



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda items 17 and 66:	
Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction: report of the Disarmament Commission (concluded)	293
Measures for the further relaxation of international tension and development of international co-operation (concluded)	
Agenda item 65:	
The question of West Irian (West New Guinea).....	296
Completion of the Committee's work.....	296

Chairman: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEMS 17 AND 66

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction: report of the Disarmament Commission (A/2979, A/3047, A/C.1/L.149/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.153/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.156) (concluded)

Measures for the further relaxation of international tension and development of international co-operation (A/2981 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.151) (concluded)

1. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that unfortunately the revised draft resolution proposed by the four Powers (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2) had not taken account of the essential features of the USSR amendments (A/C.1/L.152), which must be part of any plan for disarmament. The USSR had accordingly proposed revised amendments (A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1) to the four-Power draft resolution.
2. The first amendment would insert two paragraphs in the preamble, one relating to the agreement on objectives reached by the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, and the other to the *rapprochement* between the Powers on the questions of maximum levels for the armed forces of the five Powers and on the order to be followed in the execution of measures for the prohibition of atomic weapons.
3. The most important problem was obviously the conclusion of an agreement which would put an end to the armaments race, lead to the prohibition of atomic weapons, and set up an effective control of the measures adopted for those purposes. In the revised four-Power

draft, however, priority was given to the question of the exchange of military information and to mutual aerial inspection. The conclusion of a disarmament convention was put in the background. Such a procedure was inadmissible and certainly not in conformity with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 808 (IX). The purpose of the second USSR amendment was to correct that shortcoming in the draft resolution.

4. The purpose of the third USSR amendment, dealing with the study of methods of control, was to place that study in its proper framework, namely, the problem of disarmament.

5. Adoption of the USSR amendments would considerably improve the draft resolution and in particular make it conform with resolution 808 (IX). The USSR felt that the efforts to achieve a solution of the disarmament problem should be carried on with diligence so as to contribute to a relaxation of tension. From that point of view, the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.151) was particularly significant.

6. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) considered that the USSR amendments had been revised solely with regard to form and did not embody any change of substance. He had already stated (809th meeting) the reasons why the amendments were unacceptable, and there was therefore no need to repeat them.

7. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) recalled that he had emphasized (807th meeting) the necessity of having a unanimous vote on the question of disarmament. That was the spirit in which he appraised the efforts which had been made to broaden the four-Power draft resolution by incorporating in it a certain number of amendments.

8. His delegation would vote in favour of the revised four-Power draft resolution even though not regarding it as absolutely perfect. If, however, unanimity was to be achieved, there could be no seeking after perfection; there must be a willingness to be content with what was acceptable.

9. His delegation would vote in favour of the fifth of the amendments proposed by India (A/C.1/L.153/Rev.1), but would abstain from voting on the third Indian amendment, as well as on the Syrian amendment (A/C.1/L.156), because although an expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission was desirable, the time was not appropriate in view of the possibility that new Members would be admitted to the United Nations and that, as a result, the membership of the Security Council and thus also of the Disarmament Commission would be expanded.

10. The first part of the first USSR amendment served no purpose because the idea which it expressed had already been included in the four-Power draft resolution. On the other hand, the second part of that amendment was necessary because agreements had been achieved in certain respects. There could be no justification for the

second USSR amendment, because, if agreement was to be reached, the better course was to be reasonable in selecting the questions to be given priority. His delegation would abstain from voting on that amendment and would vote in favour of the third amendment, which was broader than the four-Power draft resolution.

11. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom proposal to give priority to the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The proposal was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble to the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second, third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble.

The paragraphs were adopted by 55 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the first USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1), ending with the words "Disarmament Commission in 1955".

That part of the amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 5, with 20 abstentions.

15. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of the first USSR amendment.

That part of the amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth paragraph of the preamble to the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sixth and seventh paragraphs of the preamble.

The paragraphs were adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the eighth paragraph of the preamble.

The paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1), relating to paragraph 1 (b) of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The amendment was rejected by 39 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

21. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the initial phrase of operative paragraph 1 (b) of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2): "Should as initial steps give priority to early agreement on and implementation of".

The phrase was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 (b) (i).

The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 5.

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 (b) (ii).

The paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of operative paragraph 2, ending with the words "problems of inspection and control".

That part of the paragraph was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of operative paragraph 2.

That part of the paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2 as a whole.

The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 3.

The paragraph was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1).

The amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 4 of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Syrian amendment (A/C.1/L.156).

The amendment was rejected by 28 votes to 14, with 13 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.153/Rev.1, para. 3) to the effect that the Disarmament Commission should be enlarged.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 5 of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.153/Rev.1, para. 5) proposing the addition of a new paragraph 6.

The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 6 of the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.150/Rev.2).

The paragraph was adopted unanimously.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to 5.

36. Mr. MENON (India) said that, in view of the adoption of the four-Power draft resolution, he withdrew the first two paragraphs of the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.149/Rev.1).

37. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3 of the Indian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.149/Rev.1) to the vote.

The paragraph was rejected by 36 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.

38. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority of the Committee was a very important event in the history of the United Nations. The resolution would be a protection against aggressions, would promote disarmament, and would bring the desired aims nearer.

39. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the four-Power draft resolution because it contained no recommendation on the basic task, which was to work out agreed steps to end the armaments race and remove the threat of a new war. Instead of providing for the reduction of armaments and armed forces, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and strict control of those measures, the draft resolution was primarily concerned with the disclosure of military information and put aside the solution of the problems mentioned in General Assembly resolution 808 (IX).

40. The USSR delegation had proposed amendments designed to remedy those defects. As the amendments had not been adopted, the USSR had not been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. The USSR would nevertheless persevere in its efforts to reach an agreed solution on the carrying out of a disarmament programme.

41. Mr. HSIOH-REN WEI (China) said that he had asked for a separate vote on the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution because he felt that the Asian-African Conference at Bandung should not be put together with the Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers at Geneva and the tenth anniversary commemorative meetings of the United Nations at San Francisco.

42. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) expressed surprise at the USSR representative's statement that the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee departed from resolution 808 (IX); operative paragraph 1 in fact urged the members of the Sub-Committee to continue their endeavours to reach agreement on a comprehensive disarmament plan in accordance with the goals set out in resolution 808 (IX). He shared the United States representative's view that the adoption of the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority confirmed the desire of the United Nations to attain full disarmament and, above all, to try to make a start with such confidence-building measures and disarmament as were even now possible. He could not, consequently, share the somewhat pessimistic opinion expressed by the USSR representative.

43. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was equally surprised at the United Kingdom representative's assertion that the draft resolution, as adopted by the Committee, was consistent with resolution 808 (IX), especially as the United Kingdom representative had previously voted against the Indian amendment requesting the Disarmament Commission to undertake without delay the drafting of an international disarmament convention.

44. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the revised four-Power draft resolution, which incorporated a number of amendments presented by India and the USSR as well as the amendment submitted by Costa Rica, Mexico and Pakistan (A/C.1/L.154/Rev.1).

45. In principle, the Indian and Syrian amendments seeking to enlarge the Disarmament Commission proposed an interesting innovation. Nevertheless, in view

of the prospective admission of eighteen States to the United Nations, it was preferable, for many reasons, not to make that move at the present time.

46. His delegation could not agree with the first paragraph of the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.151). It was difficult to note with satisfaction the efforts made by the Heads of Government of the four great Powers, with a view to relaxing international tension, after Mr. Krushchev's statement on 10 December 1955 that the people of Kashmir had already decided to join the Indian Union. That provocative utterance had shown disregard of all the Security Council resolutions on the question and was liable to increase tension in that part of the world.

47. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the question of Kashmir was not on the agenda. He objected to the allegation that Mr. Krushchev had indulged in provocation and asked that the speaker should be called to order.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, in considering the proposal on measures designed to reduce international tension, a speaker could refer to existing tension. He would nevertheless ask representatives to show moderation and not to cite Security Council resolutions in detail.

49. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that statements like the one made by Mr. Krushchev on the subject of Kashmir were likely to increase international tension and imperil international peace and security. For that reason, his delegation could not support the USSR draft resolution.

50. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of each paragraph of the four-Power draft resolution, as well as for the draft as a whole. It had abstained from voting on the Indian and Syrian amendments, which proposed the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee, as such a measure did not seem opportune. He had voted against the Indian amendment requesting the Disarmament Commission to undertake without delay the drafting of a convention on the question of disarmament because the moment for such a request had not yet come. He had also voted against the Indian proposal that the General Assembly should only stand recessed, as a few months would hardly be sufficient for much progress to be made.

51. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) pointed out that a vote on the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.151) concerning measures designed to reduce international tension had become unnecessary. The ideas contained in the first two paragraphs were covered by the draft resolution which the Committee had just approved. The idea expressed in the third paragraph corresponded to the second USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.152/Rev.1), which the Committee had rejected. Lastly, time and the debate in the Committee had taken care of the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution. The draft resolution as a whole should therefore not be put to the vote.

52. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the United Kingdom representative's motion. The question of measures for the further relaxation of international tension and the development of international co-operation had been included on the agenda as a separate item. It had admittedly been considered concurrently with the question of the regulation and reduction of armed forces, but the two questions were distinct, and separate resolutions should be adopted.

53. The USSR draft resolution drew attention to outstanding matters and called upon Governments to con-

tinue their efforts with a view to consolidating peace and security. Delegations which had been unable to support those provisions in the general context of disarmament might be able to do so in a separate draft resolution. For that reason, his delegation would insist that the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

54. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) felt that the United Kingdom representative might have gone a little too far in interpreting the votes of some delegations on the USSR draft resolution. The Yugoslav delegation had been unable to support the second USSR amendment in the context of disarmament. The idea it contained was nevertheless important. His delegation would therefore be disposed to vote in favour of the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.151).

55. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) felt that there was nothing more to be put to the vote. The USSR draft resolution had been discussed at the same time as the draft which had just been adopted. He therefore supported the United Kingdom representative's motion. It might perhaps be possible to add the heading of the USSR draft resolution to the title of the draft resolution already adopted.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that he proposed to put the United Kingdom representative's motion to the vote.

57. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) refuted the arguments advanced by the United Kingdom representative. The Committee had discussed two separate agenda items concurrently. It has been decided to do so because the two items were related, but interdependence was not the same as identity. The Soviet Union draft resolution should be put to the vote because in view of the scope of its provisions it was likely to mobilize world public opinion in favour of peace.

58. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) supported the United Kingdom motion and in that connexion read out rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The two draft resolutions related to the same question and the rule was therefore applicable. The Committee was therefore quite entitled to decide that it would not vote on the Soviet draft resolution. Moreover, that text had been discussed and partly incorporated in the draft resolution that had been adopted. Lastly, it should be pointed out that some of its provisions did not correspond to the facts.

59. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that rule 132 was not applicable in the present case. The words "the same question" meant "the same agenda item" and the Soviet draft resolution did not relate to the same agenda item as the draft resolution just adopted. There was no rule in the rules of procedure which would preclude the Committee from voting on the USSR draft resolution.

60. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) pointed out that he had not said that there was any rule in the rules of procedure which precluded the Committee from voting on the Soviet Union draft resolution. Nevertheless, he maintained that such a vote would be redundant because the Committee had already taken a position in the matter.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom motion that the First Committee should decide not to vote on the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.151).

The motion was adopted by 40 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

62. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) asked what would be the title of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that the text would retain its present title.

64. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) pointed out that it had never been the Committee's practice to vote on the titles of draft resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 65

The question of West Irian (West New Guinea) (A/C.1/L.155)

65. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) introduced the joint draft resolution submitted by Ecuador, India, New Zealand, Norway and Syria (A/C.1/L.155). On behalf of co-sponsors, he expressed the hope that the Committee would adopt it without discussion of the substance of the question. The Netherlands and Indonesia had been informed of the draft resolution and had made no objection to it. Its sponsors hoped that its adoption would assist the two Governments directly concerned in their efforts to solve the question at issue.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of objections he would consider the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.155) adopted.

Completion of the Committee's work

67. The Committee having concluded its work, Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia), Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia), Mr. NUNEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru), Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia), Mr. SARPER (Turkey), Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia), who spoke on behalf of the delegations of the British Commonwealth, Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt), Mr. MELAS (Greece), Mr. KIDRON (Israel), Mr. THORS (Iceland), Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand), Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico), Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands), who spoke on behalf of the Benelux delegations, Mr. BASAGOITI (Uruguay), Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), Mr. LODGE (United States of America), Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma), Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), Mr. TARCICI (Yemen), Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina), who spoke also on behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala and Honduras, Mr. ALPHAND (France), Mr. Hsioh-Ren WEI (China), Mr. PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela) and Mr. DIAZ ORDONEZ (Dominican Republic) congratulated the Chairman on the manner in which he had discharged his difficult duties. His skill, authority and tact had made it possible for the Committee to complete its work smoothly and successfully. Despite the many highly controversial items on the agenda, the discussions had, thanks to his impartiality and unflinching courtesy, been dignified and moderate in tone.

68. Those representatives also paid tribute to Mr. Abdoh, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Echeverri Cortés, the Rapporteur, and Mr. Protitch, the Secretary of the Committee, for the competence and devotion they had displayed in their work. They also thanked all the members of the Secretariat who had directly and indirectly participated in the Committee's work.

69. The CHAIRMAN expressed gratitude for the generous statements that had been made about him.

He had been greatly assisted by the patience and understanding shown at all times by the representatives of all delegations. He had worked in close co-operation with them for many weeks and felt that he could look upon them as friends. His task had been greatly facilitated by the officers of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, and Mr. Protitch, whose great devotion and knowledge had been an invaluable source of assistance. The frequent occasions on which the Secretary-General had sat with the Committee afforded further proof, if any were needed, of his interest in the questions before it. In conclusion, the

Chairman paid a tribute to the work of the members of the Secretariat.

70. The VICE-CHAIRMAN, the RAPPORTEUR and Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs) thanked the members of the Committee and the Chairman for their kind words. Their task had been facilitated by the Chairman's skill, understanding and courtesy. Mr. Protitch also expressed the gratitude of the members of the Secretariat to whom the kind words addressed to him should, he felt, be conveyed.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.