



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Election of the Vice-Chairman.	3
Election of the Rapporteur	3
Order of discussion of agenda items.	3

Chairman: Mr. Victor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

Election of the Vice-Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for the honour conferred upon him and his country by his unanimous election to the office of Chairman of the First Committee. He expressed his confidence that the co-operation and assistance of the members of the Committee would be forthcoming and that the success of the Committee's work would depend primarily thereon. The Chairman paid tribute to the Secretary-General. He was convinced that the Secretariat would co-operate as it had in the past. The Committee would continue to be ably served by Mr. Protitch, the Secretary of the Committee, as well as by Mr. Narayanan, the Deputy Secretary.

2. He invited the Committee to elect its Vice-Chairman.

3. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand) nominated Mr. Gunewardene (Ceylon).

4. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) and Mr. Krishna MENON (India) supported the nomination.

Mr. Gunewardene (Ceylon) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

5. Mr. GUNewardENE (Ceylon) thanked the members of the Committee, and particularly the representatives of New Zealand, El Salvador and India, for the compliment paid to him and to his country.

Election of the Rapporteur

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to elect its Rapporteur.

7. Mr. VITETTI (Italy) nominated Mr. Matsch (Austria).

8. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) supported the nomination.

Mr. Matsch (Austria) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

9. Mr. MATSCH (Austria) thanked the members of the Committee, and in particular the representatives of Italy and Mexico, for the honour bestowed upon him and his country.

Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.1/777)

10. Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) noted that all the items on the Committee's agenda were important. The current session of the General Assembly had been unusual in that the attention of all representatives had

been so concentrated on the debates that had already taken place that the majority of delegations had not had sufficient time to study any of the other questions. He, therefore, proposed that the Committee discuss first items 1 and 2 in the letter from the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/777), namely the Korean question [item 21*] and the question of disarmament [item 22*], and postpone discussion on the order of the remaining three items until later.

11. Mr. KASE (Japan) said that, following an exchange of views, the African-Asian group had come to the conclusion that, because of the urgency of the question of Algeria [item 62*], the Committee should be requested to discuss that item first. In view of the prevailing situation in the United Nations, the group had later come to the conclusion that the Committee might proceed first with the Korean item and then discuss the Algerian question. If the Committee did not accept that suggestion, he thought the group might agree to place the Algerian question as the third item.

12. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) disagreed with the statement of the representative of Colombia that the various delegations had not yet crystallized their positions on various issues and pointed out that the Assembly had already been in session for over two months. As a matter of principle, the Committee must decide on the order of all the items. If the United Nations gave the impression that it was unwilling to discuss problems relating to colonialism, its prestige would be endangered.

13. Two of the items, the problems of Algeria and of Cyprus [item 55*], involved the peace of the world. There was bloodshed in both countries. The problem of Korea had slipped into the background. The disarmament question was an important one, but he did not know if the two great Powers concerned, the United States and the USSR, were in fact prepared to advance concrete proposals which would make progress possible. He suggested the following sequence be approved: first, the Algerian question; second, the question of Cyprus; third, disarmament; and fourth, the question of Korea.

14. Mr. DE FREITAS VALLE (Brazil) supported the Colombian proposal, which came close to meeting the position of the African-Asian group of members.

15. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regarded the items, with the exception of the Korean question, as of great importance for the reduction of tension in various parts of the world. One problem of equal concern to all people was that of disarmament, the cessation of the armaments race and the prohibition of atomic weapons. The continuing armaments race, particularly that for new types of weapons of mass destruction, was creating anxiety and alarm. It was impossible to live in peace and calm on top of a box of dynamite, especially when certain parties

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

played with fire near that box. The United Nations must do everything in its power to prevent a new war and to draw the proper conclusions from the lessons of history. The peoples of the world demanded the cessation of the arms race. The sooner States reached agreement on disarmament, the sooner it would be possible to solve other problems; such an agreement would contribute to the lessening of tension and to the raising of standards of living in the world. The USSR proposals of 17 November 1956 (A/3366) on disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and of tests of those weapons, as well as on measures of control, raised new possibilities, the exploration of which was the most urgent task before the Committee. The peoples of the world would not understand if the question of disarmament were postponed. Instead of being placed first, the Korean question should be discussed last.

16. Referring to the statements made by the representatives of Japan and Greece, he said that, if the Committee considered it appropriate to discuss the question of Algeria or the question of Cyprus first, he would not insist on taking up the disarmament question beforehand.

17. Mr. KASE (Japan) explained that some members of the African-Asian group desired to give the disarmament question priority in preference to the Korean question, giving the Algerian item as high a priority as possible.

18. Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) observed that there were questions among those five which had already been discussed by the Committee and by the General Assembly in the past, whereas others had not received enough attention. The question of Algeria should receive a very high priority, for it concerned a destructive war carried on for more than two years by a modern army using weapons made in France and other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization against the inhabitants of Algeria. The question created tension between a large number of Member States. The lack of attention given to that war by the Organization represented neglect of its duties. The objective should be to achieve the basis for a settlement of a situation of war and bloodshed. Such a settlement would create a new atmosphere and would pave the way for a solution of other highly important questions. If not considered first, the Algerian item should at least be placed second in the order of discussion.

19. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that to discuss the Korean question first was undesirable and inconvenient. Such a proposal viewed that question either as a very urgent matter or as a mere formality, and he could not agree that either view was appropriate. He hoped that it would be possible to get a decision whereby the Korean question would be discussed later and the disarmament question would be taken up first. If that was not possible, he hoped that the resolution stage of the Korean item would be postponed. The disarmament question was the most important one before the General Assembly. He supported the proposal that the greatest priority possible should be given to the Algerian item.

20. Mr. TSIANG (China) supported the Colombian proposal. The members of the Committee could not forget that it was in Korea that the United Nations had made the greatest effort in its history. Any attempt to belittle the importance of the Korean problem would be out of place and would create the impression that the

United Nations could not hold steadfast on any course it had set.

21. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) found the Colombian proposal reasonable and the statement of the representative of China cogent and persuasive. He supported the proposal to discuss the question of disarmament after the Korean question. He agreed with the representative of the USSR on the vital importance of the question of disarmament. The United States attached great weight to discussion of the matter. He believed that within a week or so delegations would be in a position to discuss the report of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee (DC/83).

22. Mr. BEN-ABOUD (Morocco) agreed that all items were important. In Korea there was peace, but a solution had not been achieved. The question of disarmament was undoubtedly of capital importance. But he found the Colombian proposal somewhat strange in that it singled out those two items, postponing indefinitely a decision on the order of the others. The Committee must decide on the order of discussion in a clear-cut manner. The priority of items should be commensurate with their moral urgency. The Algerian question should be considered in time to avoid such consequences as an extension of the conflict or of insecurity. While he proposed no particular sequence, therefore, he would be glad to have the disarmament question first followed by the questions of Algeria and Cyprus — where there was also bloodshed — and then those of Korea and West Irian [item 63*].

23. Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia), in reply to the representative of Greece, explained that he had had no intention of eliminating any item. He noted that the USSR representative had stressed the importance of the question of disarmament. The representative of Japan had also implicitly accepted his proposal, but placed the disarmament question first. He stressed the importance of the Korean question and of not shifting rapidly from one question to another.

24. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece), noting that the representatives of the United States and the USSR were apparently willing to have the disarmament question discussed first, proposed the following order: (1) disarmament, (2) Algeria, (3) Cyprus, (4) Korea, (5) West Irian.

25. Mr. LODGE (United States of America), on a point of order, said that his delegation favoured discussion of the Korean item first and of the disarmament item second.

26. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) said that one of the advantages of the order proposed by the Greek representative was that delegations would know in advance what items to prepare for. The only war going on in the world at present was the one in Algeria, where destruction was on a broad scale. Over half a million troops were being employed. The organized resistance of a whole nation in arms had caused the conflict to continue for two years. The situation had very wide international implications. The problem was more urgent than any other on the list before the Committee. Because of the universal importance of the problem of disarmament, he agreed that that question should come first. Algeria would come next. The problem of Cyprus, although on a smaller scale, was similar to that of Algeria and should follow the latter. As for Korea, there was very little urgency since little could be done at present. On the contrary, there appeared to be advantages in discussing that question later.

27. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the various proposals and suggestions made, noted that there were only three proposals of a formal nature: those of Colombia, Greece and the USSR.

28. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, declared that the Greek proposal would meet the interests of the USSR delegation and for that reason, he would vote in favour of it.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the statement of the representative of the USSR, there were only two proposals before the Committee, namely, the Colombian proposal and the Greek proposal.

30. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) said that the discussion in the Committee had clearly shown the importance which it attached to the question of disarmament. The Czechoslovak delegation felt that that matter required urgent action on the part of all concerned, as progress achieved in the field of disarmament would have good effects as far as solution of outstanding international problems was concerned. The Czechoslovak delegation would therefore vote in favour of giving priority to the consideration of the disarmament question. It would also support an early discussion of the Algerian question and favour the order of discussion suggested by the representative of Greece.

31. Mr. MENEMENCIOLU (Turkey) said that he felt that Japan had already made a formal amendment which provided that the Committee would begin consideration of the first two items on its agenda and then decide to put the question of Algeria as the third item.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Japan had not made a formal proposal.

33. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that, as the Greek proposal was most comprehensive, he wished to move that it be voted upon first, before the Colombian proposal.

34. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the proposal of the representative of Jordan constituted a question of priority and must be decided upon by the Committee.

35. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) said that, while his delegation was not opposed to a vote being taken on the Colombian proposal, it would, however, favour a decision on all items contained in the letter of the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/777). The delegation of Spain would, therefore, suggest that the remaining items in that letter should also be included in the Colombian proposal. Otherwise, it might appear that the Committee was postponing discussion of those items or relegating them to a less important position.

36. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia) said that his delegation would support the Colombian proposal as experience had shown that it was not always wise to adopt a fixed order for the entire agenda. It was better to determine the first two items and leave the others to be determined at a later stage. Moreover, the representative of the United States had already stated that his delegation was not yet ready to discuss the question of disarmament. For that reason, it would not be appropriate to put disarmament as the first question on the agenda.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal submitted by the representative of Jordan that priority be given to the Greek proposal in voting.

The proposal was not adopted, 29 votes being cast in favour and 29 against, with 14 abstentions.

38. Mr. KHOURI (Lebanon) submitted an amendment to the Colombian proposal to the effect that three more items should be added to the Colombian proposal which would then be in the following order: first, the question of Korea; secondly, the question of disarmament; thirdly, the question of Algeria; fourthly, the question of Cyprus; and fifthly, the West Irian question.

39. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be difficult for many delegations to vote on the Colombian proposal with the Korean question appearing as the first item. The delegation of the USSR would therefore propose that a separate vote should be taken as to which item would be the first one.

40. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Colombian proposal was a whole and could not be separated without the agreement of the sponsor.

41. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that under rule 130 the Committee could adopt a procedure which would make it possible to vote in parts or to present amendments, and for that reason the USSR delegation would move that separate votes should be taken on the place of each of the first two items, namely, the Korean question and the question of disarmament.

42. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) said that the essential part of the Colombian proposal was that the Committee should postpone its decision on the three other items. Even if that proposal was adopted, the Greek proposal should still be put to the vote, as it covered all items.

43. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia) said that the Colombian proposal was an indivisible one and must be voted upon as a whole in accordance with the practice followed in the Committee.

44. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that the Committee would be justified if it were to decide to vote separately on the order of the first two items in the Colombian proposal were it not for the third part of that proposal, which provided that the Committee should decide to leave to a later stage its decision on the other three items. That being the case, it was impossible for the Committee, as the representative of the USSR had suggested, to vote separately on the place of the first two items. For that reason, the Colombian proposal should be voted upon only as a whole.

45. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) recalled that the essence of the Colombian proposal was that the Committee should decide to postpone a decision on the remaining three items. In the opinion of the Greek delegation, that would result in postponement of those items to a time when there could be no possibility of their adequate discussion, although they were the most important questions on the Committee's agenda since they dealt with problems of colonialism. He therefore proposed that either the Colombian proposal be put to the vote in three parts or it should be made clear that the adoption of that proposal would not prejudice the order of discussion of items other than those of Korea and disarmament.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that a proposal could not be divided into parts without the approval of its sponsor. It was a question not only of the rules of procedure but also of logic. If the substance of a proposal related to a certain order, then that order could not be changed without changing the substance of the proposal. The Committee could reject that proposal if it considered that the order proposed therein was not correct.

47. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that the Committee must first decide whether it wished to determine the definitive sequence of the discussion of all the items of its agenda or only that relating to the first two items. After a vote on that question, the Committee could proceed to decide on the other proposals.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to point out that there was a proposal submitted by the representative of Lebanon which complemented the proposal of the representative of Colombia. Therefore, after a vote had been taken on the Colombian proposal, the Committee could proceed to vote on the Lebanese proposal.

49. Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) said that in submitting its proposal his delegation had no intention whatsoever of making the Committee postpone the discussion of the other three items. It only desired that the Committee might first decide on the items which it considered to be of more immediate importance. However, in order that the Committee might reach a unanimous decision, the Colombian delegation was prepared to accept the proposal of the representative of Lebanon that the order of the last three items should also be determined, with Algeria as the third item, followed by the questions of Cyprus and of West Irian.

50. His delegation could not accept the proposal of the USSR delegation because it might result in having nothing in first place on the agenda.

51. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in case the first item on the agenda was not voted upon, the Committee could fill the void with another item or make the second item the first. He reiterated his delegation's request that a separate vote be taken on the place of each of the first two items in the Colombian proposal.

52. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that, in view of the acceptance of the Lebanese proposal by the representative of Colombia, the position had been considerably modified, as the third part of the Colombian proposal, which required postponement of the decision on the other three items, no longer existed. That being the case, a separate vote could be taken on each part of the proposal as provided in rule 130.

53. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) suggested that the Colombian proposal might be amended to have the disarmament question as the first item and the question of Algeria as the second item.

54. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) reiterated his proposal that the Committee should adopt the agenda order as listed in the letter of the President of the General Assembly.

55. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) inquired whether the representative of Colombia was prepared to have a joint vote on the proposal submitted by his delegation and by the representative of Lebanon.

56. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) suggested that, as there was no dispute on the place of item 5, the place

of the remaining four items could be determined by balloting.

57. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) said that the Committee had only one proposal before it, that of the delegation of Colombia, as amended by the representative of Lebanon; the only outstanding issue was the one of voting in parts, as requested by the representative of the USSR. That question would have to be decided by the Committee, in case the USSR representative insisted on division. However, such a division would not be appropriate as the Committee had no right to decide whether it should discuss a certain item or not. The First Committee must consider all items submitted to it by the General Assembly. Therefore, the entire Colombian proposal as amended by Lebanon should be put to the vote. However, the Committee must first decide on the point raised by the representative of the USSR, in accordance with rule 130.

58. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee was not being asked to reject an item; it was only being requested to take a decision on the place of an item in the agenda. In case the Korean question was not put as the first item, it would, however, still be on the agenda and would still come up for discussion.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal for a division of the Colombian proposal.

The proposal was rejected by 43 votes to 11, with 18 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN, after the representatives of Colombia and Lebanon had agreed to be co-sponsors and to have a joint vote on their two proposals, put to the vote the proposal by Colombia and Lebanon, namely, that the Committee should discuss the items on its agenda in the following order: (1) Korea, (2) disarmament, (3) Algeria, (4) Cyprus, (5) West Irian.

The proposal was adopted by 58 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

61. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) said that the Committee's vote had made it certain that all items on the agenda would be discussed.

62. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the Colombian-Lebanese proposal because it had placed the Korean item first on the agenda. As regards the order of consideration of the other items, the Soviet delegation agreed to that order.

63. Mr. LALL (India), after recalling the statement of the Chairman of his delegation, said that his delegation hoped that the Committee, after having held a general debate on the Korean question, would adjourn further consideration of that item to a later stage.

64. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representative of India might make that suggestion again at the appropriate time.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.