it that way, we do request formally that the consideration of item 39 should be deemed to be terminated and

that it should not be carried over to the resumed sixteenth session.

38. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether he is adopting the same position?

39. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): I take the same position as the representative of the United States, but like the representative of the United States I think that the President stated the proposition correctly the first time.

40. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I therefore have no formal request for the deletion of item 39 from the agenda but merely a recommendation from the Fourth Committee that this item should be kept on the agenda for discussion at the resumed session. I am putting this recommendation to the General Assembly.

41. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) (translated from French): If the President and the Members of the General Assembly will bear with me, I should like to say that we are entering a most important phase of the discussion and I consider myself to be discharging a duty in asking for the floor a second time to protest against the turn the discussion is taking. Despite ourselves, we are allowing our debates to become completely distorted. I was under the impression that we had before us a report of the Fourth Committee and that this report was to be approved or rejected by the General Assembly.

42. As far as I am aware there has been no request for a separate vote on specific parts of this report and I think, if I am not mistaken, that the President said at the outset that the Assembly was to vote on the report as a whole.

43. With regard to the substance of the problem, I must correct what the representative of the United States has just said, namely that the question of the draft resolutions was distinct from that of keeping item 39 on the agenda. It is true that these questions are distinct, but the Fourth Committee expressed a desire to continue the discussion of item 39 and it was almost unanimous in requesting the Chairman to convey this wish to the General Assembly for approval since we were pressed for time and could not complete our agenda.

44. The question of the draft resolutions does come within the scope of item 39 but on this latter point there were discussions—at which I may add, the greatest cordiality and understanding were displayed—and I am discharging a personal duty when I say that I undertook on behalf of the sponsors of the two draft resolutions to approach the delegations which are today asking that this question should not be discussed. As I said, however, this action was taken in a spirit of conciliation so that we might have time for reflection before the matter is taken up again in January.

45. The President will easily understand that my respect for the persons who asked me to make these contacts and approach the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom makes it impossible for me to ignore insinuations that we are confusing the problems and that the discussion concerns item 39 and not the draft resolutions. If item 39 is removed the draft resolutions too will be removed. I was instructed by sovereign States, in a spirit of conciliation and with a view to causing no offence to anyone,

to take these steps to enable us to hold these matters over until January. Surely it is normal to respect a gentleman's agreement and abide by it once it has been concluded.

46. As was pointed out just now, the deletion of item 39 would require a request for the amendment of the agenda; in such an event a two-thirds majority would be required and my delegation would vote against the request. Similarly, before a separate vote can be taken on the various parts of the Fourth Committee's report [A/4997/Add.1] a formal request to this effect must be submitted to the General Assembly. My delegation would vote against that request too.

47. As there are no proposals of this nature, I ask that the General Assembly should vote on the report as a whole and not on certain parts of the report.

48. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I ask the Assembly to remain calm, for this might help us to bring the discussion to a satisfactory close.

49. I propose to take a vote, as the representative of Mali has just explained, on the Fourth Committee's report [A/4997/Add.1], including the part concerning the Committee's wish for the consideration of item 39 to be continued at the resumed session.

50. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): If it is the President's intention to put the recommendation of the Committee to a vote, we have no objection. If it is his intention to put the motion of the United States delegation to a vote, then I feel that this is a new proposal, because the agenda was settled and this item was included in the agenda. To exclude it from the agenda is a new proposal.

51. Rule 83 clearly states that "when a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides."

52. The General Assembly has adopted its agenda. If the United States delegation wants this item excluded from the agenda, the it must be done by a two-thirds majority vote.

53. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I repeat that I have received no formal request for the deletion of item 39 from the agenda. I have before me a proposal of the Fourth Committee on which I am going to ask the Assembly to vote.

54. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, I do not know, perhaps the interpreter was not quite clear, but in the Russian version I distinctly heard the representative of the United States state plainly that he formally proposed the deletion of item 39 from the agenda. I was, therefore, somewhat surprised when you said that there was no formal proposal.

55. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): So that there may be no misunderstanding I again ask the representative of the United States to repeat his proposal. Does he formally request that item 39 should be deleted from the agenda?

56. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): It is an unusual privilege for me to be able to announce that in this matter I am in complete accord with the representative of the Soviet Union. He has stated that we did make the formal request, which I understood was the President's preference with regard to the way to proceed namely that this item which has been under

full consideration by the Fourth Committee, which has produced a number of draft resolutions, should be deleted from the agenda for the purpose of the resumed session. Under rule 22 of the rules of procedure, as I understand it, this is a matter for a majority vote of the Assembly.

57. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I apologize to the Assembly. There is a formal request that item 39 should be deleted from the agenda of the present session.

58. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan): I am sorry that these proceedings have been unnecessarily prolonged. A while ago a formal proposal was made by the representative of the United States, and supported by the representative of the United Kingdom, to the effect that this item should be deleted from the agenda of the present session. I think this proposal should have been put to the vote. In our humble view, that proposal requires a two-thirds majority for adoption. Rule 22 has been quoted, I am sorry to say erroneously, by the representative of France. Rule 22 relates to the adoption of the agenda, but the agenda has been adopted and item 39 has been adopted. A two-thirds majority is necessary to reverse this decision. Rule 22, therefore, does not apply at all.

59. Mr. IFEAGWU (Nigeria): I wish to support the statement just made by the representative of the Sudan. This item was adopted at the beginning of the session. To reverse this decision a two-thirds majority is necessary.

60. It must also be stated that the resumed session is only a resumed part of the sixteenth session. It is not a new session of the Assembly. In fact, the General Committee did not rule that there would only be two items on the agenda of the resumed session. It left to the discretion of the Committee to decide which items they would like to bring up. The Fourth Committee decided in its wisdom that it would like to continue this item. To exclude it, therefore, would require a two-thirds majority.

61. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the United States considers that a simple majority vote is required for his proposal and the representative of France shares this view. The representatives of Nigeria, the Soviet Union and the Sudan, however, consider that rule 83 of the rules of procedure should apply, since the proposal entails the reconsideration of a decision already taken by the General Assembly.

62. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): With all due respect to those who have taken a contrary view, it seems to me quite clear that rule 22 is controlling in this case. Rule 22 states: "Items on the agenda may be amended or deleted by the General Assembly by a majority of the members present and voting."

63. Now the word "deleted" could only have sense in that rule if it meant that it was referring to an item that was already on the agenda, because if an item was not on the agenda it could not be deleted. Therefore, that rule is perfectly clear that an item, even though on the agenda, may be deleted by a majority vote. On the contrary, rule 83 refers not to items on the agenda but to proposals for action—resolutions, in other words. Once proposals for action or resolutions have been adopted or rejected, then such proposals for action may not be reconsidered except by a two-thirds

majority. But it is quite clear, in the view of my delegation, that rule 83 speaks of resolutions which may be adopted or rejected and not of items on the agenda. We believe that rule 22 is perfectly clear that an item may be deleted from the agenda by a majority vote.

64. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): My delegation is sorry to have to state that it will not allow itself to be misled about the interpretation of the texts before us.

65. We are concerned here with what might be called two different acts: there is first of all, when the agenda is drawn up, an administrative act performed by the Secretary-General; when this administrative act is submitted to the Assembly for consideration and is approved by the Assembly it becomes a decision of the General Assembly.

66. We think that rule 22 of the rules of procedure is applicable at the state of the administrative act, that is, when the Secretary-General draws up the provisional agenda of the General Assembly. When this provisional agenda is submitted to the Assembly for consideration, a simple majority is sufficient for the deletion of any item. Once the agenda is adopted, however, it becomes a decision of the General Assembly and its reconsideration is subject to rule 83 of the rules of procedure, which requires a two-thirds majority.

67. This is how my delegation interprets the position and it will not, I repeat, allow itself to be misled.

68. Mr. KHOSA (India): My delegation agrees with the interpretation which has just been given by the representative of the Ivory Coast. Confusion has arisen in the minds of some of the delegations because it has not been realized that under rule 22 we are dealing with the provisional agenda which has not as yet been accepted by the Assembly. Once the Assembly has accepted the agenda, then it is only rule 83 which applies. We cannot really alter the agenda once it has been applied, save for exceptional reasons, and for that, therefore, a two-thirds majority is required.

69. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): Since we seem to have become engaged in a difficult debate involving the interpretation of the rules, and since we have no desire to prolong the debate, my delegation will withdraw its proposal for the deletion of the item and suggests that a vote be taken on the approval or rejection of the Fourth Committee's report [A/4997/Add.1] which, in paragraph 16, calls for the continuation of the discussion of this item at the resumed session.

70. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the United States has withdrawn his proposal but has requested a vote on the Fourth Committee's report.

71. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): The delegation of Guinea asked for the floor before it was announced that the proposal made by the United States delegation had been withdrawn. I must state first of all that my delegation disapproves of the withdrawal and categorically opposes it, if that is possible.

72. My delegation asked for the floor in order to express its concern at the inordinate length of this discussion. The question seemed perfectly clear to us and we were of the opinion that the President

had given at least a tacit decision. That is, it was made clear from the very start that if a delegation requested the withdrawal of an item placed on the agenda a two-thirds majority would be necessary for the adoption of such a proposal. There is no question about this.

73. After these explanations the President clearly and unmistakably asked the representative of the United States whether or not he wished item 39 to be removed from the agenda. In reply to this perfectly clear question the representative of the United States came to this rostrum and said "If it is the wish of the President that this issue be formulated in that way, we do demand formally the termination of item 39 for consideration by the resumed session".

74. There is therefore no further doubt in the matter. Once the representative of the United States had made this proposal everyone concurred and there was even a tacit decision—and I use the word "tacit" advisedly—but nevertheless a decision by the President which the representative of the United States clearly understood. We are here to deal frankly with one another and I think that the Assembly is sufficiently enlightened about the situation.

75. A clear question has been asked by the President and it has received an equally clear answer. We were just about to vote when discussion started and the position became confused.

76. The situation being such, therefore, my delegation objects to the withdrawal of the proposal which has been discussed and has led to a tacit decision by the President. It is quite obvious, in my opinion, that, if the deletion of an agenda item is under discussion, and in view of the way in which the President put the question to the United States representative and the way in which the latter replied it is for the President alone to say whether a two-thirds majority or a simple majority is necessary.

77. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Rule 82 of the rules of procedure reads:

"A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has commenced, provided that the motion has not been amended. A motion which has thus been withdrawn may be reintroduced by any Member."

78. Under this rule any representative may withdraw a motion that has not been voted upon, and the representative of the United States has withdrawn his motion for the deletion of item 39 from the agenda of the resumed session.

79. I have before me a report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1], in paragraph 16 of which it expresses the desire to continue the discussion of agenda item 39 at the resumed session of the General Assembly.

80. I put this report to the General Assembly.

81. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We have done a great deal of work and made good progress. We should not now go back to the point where we began.

82. In the course of our debate, we came to the conclusion that if there was no proposal to delete an item from the agenda there was no point in voting. Then a proposal to delete item 39 from the agenda was made and so there was an issue to vote on. However, the

representative of the United States then withdrew his proposal to delete item 39 of the agenda: so the reason for voting disappeared for there was nothing on which to vote; the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1] should be noted.

83. If the United States proposes to have a vote on this report, this means that they are indirectly asking for a vote on whether or not to leave the item on the agenda. Let them, then, openly table such a proposal. In fact, they did do so, and now they have withdrawn it, but still want to take a vote on it indirectly.

84. But this will not do—we are serious people. Let us decide the matter directly: either you are deleting item 39, then submit a proposal and we will take a vote; we are not refusing to vote—let us vote by all means; but if you have withdrawn this item, there is nothing to vote on. Then we will take note of the Committee's report and pass on to the next item on the agenda.

85. Mr. BOZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): We have become accustomed to many procedural proposals, to say the least, but in this case the matter seems to be quite clear. A certain item was on the agenda of the Fourth Committee, and the consideration of that item was not completed. I do not wish to enter into a discussion as to whether or not a two-thirds majority vote is required. This was stated quite clearly yesterday. But I would like to ask the President whether, if a simple majority decides against the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, it would mean the removal of the item from the agenda. What majority rule is to be applied in this case?

86. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): In order that the Assembly may emerge from this bottle-neck, I move that we merely take note of the recommendation made by the Fourth Committee in its report [A/4997/Add.1].

87. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan): I think that all my colleagues who know me in this Assembly have discovered by this time that I am not a talkative person. I fully endorse the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union, and supported by the representative of Liberia, that what the Assembly could do with regard to this report [A/4997/Add.1] is merely to take note of it, because there is no draft resolution in it on which to vote. Paragraph 16 expresses the "desire" of the Committee. How can one vote on a "desire"? There is no proposal here whatever; therefore, all that the Assembly can do is to take note of this desire. How can one vote on a subjective thing, on a desire?

88. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly has before it a proposal submitted by a number of delegations that it should merely take note of the report of the Fourth Committee [A/4997/Add.1]. This proposal is clear and precise and would seem to simplify the situation. If there is no objection I shall consider that the General Assembly adopts this proposal and consequently takes note of the report, subject, of course, to all the reservations in the report but including the explicit wish expressed in it.

It was so decided.

89. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, I would like to add just one word. Since we have disposed of this matter, our understanding is that item 39 remains on the agenda and will, therefore, be discussed at the

resumed session. Obviously, that is the general understanding.

90. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): That is how I summarized it.

AGENDA ITEM 20

The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5071)

91. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee on agenda item 20: "The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea."

92. As stated in the report, the Committee could not reach unanimity on the matter of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of this question. A number of delegations felt that the conditions laid down by the decision of the majority for the participation of the North Korean representatives were not called for. Opinions were equally divided as to the question to what extent it could be considered that the reply received from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea fulfilled the conditions laid down for the participation of its representatives.

93. It was decided by a vote of 54 in favour to 17 against, with 22 abstentions, that there was no basis for such participation. By 41 votes against and 20 in favour, with 24 abstentions, a motion was rejected according to which consideration of this item would have been deferred until the resumed session. The Committee finally adopted today, by 55 votes in favour and 11 against, with 20 abstentions, a draft resolution, the text of which is reproduced in paragraph 20 of the present report. It did not vote on the other draft resolutions, which were withdrawn by their respective sponsors, who felt that a vote on them under the prevailing conditions would not be desirable. I have, therefore, the honour to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the report.

In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the First Committee's report.

94. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I remind the Assembly that speeches must be confined to explanations of vote.

95. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): Normally, on all cold war issues before the Assembly, my delegation has abstained without explaining its vote, but I have deemed it necessary to do so this time because we think that although the Korean issue is a cold war issue, it should not be a cold war matter which must be left in perpetuity. Our view on the Korean question as enunciated in the draft resolution which was passed by the Committee and is now set forth in the Committee's report [A/5071] has been fortified by the various statements which were made in the First Committee. On the one hand, there was unqualified praise for the South Korean régime and condemnation for the North Korean régime by one set of speakers belonging to the Western camp. On the other hand, there was complete condemnation of

the South Korean régime but praise for the virtues of the North Korean régime by another set of speakers belonging to the Socialist bloc of countries. Can we honestly say, then, that the First Committee has suggested any solution in the report which will bring solace and peace to all the Korean people? Has the debate on the Korean question been useful at all? These are questions which this Assembly is in duty bound to answer.

96. My delegation does not think that the mere withdrawal, as suggested in the First Committee, of United Nations armed forces from Korea would solve the problem. Nor will dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea help. Nor will the continued existence of the United Nations Commission do the trick. The United Nations, in our opinion, must assume a proper responsibility in the question and make an approach based on the realities of the situation.

97. Whether we like it or not, there are at present two régimes in Korea, and no solution suggested by this Assembly will be of any avail without a proper consultation of the Korean peoples themselves. That is why the delegation of Ghana would have liked to hear from the horse's mouth what exactly should be done in Korea by the United Nations. This means that the First Committee should have agreed to hear what the representatives of the Korean people, namely, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Government of the Republic of Korea have to say on this matter. The First Committee, by not hearing the representatives of all the Korean people, has placed itself in a very injurious position, in spite of all the resolutions passed there. I am reminded of a very intelligent man who went about saying he was a mouse. His people found his behaviour rather abnormal and, therefore, committed him to a mental home. The doctor in charge of the mental home said that the man in question was totally normal, and so he called the medical board to pronounce on the state of health of this man who said he was a mouse. The board examined him thoroughly and pronounced the man perfectly normal. Thereupon this man said: "You say I am all right, but have you asked the cat?" The analogy may be far-fetched, but has the United Nations asked the Korean people what they want? Why these cold war potions which do not deal vitally with this important question affecting the destiny of a people?

98. My delegation is firmly of the opinion that a concrete solution should have been found. In a speech to the General Assembly last year, my President, Mr. Nkrumah said:

"It is possible even now to settle this intractable problem by having general elections in Korea."
[A/PV.869, para.75.]

99. My delegation would like to leave with this Assembly the proposal that a special committee on Korea be set up to invite representatives of the two régimes of Korea and work out a solution acceptable to the Korean people. In this way there will be a proper consultation, and the United Nations may be in a position to solve the Korean question once and for all.

100. In the light of all I have said, my delegation cannot support the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/5071] and, therefore, will abstain.

101. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation feels it should start its explanation of the reasons for its vote on the draft resolution in the report of the First Committee [A/5071] on the Korean question by stating that the whole discussion of this question in the First Committee was conducted, as has just been pointed out by the representative of the Republic of Ghana, in a quite abnormal political atmosphere, an atmosphere created by a single delegation, the delegation of the United States of America.

102. This abnormal political atmosphere—the atmosphere of the "cold war"—was created in the First Committee by the United States delegation, notwithstanding the many appeals of various delegations to make a fresh approach to the Korean problem, to renounce the "cold war" spirit, to act in a spirit of peace and peaceful co-existence. The United States delegation did not take this course. On the Korean question it continued, as in past years to act in the spirit of the "cold war". As a result, the delegation of the United States, by imposing its will on the countries dependent on the United States of America, managed to secure the cancellation of the invitation to the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. There can, of course, be no fruitful discussion of the Korean question without such participation, as even the United States delegation realizes full well.

103. The United States delegation managed to ensure that the discussion of the Korean question took place in an atmosphere of haste and under pressure of time. The proposal of some delegations to transfer the discussion of the question to the second part of the sixteenth session, since only three meetings were left before the adjournment of the first part, was, on the insistence of the United States, rejected.

104. Moreover, today discussion of the question was stopped, at the insistence of the Western delegations—this time, the delegation of the United Kingdom—although the debate was still proceeding and two-thirds of the speakers who had put their names down to speak had not yet been heard. Consequently, a number of delegations had no chance of expressing their views. In this altogether abnormal political atmosphere, the delegations of the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic, which had submitted draft resolutions on the really international aspects of the Korean question—such as the evacuation of the American armies of occupation from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—came to the conclusion that, in view of the atmosphere prevailing in the First Committee, it was pointless to take any vote. And so these resolutions, which reflect the demands of our time, the demands of peace, the demands of the peoples, were not put to the vote in the First Committee.

105. As for the resolution which has been submitted—this stereotyped resolution which, year after year, is foisted on the United Nations by the United States, the first thing that should be said is that it is absolutely useless. It is absolutely useless even from the point of view of those who submitted it and tried to secure its adoption by the First Committee. The sponsors of the resolution and, in the first place, the United States of America, realize very well that it can have, and will have, no practical influence on the situation in Korea.

They strove to have it accepted solely in order to increase tension and set one Korean State against the other.

106. We regret this. We regret it all the more because the United States resolution is not only useless, but definitely harmful. It again urges the United Nations to interfere in the internal affairs of the Korean people; it incites the United Nations to secure, by some unknown means or other—perhaps by the use of force, as Syngman Rhee and his present-day military and fascist successors in South Korea would like—the unification of Korea against the will of the Korean people, not on the terms, the only terms acceptable to Koreans—on the terms of unification by peaceful means, terms which have always been advocated by the peace-loving Socialist State—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

107. Once more the United Nations is being urged to lend its emblem, its flag and its honour to cover up the presence of the United States occupation troops in South Korea, a presence which constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

108. This resolution is yet another offspring of the "cold war". Obviously, therefore, the Soviet delegation will vote against it, as it did in the First Committee.

109. But regardless whether or not this resolution will be adopted in the Assembly here—quite independently of this fact—life poses real and practical problems—the problem of the immediate evacuation of United States and other foreign troops from Korean soil and the problem of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—this NATO-SEATO Commission, which serves as a cloak for United States aggressive policy in Korea and a prop for the fascist-military dictatorship in South Korea that has destroyed everything that was praised so highly by this same Commission in its previous reports. These vital problems face us; they must be solved, even the United States of America cannot evade this. And they should be solved not in the spirit of the "cold war"; they should be solved on the basis of the reality of the world situation, on the basis of a new approach—that of recognizing the principles of peaceful coexistence—and on the basis of consolidating peace.

110. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I believe that anyone who followed the debate in the First Committee will be quite aware which delegations provoked a cold-war atmosphere and which did not. The Korean question was discussed by the Committee for several days. In the general debate alone twelve delegations spoke, of which eight were from the Soviet bloc. I may add that the latter spoke at great length and in a stridently cold-war tone. But the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/5071] which is before us reaffirms the long-standing objectives of the United States in Korea to bring about the peaceful unification of this divided land in freedom and the restoration of international peace and security in the area. The draft resolution urges that continuing efforts be made toward this end and requests the Commission which represents the United Nations in Korea to continue its work.

111. Through its reaffirmation of previous resolutions of the General Assembly, the draft resolution continues to offer a formula whereby the people of both North and South Korea may determine their own

national future in freedom. It seems to my delegation that all of us here can subscribe to this draft resolution without reservation. It does not infringe upon the sovereignty of Korea. It does not seek to interfere in Korean domestic affairs. It does not advance any special interest, military or otherwise, of the United Nations or any Member State. On the contrary, by demonstrating the continued interest and concern of the United Nations in the Korean problem, the draft resolution gives renewed hope to the Korean people that their divided land will yet be reunited.

112. It has been argued that the representatives of North Korea should have participated in the First Committee's discussions, as did the representatives of the Republic of Korea. The question of the participation of the North Korean régime in its debate was very thoroughly discussed, and was decided by the Committee. An invitation was addressed to the North Korean régime conditional upon its accepting the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action in the Korean question. The Committee decided that the reply of the North Korean régime did not constitute an acceptance of this invitation, that the condition had not been accepted, and hence that the representative of that régime should not participate. It was for that reason that the Committee found it necessary to act without the participation of a representative of North Korea.

113. The United Nations should not and cannot be called upon to cease its efforts to solve the problem of Korea, even if the intransigence and non-cooperation of the North Korean régime makes its representatives' participation pointless. We shall continue to hope that that régime, which professes respect for the United Nations Charter, will yet find it possible to accept not only the well-established competence of the United Nations in this problem, but also the sincerity of the United Nations desire to assist in solving it.

114. It is with this in mind that the United States delegation supports, and will vote for, the draft resolution before us.

115. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution which appears in the First Committee's report [A/5071] and which that Committee has recommended for adoption. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Congo (Brazzaville), having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first:

In favour: Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia.

Against: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon.

The draft resolution was adopted by 60 votes to 11, with 27 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 78

Complaint by Cuba of threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5072)

116. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly has before it the report of the First Committee [A/5072] on agenda item 78. I should like to draw the special attention of the Assembly to paragraph 4 of this report, which contains the proposal of the Chairman of the First Committee, reading as follows:

"Bearing in mind that the General Assembly must conclude its work today, and thus that it would be virtually impossible for the above subject to be debated in the few hours left before the conclusion of the General Assembly, the Chair suggests that, if no objection is raised, agenda item 78 should not now be discussed by the Committee for lack of time."

117. I understand from this paragraph that the item remains on the agenda of the resumed session. If there is no objection, I shall assume that the Assembly takes note of the report to which I have referred.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 95

United Nations Year for international co-operation

118. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly has before it a request for the inclusion of item 95, submitted by India [A/4972], and a draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan, Ghana, India and Nepal (A/L.382 and Add.1 to 3). A number of delegations have pointed out to me that, owing to the lateness of the hour and the short time remaining to us before the adjournment of this session, the item might be deferred to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. I have consulted the sponsors of the item on this subject and they have told me that they would have no objection to this suggestion. Accordingly, if there is no opposition I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to defer the consideration of item 95 to the seventeenth session.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 89

Question of Hungary

119. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): Once again it is the duty of the General Assembly to address itself to the Hungarian question. This body must again consider what can be done to secure the co-operation of the Soviet and Hungarian Governments with a view to effecting an amelioration of the situation of the Hungarian people.

120. The events of October and November 1956 are still fresh in the minds of millions of people throughout the world—events which saw the Hungarian people struggle bravely for freedom and for independence, only to be suppressed by the intervention of massive Soviet armed forces. It is not necessary for us to recount in detail the developments which occurred in Hungary during those fateful days.

121. As the sixteenth session of the General Assembly approaches its conclusion, it is, however, appropriate to pay tribute to the free spirit of the Hungarian people and recall the efforts which the General Assembly has made during the past five years to alleviate the plight of that people and affirm the justice of their struggle.

122. This Assembly appointed a special committee and two special representatives who were assigned the task of looking into the reporting upon developments relating to the issue. These gentlemen, in each instance, have approached their difficult task with a high sense of responsibility, with impartiality, and with devotion to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

123. Regrettably, however, the Soviet and Hungarian authorities have persisted year after year in their disdain for their United Nations obligations and have continued to refuse to co-operate with the Organization and its appointed representatives on the Hungarian problem.

124. In these circumstances, the Soviet and Hungarian authorities must continue to bear before this world body and before world opinion the opprobrium of their defiant attitude and conduct.

125. The United States delegation welcomes the report [A/4996], of 1 December 1961, which Sir Leslie Munro, the present Special Representative, has placed before this Assembly. This report provides a careful and objective review of the Hungarian situation; it deserves the attention of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world and I commend it in particular to the delegations represented in this Assembly.

126. During the past five years the General Assembly has enacted by substantial majorities a series of resolutions which censured the Soviet and Hungarian Governments for their brutal acts during the Hungarian national uprising of 1956 and their continuing repressions in the aftermath of that event. These resolutions of Hungary have also called upon the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to take various appropriate measures to remedy the injustice which has been visited upon the Hungarian people since the 1956 uprising. As Sir Leslie makes abundantly clear in his current report, the troops of an alien Power remain on Hungarian soil and Hungarian citizens continue to suffer persecution and repression at the hands of the ruling authorities in their country.

127. The fact that now, even five years after the revolution of 1956, reliable reports are received of continuing repressive measures in Hungary and the fact that thousands of persons who participated in the uprising are still held in Hungarian prisons, are matters which must be of serious and constant concern to this Organization.

128. In the opinion of my delegation, it should again be made emphatically clear to the Hungarian and Soviet Governments that the burden they bear before the world and before this body can only be removed

when they display an attitude of co-operation with the United Nations, and move toward compliance with the resolutions that have been adopted on this issue.

129. We have all witnessed the emergence in Africa and in Asia during recent years of many new nations, exercising their right of independence, not compelled to align themselves to any particular group or bloc of States, and subscribing freely to the Charter of the United Nations.

130. The independence of a new nation in Africa or Asia which has progressed from colonial status to national sovereignty in the world community of nations, and which seeks to govern itself, free of foreign domination or interference, cannot be considered dangerous to any State, least of all to any great Power. The denial of such possibilities for independent existence and development to an historic nation, an ancient nation like Hungary, constitutes not only a violation of the fundamental rights of the people of that country, but also a deadly challenge to the very principles upon which the United Nations itself is founded.

131. There is reason to hope that new conditions in this rapidly shrinking and developing world may impress upon the Government of the Soviet Union the need for a new sense of justice and humanity in support of the rights of the people of all nations to live in freedom, to live in independence, to live as good neighbours.

132. Let me emphasize, in this connexion, that my Government confidently believes that the United Nations and this Assembly should serve the vitally important purpose, not of prolonging, but of allaying and, if possible, ending, the so-called cold war, about which we hear so much in these halls. It is precisely for this reason that we believe that the elimination of alien and colonialist domination over Hungary and the cessation of repressive practices within Hungary will contribute a considerable measure of progress toward the relaxation of world tensions and toward real and lasting mutual understanding among the nations.

133. In view of the foregoing considerations, the United States Government deplors the continuing disregard of the United Nations resolutions that have been adopted here on Hungary. We earnestly hope that the Hungarian Government will adopt a more constructive attitude towards its Charter obligations. We appeal once again to both the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to co-operate in good faith with the United Nations in its efforts to solve the Hungarian problem and promote justice for the Hungarian people.

Mr. Ortiz Martín (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

134. Mr. MOD (Hungary) (translated from French): I have come to this rostrum to speak once again in a debate which is absolutely useless, which will help no one and which can lead to no result. The tragedy of this situation is that everyone in this hall knows and understands full well what the position is, even the delegation which has insisted on reopening this dead issue. Even if there were no other evidence of this, the circumstances in which this last-minute debate is taking place would provide ample proof of the fact that this is a cold-war question. Indeed, everyone knows that nobody, not even the United States delegation, wanted this debate. The reason why we are none the less debating this question is that certain issues have not turned out as the American State Department wished. For one thing, agreement has been

reached on several important questions and it was therefore necessary to find something to disturb the atmosphere and to satisfy those who profit by tense situations. Furthermore, the United States has been unable to avoid the discussion of certain questions which were not to its liking and something therefore had to be done to redress the balance.

135. All this clearly shows that, as we have pointed out many times, the United States is retaining this item in order to create an atmosphere of cold war at any given moment. Everyone should clearly understand, however, that the entire responsibility for this falls upon the United States delegation.

136. The events of the last few days of this session of the General Assembly also prove another fact, namely, that this is not the "question of Hungary", that this is not a Hungarian problem but a problem of the United States of America. This statement is not just a play of words; on the contrary, it relates to the substance of the problem. This will be understood as soon as it is realized that the counter-revolution would never have taken place if the foreign policy of the United States at the time had been different. Moreover, the discussion of this agenda item would not have been imposed upon the General Assembly without the United States. Accordingly, it is a United States problem that we are concerned with in this discussion.

137. During the debates held in recent years, my delegation has offered sufficient proof of the two points of this thesis, and particularly of United States intervention in the events of 1956 and of the preparation, financing and arming of the counter-revolution in Hungary by United States agencies. We have also adduced facts to show the cold-war manoeuvres used by the United States to retain the item on the Assembly's agenda. I shall not restate the facts which prove these two theses and shall confine myself to raising only one question in connexion with the events which took place in Hungary in 1956.

138. What was at stake, in Hungary in particular and in Eastern Europe in general in the counter-revolutionary events of 1956? The final goal of the United States policy-makers was a general attack against the socialist countries adjacent to Hungary and against the Soviet Union. They hoped that Hungary would be the first breach in the chain of the socialist countries and that this breach could serve as a point of departure for subsequent attacks. If we realize the high stakes they were playing for, we shall be better able to understand why they press so desperately for the retention of this item before the United Nations. As for the elements representing the former ruling class, their main objective was to overthrow the constitutional order and thus to regain the abusive privileges which they had lost and to launch an attack against Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Romania and Yugoslavia.

139. Indeed, towards the end of the counter-revolution—which lasted only a few days—unbridled chauvinistic agitation and even racial persecution had already begun. The counter-revolutionary events thus endangered the civil rights of the masses of the people, the Constitution, law and order, the very existence of the State and, at the same time, international peace and security.

140. The unavoidable steps taken at the request of the Hungarian Government succeeded in saving the very life of the Hungarian people and in averting the

danger which threatened international peace and security. Anyone who tries to criticize or condemn our action in suppressing the counter-revolution can only have wished that there had been even more bloodshed, that the losses had been even greater and that the catastrophe had been even more immense.

141. Instead of recognizing these facts, the United States has used the question as a pretext for maintaining the cold war within the Assembly.

142. In earlier debates, we have also amply proved that in substance "the question of Hungary" is a cold-war problem. Despite all the proofs we have of this, Hungarian delegations to the General Assembly have always tried to the best of their ability to prevent debates in the Assembly from fostering the cold war. During the discussions we have done all we could to show the real nature of the events of 1956 and to denounce the illegal activities which certain Western agencies organized in order to be able to maintain in our world organization an atmosphere of cold war around and in connexion with the "question of Hungary".

143. With regard to the resolutions on this question, we have not only proved that they were contrary to the United Nations Charter but we have also pointed out that they should be considered unacceptable even by those who, in our opinion quite mistakenly, wished to comply with the Charter by voting in favour of including the item in the agenda. These resolutions are full of prejudice, hatred and offensive terms designed to humiliate a Member State. No one made any attempt to consult a legitimate representative of Hungary before drafting these texts. And to complete the scandal, the gentleman who acted on the basis of these resolutions took every possible opportunity of making cold-war propaganda, not only against Hungary and the Soviet Union but also against all the other socialist countries of Europe and Asia. I shall mention only one example: at the very time when we saw fit to declare a wide-spread partial amnesty, he came to Europe— at the expense of the United Nations, of course—to give lectures and hold press conferences directed against Hungary. We have pointed out several times that his attitude is inadmissible and that he has forfeited all right to represent the United Nations, in any respect whatsoever, in dealing with representatives of the Hungarian Government.

144. No Member State would be prepared to respect resolutions adopted in such an unjust manner, even if the matter were within the competence of the world Organization. This basic fact would remain unchanged, even if an attempt were made to interfere in the internal affairs of my country by preparing a draft resolution worded in relatively moderate terms.

145. As we have shown several times, this question is not within the competence of the United Nations. We have therefore regarded this matter as a question of relations between Hungary and the United States. It is the developments which have taken place inside and outside the world Organization that have obliged us to adopt this attitude.

146. We are sincerely trying to improve relations between our two countries. We are, however, fully convinced—and those who guide United States foreign policy will have to understand this too—that cold-war methods must be excluded from relations between States.

147. Last summer this discussion and the debate on our delegation's credentials were brandished like

a cudgel; we were told that our position in the United Nations would improve if we took certain measures to eliminate the obstacles which, in the opinion of leading American circles, are obstructing relations between our two States. In the present international situation, the old political principle of "speak softly but carry a big stick" is already out of date; only inexperienced students in international study groups can preserve the illusion that this political principle is still followed. Nor is the threat to keep the so-called question of Hungary before the United Nations one of the best ways—I would go so far as to say that it is no way—of improving relations between the two States. The best and the only way of improving international relations is to eliminate the antagonisms of the past and of the cold war once and for all and to open a new chapter in relations between States.

148. This is why, at this time and as far as this discussion is concerned, the best way of improving the international atmosphere would be to drop the question and the draft resolution relating to it [A/L.380]. The delegations which really want to help the Hungarian people will not support this draft resolution.

149. The statement by the United States representative did not raise a single question which is within the competence of the United Nations. All the questions he raised are within the competence of the Hungarian people and of the constitutional organs they have elected. Nevertheless, since these questions have been raised in the General Assembly, I feel bound to restate our attitude towards certain important problems, although I reserve our position regarding the principle of the matter.

150. The United States representative raised the question of the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. We shall now lift the false veil which the United States has drawn over the essential facts.

151. Foreign troops are stationed on the territory of a Member State, with the consent of the Government in question. Everyone knows that it is solely on the basis of the Warsaw Treaty that Soviet troops are stationed on Hungarian territory. Everyone knows too that the aggressive policy of the United States was responsible for the signing of the Warsaw Treaty.

152. Here, however, a question arises: is the Hungarian People's Republic the only independent country in Europe which has foreign troops on its territory? No, most of the independent countries of Europe have foreign, mainly American, troops on their territory. Must the United Nations include in its agenda each of the decisions to this effect taken by each of these countries? If we take a closer look at the United States attitude towards the principle of the matter, we see that it amounts to hypocrisy and the protection of selfish interests at all costs.

153. As far as the international aspects of the question are concerned however, it is universally known that the Soviet Government, the Hungarian Government and the other socialist countries have repeatedly proposed that all armed forces stationed abroad should be withdrawn from the territory of all the States, including, of course, the Hungarian People's Republic. The United States has never accepted this proposal. Consequently, if there is any State which has no moral grounds for obliging the United Nations to consider a question on this pretext, that State is certainly the United States.

154. I should like to say in passing that there are Soviet troops stationed in three countries, while according to official United States statistics American troops are stationed in thirty-five foreign countries. I think there are limits to hypocrisy!

155. A question has also been raised concerning Hungarian jurisdiction. In this connexion, I should like to point out that anyone with the slightest knowledge of law knows that, in any State, public order is kept in accordance with the law and that those who rebel against public order are prosecuted under the law. The counter-revolutionary activities of 1956 were organized, financed, directed and equipped with weapons from foreign sources and, to be more specific, those foreign sources are organs of the United States.

156. It is also common knowledge that, in the space of a few days, the counter-revolutionaries massacred hundreds of innocent people, captured thousands more for the same purpose and did unparalleled damage to public property. There is no constitutional State in which the guilty persons would not be prosecuted for such a multitude of crimes. Is it these persons whom the United States wants to save now? And why? Because they are its agents.

157. United States leaders placed great hopes in the counter-revolutionary activities in Hungary. They hoped to be able to deal a decisive blow against the Socialist system itself. Their attempts failed and the decisive blow was dealt, not against the Socialist countries, but against the subversive organs of the United States.

158. We understand the disappointment and despair in leading circles in the United States; we understand the attempts to protect United States agents. But if they want to use the United Nations for this purpose, the States Members of the Organization can give only one answer: "This is inadmissible!"

159. In the Hungarian People's Republic, only a person who has actually committed an offence is imprisoned. In Hungary, nobody is arrested because of his political beliefs or the colour of his skin.

160. In conclusion, I ask the Assembly to forgive me for having taken so much of its time at this advanced stage in our work. It is well known however, that nobody has done so much to prevent this truly useless debate as the Hungarian delegation. This debate was forced upon us.

161. I also ask forgiveness if I have sometimes spoken bitterly. But you will understand that nobody can calmly allow his country to be used for the iniquitous purposes of the cold war.

162. Finally, it is obvious that, despite these perhaps bitter words, the fundamental position which emerges from this statement by my delegation is dictated by our firm belief in the need to improve international relations. In this spirit, my Government hopes, with the Hungarian people, to be able in future to cooperate with the United Nations without hindrance.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

163. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): At this late hour it is not necessary to speak at length about the question that is before us because the events of 1956 are still in the minds of all of us, almost as fresh as on the day on which they occurred. We all remember the tremendous revulsion that filled the entire world at what happened in Hungary in 1956. We remember that

there was a spontaneous uprising of the people of Hungary; that they installed a Government that was by no means an illiberal one, a Government that was indeed liberal, one which went so far as to proclaim a policy of complete neutrality; and we remember also that this Government was ruthlessly suppressed by force brought in from outside by the Soviet Union and that there ensued a series of repressions of human rights which continue to this day in various forms.

164. We have before us a report [A/4996] of the United Nations Special Representative on the question of Hungary, Sir Leslie Munro, that gives us every reason to believe that what is going on in Hungary is still a matter for anxiety.

165. The speaker who preceded me said that the placing of this item on the agenda, the bringing of it forward for discussion at this time and the introduction of the draft resolution [A/L.389] was an attempt to keep the question alive. In this regard, I wish to say that it is the desire of those who are supporting this draft resolution to make it clear that the world has not forgotten what happened, and that we do not want the impression to get abroad that the passage of the years has reconciled us to what happened in 1956, or has led us to believe that what happened then can now be accepted as something that is over and done with. Those events are not to be condoned merely because of the passage of time and the draft resolution that is being submitted to this Assembly by fifteen nations is one that deserves the support of all of us.

166. It will have the support of the Australian delegation as being the minimum that the Assembly can and should do at this time.

167. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): It is regrettable and extremely surprising that, at the conclusion of our work, during which so many important questions have been discussed and fairly useful decisions taken, we should be spoiling the closing proceedings of the sixteenth session by a discussion of the so-called "Question of Hungary". It is not mere chance that the United States delegation, on whose initiative this question has been introduced and which has sponsored the draft resolution [A/L.380], has taken up the question and insisted on its being discussed just as the curtain is about to fall on the work of our Assembly. Not for them the light of day, but the dark of midnight, when people want to sleep. This is no mere chance, for living problems demand time for their discussion in substance, whereas dead questions—well, to discuss them, one might just as well choose the night time.

168. It is regrettable that a great Power, which talks about its love of freedom, independence and the maintenance of peace and international collaboration, that this great Power should, in the concluding stages of our work, have undertaken such a thankless, such—forgive me, if I use too harsh a word—a dirty job.

169. Mr. Stevenson has just said in his speech that the United States, if you please, is not in favour of continuing, but of ending the "cold war". But who is going to believe this, seeing that the United States has raised and insisted on the discussion of this purely "cold-war" issue? And it will be no use for the United States to think that, if it musters a number of votes for its resolution, this will mean that all the countries which will have to vote for its resolu-

tion regard it as other than a "cold-war" question. No people in those countries have long regarded it as purely a cold-war issue.

170. You may still be able to muster a certain number of votes and once more to carry a resolution which will bring you neither glory nor consolation. But no one will believe that you are doing this in the interests of strengthening international peace and co-operation. Everyone will say, as they leave the Assembly, how painful it is, how sad, that a Great Power should have embarked upon such a shameful course as the work of our Assembly ends.

171. Mr. Stevenson in his statement today said much which would require a comprehensive answer. But I do not intend to give it, because to couple colonial problems with the Hungarian question is ridiculous and unworthy. It is all the more unworthy of a country which, together with other colonial Powers taking part in the present session of the General Assembly, has done nothing but defend and try to whitewash the most reactionary colonial régime which exists in the world today, and countries which, as the allies of the United States in military blocs, have openly defended their racial colonial policies in the General Assembly: countries like Portugal, the Republic of South Africa and others.

172. It is not fortuitous that the sponsors of the resolution [A/L.380] which has been submitted for our consideration include the principal colonial Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Spain. And it is in their company that you desire to teach us not to tolerate a colonial régime! Rather teach your allies, your friends, who, along with you are carrying out the most cruel acts of repression in their colonies, acts which result in uprisings in all the colonial countries. On the territory of Africa bloody warfare is being waged, about which much has already been said at the present Assembly, and more still will be heard during the forthcoming debate on the question of Angola.

173. Well, we shall see then what stand you will take on the question of Angola as regards your closest ally in NATO, Portugal. Then we will see which of us is the defender of a colonial régime and a colonial Power, and which the supporter of the colonial peoples in their struggle for liberation.

174. You can, of course, today adopt another resolution, add it once more to the file, and send it round to all the relevant organs of the United Nations. You may believe that you have thereby achieved something real, that you have carried out the orders of the State Department of the United States. Yes, you will have carried them out but, I repeat, this will not bring you any consolation. All that you will have achieved will be to discredit your own policy and the United Nations itself, an Organization which is dedicated to international co-operation and not to fomenting enmity between peoples or intervening in the domestic affairs of sovereign States or violating the United Nations Charter. The United Nations Charter prohibits any intervention in the domestic affairs of nations. But, with your decisions on the Hungarian question, you are instigating a breach of the Charter and disrupting co-operation between nations.

175. The representative of Australia, the only speaker who supported you in your stand, another of your collaborators in military blocs, stated that he deems it necessary, if you please, to try to keep this ques-

tion alive. For this very reason he thinks it necessary to adopt still another resolution. You cannot keep alive something that is dead; you cannot keep alive this dead question which for many long years has poisoned the atmosphere in the United Nations and the whole world. It is time to put an end to this question.

176. We consider the best way out of the situation would have been not to discuss this question at all, but, since it has been raised, we are bound to express our opinion on the question and to appeal to the General Assembly to finish with it and never reopen it again.

177. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): I shall not follow the representative of the Soviet Union in embarking at this time of night on a debate about Angola. I prefer at this stage to speak about Hungary.

178. Our present debate follows on the resolution on Hungary adopted by the thirteenth session [1312 (XIII)]. The General Assembly then declared that the United Nations would continue to be seized of the situation in Hungary in view of the disregard of its resolutions by the Governments of the Soviet Union and Hungary. The same resolution appointed Sir Leslie Munro to represent the United Nations for the purpose of reporting significant developments regarding the implementation of the Assembly's resolutions in Hungary. Sir Leslie Munro's latest report [A/4996] shows that the attitude of the Soviet and the Hungarian Governments remains unchanged. They continue to ignore the United Nations resolutions on Hungary and still refuse to co-operate in any way with the United Nations on this issue.

179. I should like at this stage to express the thanks of my delegation to Sir Leslie Munro for his unremitting efforts to carry out the mandate entrusted to him by the General Assembly, despite the hostile attitude of the Soviet Union and Hungary and the refusal of the latter Government to authorize any contact with him or any visit to Hungary. This refusal only confirms what is public knowledge: that all is far from well in Hungary and that the Government has much to hide. My delegation deplores the failure of the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to co-operate in any way with the United Nations own representative or even to offer him the minimum of courtesy. Despite these formidable obstacles, Sir Leslie Munro has once again carried out his difficult task and produced a sober and well authenticated report on recent significant developments in Hungary.

180. At this stage I do not propose to make a long speech, but I should like to support the view put forward in this report that the question of Hungary is "fundamentally a question of the repression of the right of self-determination" [A/4996, para.17]. Just over five years ago the Hungarian people rose against their oppressors and attempted to free their country from Soviet domination and to replace the existing repressive régime by a genuinely social democratic Government under which civil liberties would be restored and their country would be free to pursue a neutral foreign policy, bound neither by the Warsaw Pact nor to the West. As we all know, this spontaneous popular uprising was crushed by Soviet tanks, and, as Sir Leslie Munro reports:

"No effect has been given to the basic resolution of the General Assembly, passed at the second special emergency session, which provided that free elections should be held in Hungary under United

Nations auspices to enable the people of Hungary to determine for themselves the form of government they wished to establish in their country." [Ibid.]

181. Instead the Hungarian Government maintains its authority by repressive measures and the threat of renewed Soviet intervention implicit in the continued presence of Soviet divisions and Soviet air support on Hungarian soil. The General Assembly has repeatedly called for the withdrawal of Soviet forces, and, as Sir Leslie Munro points out in his latest report, Mr. Kadar, in statements from November 1956 onwards, has declared that their withdrawal would be a primary objective of his Government. Five years have passed, and they are still there.

182. The report refers to the persecution of the church and mentions the trial of twelve Roman Catholics in June. Although no evidence was produced to support the counter-revolutionary charges levelled against them, and the prosecutor admitted that some had merely engaged in what were described as spiritual activities against the régime, they were given prison sentences totalling seventy years. I would remind the Hungarian Government—and also the representative of the Soviet Union, who relied in his speech so heavily upon the Charter—I would remind them both that persecution of persons for their religious beliefs is contrary to the principles of the Charter to which they and we have subscribed.

183. The report also lists a number of prominent Hungarians who are serving life sentences for their participation in the uprising of 1956. These are not, of course, the only victims. Her Majesty's Government believes that there are still at least 8,000, and possibly as many as 15,000, political prisoners in Hungarian prisons. The various amnesties granted up till now have in practice been extremely limited. My country appeals to the Hungarian Government to grant a general amnesty to all participants in the 1956 uprising. After all, the Hungarian Government itself now admits that the rising was in part provoked by the injustices perpetrated under the previous régime. Such a gesture on the part of the Hungarian Government would undoubtedly be regarded by all Members of the Assembly as an important step towards improving relations between Hungary and the United Nations.

184. So long as thousands of Hungarians languish in prison for the crime of patriotism, and so long as the Governments of the Soviet Union and Hungary continue to disregard the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the situation in that unhappy country, most Members of this Organization will still consider that the United Nations has a duty to concern itself with developments in Hungary. It is for this reason that my country has joined with a number of other countries in sponsoring a draft resolution [A/L.380] deploring:

"... the continued disregard by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the present Hungarian régime of the General Assembly resolutions concerning the situation in Hungary".

185. We appeal to Members not to regard this draft resolution merely as a move in the cold war, but to think deeply of the problem in human terms, as the problem of a brave and patriotic people whose only crime is nationalism and whose lot may be alleviated by our support. We hope that this draft resolution, like its predecessors, will receive the overwhelming support of the General Assembly.

186. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the sixteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.380]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Togo, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, India, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria.

The result of the vote was 49 in favour and 17 against, with 32 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

Adjournment of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly

187. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before declaring the meeting closed, I should like to express my great appreciation of the friendly co-operation we have received from all the Members of the General Assembly in the conduct of our work and the successful conclusion of our consideration of the different items, which we discussed in a conciliatory atmosphere that augurs well for the future.

188. In particular, I should like to thank the Acting Secretary-General, the Under-Secretaries and all the Secretariat staff, not forgetting the interpreters, for their enthusiastic co-operation and the devotion with which they have helped us in our work.

189. I am, of course, grateful also to the members of the General Committee and in particular to the Chairmen of the different Committees for their hard work and the remarkable patience with which they guided the debates in their respective Committees, despite the multitude of extremely delicate problems which the Committees have had to consider.

190. I extend my warmest wishes to you all for a happy Christmas and New Year. May the New Year bring a firm promise of an era of peace in justice, not only peace in which weapons will finally be laid down throughout the world but above all peace in the hearts and minds of all mankind, consolidating friendship between peoples and free co-operation between

nations, which is the basic objective of our Charter and our Organization.

191. In accordance with the decision of the General Assembly [1083rd meeting, para. 66], I declare that

the sixteenth session is adjourned and will resume on 15 January 1962.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 a.m. on
Thursday, 21 December.*