

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



824th PLENARY MEETING

 Wednesday, 7 October 1959,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

<i>General debate (concluded)</i>	
Statement by the representative of India . . .	431
Statement by the representative of Portugal	434
Statement by the representative of Ireland	435
Statement by the representative of Laos . . .	435
Statement by the President of the General Assembly on World Refugee Year	436

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Representatives will recall that the general debate was closed yesterday afternoon. They will also remember that the meeting was adjourned on a motion [823rd meeting] put by the representative of India after four speakers had exercised the right of reply in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. This rule provides that the President may "accord the right of reply to any Member if a speech delivered after he has declared the list closed makes this desirable". It cannot be denied that the President has interpreted this rule very liberally in the course of the general debate.

2. It is to be hoped that representatives will recognize that rule 75 is not designed to allow the legitimate right of reply to be used in such a way as to provoke a whole series of further replies. I would therefore, respectfully but earnestly, ask representatives to bear in mind that the general debate closed yesterday, and to observe both the letter and the spirit of rule 75 in the replies which they feel it necessary to make today.

3. I must also observe, and ask representatives to note, that statements which are not mere factual corrections may encroach on the sphere of the main Committees, and that it is the President's duty to prevent items which should be discussed in those Committees from being brought before plenary meetings of the General Assembly before they have been considered by the Committees concerned.

4. I now call upon those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

5. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation has made no observations which would attract rule 75. I have no doubt, if I may say so with respect, that the President of the General Assembly is perfectly in order to allow representatives to have what they call the right of reply. We have taken care during the

general debate not to refer to many controversial matters in which our country is closely involved, even though they had been raised by other delegations, because we think that these can be dealt with in other places and some of them are matters of which other organs of the United Nations are already seized. But the representative of Portugal came on to the rostrum [823rd meeting] to make statements which not only challenge the assertions that we made but go further in challenging the whole position under the Charter and, what is more, making statements of facts which may well mislead the Assembly. But I will make every effort to adhere to the injunction made and strictly confine myself to meeting the observations that have been made in this place.

6. The first is that the Portuguese territories, consisting, as I have said, of 900,000 square miles and 10 million people over four continents, did not attract the provisions of Article 73 of the Charter. In regard to this matter I should like to point out that the Fourth Committee and afterwards the General Assembly, after discussion, I believe, at more than one session, produced in resolution 742 (VIII) what are called the factors indicative of the attainment of independence or of other separate systems of self-government: that is to say, those factors which would make a country an entity that escapes what a lawyer would call the mischief of Article 73.

[The speaker then read the first paragraph, and sub-paragraph e, of Article 73.]

7. Having that in mind, I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that resolution 742 (VIII) gives these factors, which broadly speaking are under three heads. The first of the factors is that a Territory must have an international status, and none of these Territories, among the possessions for which the representative of Portugal speaks, is a Member of the United Nations. Any application made by them for membership would not be supported by the representative of Portugal. Secondly, a Territory must have internal self-government. Thirdly, it must have eligibility for membership in the United Nations.

8. Since the President has asked me to be brief, I do not want to read out the whole of this resolution. It talks in its Annex, about international responsibility; eligibility for membership in the United Nations; general international relations; national defence: "sovereign right to provide for its national defence"; form of government: "complete freedom of the people of the Territory to choose the form of government which they desire"—that is, self-determination—territorial government: "freedom from control or interference by the government of another State in respect of the internal government ..."; economic, social and cultural jurisdiction: "complete autonomy in respect of economic, social and cultural affairs." Since all these Territories are based upon economic exploitation, including forced labour, it cannot be said they

have autonomy in respect of economic, social and cultural affairs.

9. If the Territory is not independent in accordance with those factors, then the following must be taken into account: the opinion of the population; freedom of choice; voluntary limitation of sovereignty—"Degree of evidence that the attribute or attributes of sovereignty which are not individually exercised will be collectively exercised by the larger entity thus associated and the freedom of the population of a Territory which has associated itself with the metropolitan country to modify at any time this status through the expression of their will by democratic means." With regard to this point, if the populations of the Portuguese Empire were, as is alleged, only in a position of suffrage, then they would all be represented on a basis of equality in the Portuguese Parliament, but as it is there are three members, or some small number of members, in the Portuguese Parliament representing all these people on an extremely limited franchise. In the same sense, the representative said that he was a Goan. You can draw your own inference from that.

10. Continuing, now: Ethnic and cultural consideration; political advancement; international status, general international relations; change of political status—"The right of the metropolitan country or the Territory to change the political status of that Territory in the light of the consideration whether that Territory is or is not subject to any claim or litigation on the part of another State." Now, litigation is going on in that way at the present time. Internal self-government, Territorial government—"Nature and measure of control or interference, if any, by the government of another State in respect of the internal government ..." Then there is still another part, but I do not want to take up your time.

11. I would like to ask, if the Assembly spent so many sessions in detailed committee work before Portugal became a Member of the United Nations, and if Portugal accepted the principles of the Charter with all these implications, then is it not appropriate that the Fourth Committee inquire as to whether those conditions are being observed? And that is the reason why this matter comes before the Fourth Committee year after year.

12. We now come to the next allegation that was made, that is, universal suffrage. The representative of Portugal stated yesterday that:

"Portugal does not administer any territories covered by Article 73, sub-paragraph e, of the Charter of the United Nations. National constitutions are the legal expression of social reality ..." [823rd meeting, para. 287].

Here I respectfully agree; they are the expression of the social reality of empire, of the social reality of exploitation, of the rule of a metropolitan country over under-privileged, under-developed people who are being exploited.

13. Continuing:

"... The historical, geographical and political position of my country led Portugal to what has been defined as the 'Non-Europe'—This is a very euphemistic expression, to use in talking about non-white peoples—"The other great institutions for multi-racial communities, when instrumental

in the formation of the country and its collective ideals, together with the consequent absence of racial prejudices, led Portugal to the creation of true local communities by miscegenation, spiritual assimilation, and inter-relation of cultures and interests. Thus the Portuguese people, by strength of spirit, not by force of arms, became one people dispersed throughout four continents, and left a genuine feeling of community united by the same national faith." [Ibid.]

I should like to say, if any people, the Portuguese or any other people, were dispersed over four continents, in different nations, and if we were to say that those people constitute separate states, then the world would indeed be a funny place altogether. Then in the United States there would be fifty or sixty states because there are people from so many parts of the world over here; and Brazil would be a part of Portugal, because they have a lot of Portuguese there and they speak the Portuguese language.

14. Then we are told:

"The Portuguese Constitution is the legal expression of social reality ..."—with that I agree—"of social reality"; but it is a reality we want to change; the world wants it changed—"... that the overseas provinces are integral parts of the Portuguese State." [Ibid., para. 288.]

They are integral parts of the Portuguese State in the same sense that the colonial empire is part of the United Kingdom. Legally it is so. But it is not like the other Commonwealth components; they have British nationality; they have British citizenship with all its privileges and all its limitations. In that they are integral, and the purpose of self-government was to establish their autonomy.

15. The representative of Portugal continued:

"There is only one national Assembly elected by direct universal suffrage."—With great respect, we challenge this statement. We would like to know whether the electorate of the Portuguese Parliament consists of 15 million people—"As a final result of these realities, the sovereignty of the Portuguese nation is one and indivisible, and it cannot, therefore, acknowledge any specific international status which would differentiate between parts of the same national territory."—Now, that is empire, nothing else,—"Such an international status would have to be applicable to non-self-governing territories, which is entirely outside the Portuguese case, for it is clearly defined in the constitutional structure of Portugal that all parts of the national territory and their respective populations are independent with the independence of the nation." [Ibid., para. 289.]

This reminds me of a dog that used to perform in the cinema about twenty-five years ago—Rin-Tin-Tin, I believe he was called. He used to say, "I'll take my master out for a walk."

16. So if you allow these people, as they are made to appear, into the magnificence of the master empire, then of course they are all free.

17. I will not read any more of this, but I would like now to quote an authority on this matter. I have here a work which has been produced under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, with the support of the Ford

Foundation. The conclusions and opinions are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Ford Foundation. The American Council of Learned Societies made a grant-in-aid to help in the preparation of the manuscript. It is a Harvard University Press publication.^{1/} I shall quote from page 282:

"The source of all important colonial authority is Lisbon and resides in three bodies: the National Assembly, the Council of Ministers, and the Overseas Ministry. The National Assembly has but a modest role in colonial policy and administration, serving only to legislate the proposals it receives from the Overseas Ministry through the Council of Ministers and to review the yearly reports from the overseas provinces."

18. Analysing all this verbiage, it means this, that the satrap, the provincial tetrarch or proconsul who sits in the colony of the empire, says what he wants made into law, and the Portuguese Parliament puts its stamp on it—and the Portuguese Parliament does not represent those people. Therefore, it is real colonial rule through proconsuls.

19. Now continuing, from page 282: Among the 120 members of the Portuguese Parliament "are three deputies elected from Angola and three from Mozambique"—none from the various other places—"but since these men need not be residents of the colonies and are candidates chosen by the government to stand for election, their influence on colonial conduct is as negligible as that of the rest of the Assembly's members". This is the same way as in the Union of South Africa, where representatives are elected to represent the African populations. If this is a universal franchise, I don't know the meaning of the term.

20. Again from page 282: "The Portuguese government (i.e., the Council of Ministers) acts in a general executive capacity on overseas affairs." That is to say, they, who are not the representatives of the people whom they are governing, are the executives. Now, continuing: "It may legislate by decree for the national territory or for the individual provinces. It alone may permit the negotiating of loans"—thus destroying a factor of economic independence—"it alone may permit the negotiating of loans by the provinces, which occurs only under exceptional circumstances, and it approves all concessions to foreign companies". That is the fly in the ointment—"it approves all concessions to foreign companies". Then it goes on: "The appointment and dismissal of colonial governors is also the business of the Council." In fact, these colonial governors are high-place tetrarchs who are the instruments of the executive in Lisbon.

21. Continuing on page 283, I quote:

"Through various governmental boards, such as those controlling the production of certain crops (cereals and cotton, for example), and export-import commissions the government effectively dominates the economic life of Angola and Mozambique. Through the national labour laws the government extends its influence over workers and employers overseas."

"In more specific matters the central organ of overseas administration is the Overseas Ministry, whose authority embraces all questions of general colonial policy. On particular levels this includes responsibility for administrative personnel, native policy, missionary matters, censorship, some aspects of the juridical system and the military organization, and public works programs. Ultimately the Overseas Minister is responsible for the political and administrative life of the provinces and their over-all financial organization; he must decide on all disputes arising between the governor general and the provincial legislative councils. No colonial legislation becomes law until the Minister has released the text for publication in the Boletim oficial of the province or provinces concerned."

22. Then we go on to citizenship rights. We were told that there was a universal franchise, that it was an egalitarian society; therefore you would say that, irrespective of race, class, creed, social status or anything else, everybody has got a vote. However, this is what this book says, on page 291: "Defined by a statute of 1954, the 'indígena' is a person of the Negro race who is governed by the customs of his own society and has not yet evolved to a cultural level..."—Now, who is to decide whether a Negro has arrived at a cultural level or not? He was on this earth long before other people were—"...or state of civilization—which would permit him to be governed by the same laws as a Portuguese citizen." Therefore, he is not governed by the same laws, there is no equality before the law; and the representative of Portugal alleged before this Assembly that there was equality before the law which would permit him to be governed by the same law as Portuguese citizens.

"Thus the inhabitants of the African possessions fall into two categories: 'indígenas' and 'não-indígenas' (whites and assimilated Africans or mulattoes). In practice a third category, that of the assimilated African, or 'assimilado', is commonly recognized, if not legally sanctioned, and every provincial census contains statistics on this third category."

24. I will not read this chapter on forced labour, I must have something to talk about when I go to the Fourth Committee.

25. I had no intentions of provoking a controversy on this. I was dealing with the whole question of colonial empires and how we should operate under the Charter. I have given these facts because it should not be said that some metropolitan country, on account of the bias which I as an ex-colonial may have, was merely holding them to ransom. There are African representatives here who, if they had spoken, would not have spoken with the moderation that I have exercised. There are ten to twelve million people scattered over the four continents where there is not the flag of freedom but the jackboot of domination.

26. We are entitled to ask every single Member of the United Nations to subscribe to the Charter and to accept it. There may be some excuse for the Members who came in before the factors were defined, but not for those who became Members of the United Nations not only after reviewing the general principles of the Charter, but when the Charter was spelt out in the factors which have been approved by the General Assembly and which leave no loophole whatever, since

^{1/} James Duffy, Portuguese Africa (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1959).

every single point, economic, political, social and administrative and the degrees of freedom, its quantum and quality, were all defined by the process of discussion which I believe occupied two or three sessions and are contained in resolution 742 (VIII) to which I have referred. Those who became Members in such circumstances are committed to the Charter not only as it is spelt out in its fundamental principles but as it is implemented and elaborated by these provisions. If under those circumstances they refuse to give information under Article 73 e, of the Charter, it is a violation of the form of the words and the spirit of the Charter and is a negation of the purposes for which this Article was incorporated.

27. Mr. J. S. DA COSTA (Portugal): My delegation deeply regrets having to intervene again, thereby delaying the closure of the general debate, but the statements we have just heard from the representative of India make it our duty to clarify a few points in order to keep the record straight.

28. In the first place, we think that we also would be entitled to ask now for an adjournment of this meeting in order to prepare our reply, as the Indian representative did yesterday [823rd meeting]. We are confident that the General Assembly, in its fairness, would grant such a request. However, out of courtesy and deference to this high body, we shall not request such an adjournment since we do not wish, for our part, to delay the proceedings.

29. It seems more important to note that the reply to our reply, to which we have just listened, stems from the fact that the Indian representative does not enjoy being contradicted. The representative of India, in his intervention yesterday, made some statements concerning the position of my country in regard to Article 73 of the Charter. On behalf of my delegation, I stated our view on the matter, which is different from that of the Indian representative, and I believe that in asserting our opinion we stuck to principles and did not indulge in any references or use any expressions which could call for a reply, particularly a reply such as the one we have heard this morning. There the matter should have rested. The Indian representative stated his view, and we stated our disagreement with that view. The Indian representative is entitled to speak his mind; I think we are entitled to speak ours.

30. Now I shall deal very briefly with our position in regard to Article 73. Yesterday, I had the opportunity of outlining our guiding principles on this question. I shall not repeat them now, but the Indian representative has insisted on one or two points as though they were decisive and as though his arguments, as it were, were final and conclusive. In repudiating those arguments I shall avoid all details in order not to tire the Assembly, but I cannot refrain from stressing the following aspects.

31. First, Article 73 does not apply to the Portuguese nation which, being politically unitary, is in the very same condition as any other country where there may be under-developed populations. It is in the same conditions as other nations, such as the Indian Union, and we do not claim that India should supply information on the way it is developing 30 or 40 millions of such people within its borders.

32. Secondly, in accordance with its centuries-old constitutional law, the Portuguese nation is and has

always been, a unitary State independently of the relative geographic situation of its various provinces. Nothing whatever in the Charter authorizes the United Nations to contradict the existence of a unitary State, irrespective of the geographical position of the various components of the national territory. A proof of this is that the United Nations, surely acquainted after ten years with the terms of the Portuguese Constitution, has not found in that Constitution any provision which would jeopardize the admittance of Portugal into this Organization. Thus, the very fact that Portugal was unanimously admitted to membership in the United Nations signifies beyond any possible doubt respect for a political and constitutional structure, a structure which is centuries older than the existence of the United Nations.

33. In fact, the present political Constitution of the Republic of Portugal, enacted in 1933, followed the unalterable tradition of the Portuguese constitutional laws which had their origin in the fifteenth century. It defines in Article I the national territory as an indivisible unity, placing all its conduct on a plane of equality. Manifestly, it is not a new juridical conception nor a simple gesture of political expediency: it is, on the contrary, the very essence of a nation which was born, grew and defined itself very long ago in several continents, unhindered by distinction of race, religion, social origins or castes. This unitary political structure, embodied in the fundamental laws of the country—thus much older than the movements of modern constitutionalism—was later expressed in all the Portuguese constitutional texts, namely the constitutions of 1822, 1832, 1842 and 1911, whence it took its present shape. Even the latest reform of the Portuguese constitution—which no one has suggested altered its substance—well antedates the admittance of Portugal into the United Nations.

34. As a final result of these realities, the sovereignty of the Portuguese nation is one and indivisible, and it cannot therefore acknowledge any specific international status which would differentiate between parts of the same national territory. These facts render absolutely impossible the applicability of Chapter XI of the Charter to Portugal, for it would imply the imposition of a distinct international status to one or another part of the national territory. Such a status would have to be then the one applicable to Non-Self-Governing Territories, which is strictly prohibited by the constitutional structure of Portugal, for it is clearly defined that all parts of the national territory, and their respective populations, are independent with the independence of the nation. We could not discriminate against a segment of the population, for such a system would bear a racial discrimination which we have never practised during eight centuries of nationhood.

35. This is not the Fourth Committee, as the Indian representative himself admitted yesterday, and therefore, we do not wish to go any further, while reserving our right to do so at the appropriate time and place, should there be any need, particularly reading and quoting some of many books on India.

36. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): A point of order.

37. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I would like to inform the representative of India, if I may, that I do not think that any point of order has

arisen from the general debate. If he wishes to make any observation, I will call on him after the speakers on my list have made their statements.

38. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): My delegation had not intended to reply to certain remarks made yesterday, by the representative of the Soviet Union [823rd meeting]. These remarks concerned the proposal made by the delegations of Ireland and Malaya [A/4234] for the inscription in our agenda of an item entitled "The Question of Tibet". As a number of other delegations have, however, exercised their right to reply at this stage of the debate, we feel that for us to remain silent might be open to misinterpretation as a tacit acceptance of the Soviet delegation's allegations. The delegation of the Federation of Malaya has already, for its part, replied to similar allegations made a few days ago [821st meeting]. To intervene now also gives us an opportunity to refer to certain aspects of the question that require emphasis.

39. Mr. Kuznetsov implied yesterday that, in asking the Assembly to consider the case of Tibet, we were acting at the behest of another delegation. The reason why the Irish delegation, in association with the delegation of the Federation of Malaya, has asked the Assembly to consider the case of Tibet is quite simple. We believe that the fundamental rights, and even the very existence of a small nation, and of a small people—the people of Tibet—are threatened. We believe that whenever the rights of a small people are forcibly violated in this manner, the representatives of other small peoples in this Assembly have the duty to speak out. If we fail to do so in such a case, a case like that of Tibet, then in our view we would be weakening what is in the long run the only defence of small peoples everywhere—the moral force of public opinion, upholding the rights of our Charter.

40. If the delegation of the Soviet Union will trouble to examine my delegation's record in this Assembly they will find that we have in fact spoken and voted on all similar issues in accordance with these beliefs. Our position in this Assembly has been governed by adherence not to any bloc but to the principles of the Charter and to the evolution of the rule of law.

41. In conclusion, I should like to suggest to Mr. Kuznetsov, the representative of the Soviet Union, that he is making a very grave error if he really ascribes the alarm and anxiety aroused everywhere by actions such as that of the People's Republic of China in Tibet, to the activities and machinations of a particular State or group of States. There are actions which in themselves are repugnant to the moral conscience of mankind. The best and speediest way of ending the cold war is to refrain from such actions and to pursue peaceful policies; indeed, that course was recommended by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, His Excellency, Nikita S. Khrushchev in an important recent address in Peking.

42. Mr. CHAMPASSAK (Laos) (translated from French): The prevailing mood at this fourteenth session of the General Assembly has been one of general relaxation of tension. Consequently, we were greatly surprised at the statement made yesterday [823rd meeting] by the representative of India to this Assembly. We were accused, among other things, of a unilateral violation of the 1954 Geneva agreements, and of preferring a truce to peace.

43. In exercising my right of reply, I do not wish to enter into an argument with anyone. I simply wish to inform the Assembly of the nature of the events in Laos, in order to clear up all doubts, misunderstandings and obscure points that are being used to create confusion.

44. I listened carefully to the statement by the Indian representative. A good part of his speech was devoted to the situation in Indo-China in general and to Laos in particular. He said nothing which was not already known. He repeated the same arguments which have been used over and over again since the day when Viet-Minh gave the signal for the events which you know. I wish to thank him however for the importance which he attaches to the cause of peace in Asia and for his interest in my country. That moves us all the more as India and the Kingdom of Laos have always maintained, and are maintaining, very cordial, even affectionate, relations.

45. Laos, a country deeply impregnated with Buddhism, bears the stamp of Indian civilization and is, spiritually, if I may use that term, a product of India. My country regards India as a great nation capable of setting the countries of Asia, particularly the smaller and the new independent ones, which have to struggle with the multifarious problems of growth, on the road to independence and freedom.

46. For that reason we were happy to see the chairmanship of the International Commission for Supervision and Control, an international body which emerged from the 1954 Geneva agreements, entrusted to India. These agreements, as far as Laos was concerned, provided for the cessation of hostilities and for a political settlement. The cessation of hostilities was brought about as early as the end of 1954 and a political settlement was achieved, after difficult negotiations, in 1957. Since then no major problem remains to be solved.

47. The Geneva agreements, as far as Laos was concerned, were fulfilled through the integration of the Pathet Lao fighting units into the national community. These agreements were not intended to delay the development of an independent State nor did they link the problem of Laos with that of Viet-Nam or of Cambodia.

48. We are deeply distressed to note that some States wish to perpetuate the life of a body which no longer has any reason to exist. Furthermore, the Geneva agreements spoke only of the Pathet Lao fighting units and never recognized the Pathet Lao movement as a political entity.

49. The intervention of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam into our internal affairs has continued since the day when that neighbouring Republic set up a so-called "national liberation movement" as an instrument of its policy. Laos has never known peace or tranquillity since that day. There is much talk in the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam of the principles of the Bandung Conference and of peaceful coexistence, but there is constant interference in the affairs of a small country which asks only to live at peace with all nations.

50. A little while ago I said that the Pathet Lao movement was created to serve the Viet-Minh policy of war. Is the Indian representative aware that the name Pathet Lao was first used at Geneva by the head

of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, to the great astonishment of the rebels? The words Pathet Lao merely mean "land of Laos".

51. I do not wish to dwell too long on this question. Besides, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Laos, in his speech during the general debate [815th meeting], described the situation in my country. I do believe, however, that a few points need clearing up at this time.

52. According to the Indian representative, all the after-effects of the Indo-Chinese war—which was not our war—had to be completely wiped out before the International Commission for Supervision and Control could be dissolved. In other words, it was necessary to wait for the unification of Viet-Nam, which might mean waiting five or ten years or even indefinitely. During that time, my country, Laos, would be condemned, through the fault of its neighbours, to remain permanently under the yoke of an international supervisory body.

53. I should like to remind the Indian representative that Indo-China, as a geographical and even political concept, is out-of-date, and has been discarded. There is no longer an Indo-China, as an entity. There are only Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos. The birth of these States, once part of Indo-China, took place well before 1954, well before the Geneva agreements. That is why three separate International Commissions were set up: one for Laos, another for Cambodia and still another for Viet-Nam.

54. For that reason, my delegation is anxiously wondering whether the Indian representative's insistence on the reactivation of the International Commission is not based on the nostalgic desire still secretly felt by a few States to play some sort of role in my country. I shall revert to these problems when the question of Laos is discussed and shall then speak in greater detail about my country.

55. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I promised the representative of India that I would call upon him for any observation he might wish to make in connexion with the general debate.

I call on the representative of India.

56. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I merely rose to a point of order and under the rules of this debate I would have been called to make my point of order. Out of my personal respect for the President I did not argue it at that time.

57. I have no intention of replying to a reply or anticipating another debate. All I wanted to say was that my delegation moved the adjournment of the meeting of the Assembly under rule 78 until this morning because the Assembly had already been sitting an hour and twenty minutes after time and we wanted to go home, as did many of the others. If you

had been good enough to put the motion to the vote, it would have been unanimously carried. Therefore it is very wrong to say that we moved the adjournment as a subterfuge for preparing a speech. The General Assembly can make its own inference as to who used the time for preparation. I can answer the Portuguese case in my sleep.

Statement by the President of the General Assembly on the World Refugee Year

58. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to draw the General Assembly's attention to the World Refugee Year. The resolution adopted in December 1958 [resolution 1285 (XIII)] had three objectives: to focus interest on the refugee problem, to encourage additional financial contributions from Governments and the general public, and to encourage additional opportunities for permanent refugee solutions. The Secretary-General lost no time in undertaking these tasks.

59. Certain Member States have made generous increases in their own contributions to the programmes of assistance to refugees. However, as President of the Assembly, I must make it clear that the success of World Refugee Year is as yet by no means assured. We all know that a World Refugee Year cannot solve every question; but there are certain clearly identifiable situations which have been on the world's conscience for too long, mainly owing to lack of funds and to the public's inadequate understanding of the problem. As matters at present stand, and however promising the start which may have been made, the success of the World Refugee Year depends on the practical response of a large number of Members of this Assembly. This is a humanitarian undertaking, which, because it has been begun under the auspices of the General Assembly, should be carried to a completely successful conclusion. In the next few weeks, Members will have the opportunity of considering and announcing their contributions, whether financial or of any other type.

60. Possibly the most important factor will be the meeting of an ad hoc committee of the whole Assembly for the announcement of pledges of contributions to the two United Nations bodies concerned with refugees. This meeting will take place in November.

61. I earnestly request all Members to consider most carefully the contributions which they will make, and to announce them at the meeting that I have just mentioned. In sponsoring the World Refugee Year, the General Assembly has brought fresh hope to millions of refugees throughout the world. It is our duty to see that this hope is not disappointed. The Secretary-General and those working with him have done their part. The responsibility is now yours.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.