



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.813
2 January 1957

ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 2 January 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

1. Election of the Vice-Chairman
2. Election of the Rapporteur
3. Agenda of the Committee.

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.813. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like first to express my warm appreciation to all of you for the honour conferred upon my country and upon me by my unanimous election to the office of Chairman of the First Committee.

I have long been convinced that the best way to show appreciation is to make a request. This is perhaps somewhat difficult to understand. Nevertheless, I want my appreciation to be coupled with a request. I know that you will grant my request; that is why I take the liberty of making it. I ask for your cordial but determined co-operation. I know that when you elected me as Chairman and placed upon my feeble shoulders such a heavy load you were well-intentioned and ready to give me your co-operation and help. But today I want to ask you specifically for your co-operation, especially because I am convinced that the success of our work, after the help that we expect from God, will depend primarily upon the co-operation, that friendly and constructive help, that can come only from all delegations here.

I am also convinced of the co-operation of the Secretariat of the United Nations. I have been told that in a few moments the Secretary-General will be here. I know how occupied he is with grave and serious responsibilities and tasks. I wish to pay tribute to him. I want to tell him that our Committee is counting **not** only upon his technical co-operation but also upon his generous inspiration.

(The Chairman)

I do not think I need to introduce to the Committee Mr. Protitch, the Secretary. He is already an institution in the United Nations, and I am linked to him by many ties of friendship and co-operation in the Security Council. I am also confident of the co-operation which I shall receive from Mr. Narayanan, who has always been extremely helpful to me and to all of us.

ELECTION OF THE VICE-CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: The first matter to which we have to attend is the election of the Vice-Chairman. According to rule 105 of our rules of procedure, the officers of the Committee are elected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, experience and personal competence. Are there any nominations?

Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): It is my particular pleasure to nominate as Vice-Chairman of this Committee His Excellency Mr. R.S.S. Gunewardene, the Ambassador of Ceylon to the United States and the first permanent representative of his country to the United Nations. Mr. Gunewardene, it goes without saying, has had a distinguished career both in his own country and in the field of international affairs. He is a lawyer and a graduate of London University. In the forefront of the political life of Ceylon from an early age, Mr. Gunewardene was a founder member, secretary and vice-president of the Ceylon National Congress, an organization devoted to the independence movement in Ceylon. He was elected to the State Council in 1936 and he served as a Minister and in other important capacities until 1947, when Ceylon obtained independence within the Commonwealth. In 1947 he was elected to the first Parliament and was appointed a Minister in the first Cabinet. He has been his country's Ambassador to Italy and he has been very prominent in the affairs of FAO and WHO.

(Sir Leslie Munro, New Zealand)

I do not need to remind my colleagues here of Mr. Gunewardene's assiduity and his devoted skill in procuring the admission of his country to this Organization, a cause which I and all my colleagues in the Commonwealth were glad to embrace and which came, as we all know, to a triumphant conclusion. I nominate him because I esteem him as a diplomat and because I esteem him for myself as a friend, and because he is the representative of a member of the Commonwealth of Nations -- a great Asian member which we in New Zealand and I may say throughout the whole Commonwealth, respect and admire.

I have the honour, therefore, and also the greatest pleasure in nominating Mr. Gunewardene as Vice-Chairman of this Committee.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I am extremely happy to second the nomination made by Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand for the election of His Excellency Mr. R.S.S. Gunewardene as Vice-Chairman of this Committee. He is the Ambassador of Ceylon to the United States and the permanent representative of his country to the United Nations. He is also chairman of the delegation of Ceylon to the present session of the General Assembly.

The political and diplomatic career of our distinguished colleague from Ceylon, as we learned from the interesting data submitted to us by the representative of New Zealand, has been fruitful and brilliant not only for his own country, but for the international organizations with which he has been associated. He has proved his intelligence, his wisdom, his sagacity and his admirable knowledge of people.

When, in the middle of 1955, he came for the first time as Observer from Ceylon to the United Nations we gained a very fine impression of his high personal qualities; we saw him as an indefatigable fighter for the admission of his country to membership in the United Nations. Later, as Ambassador and permanent representative of his country to our Organization we admired without any reservations his courage and his zeal in studying the gravest and most difficult problems being discussed by all diplomats and statesmen in the United Nations. His abilities as a parliamentarian were proved when he very wisely presided over the United Nations Conference on Maintenance Obligations six months ago.

(Mr. Urquía, El Salvador)

Mr. Gunewardene and his great qualities are so well known to us that I am sure we are, without exception, more than ready to elect him to the Vice-Presidency of this important Committee. In so doing, we shall only confirm once more the high esteem in which he is held and the admiration that we feel for his noble country.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation deems it a great privilege to support the nomination of Mr. Ratnakirti Senarath Serasinghe Gunewardene as Vice-Chairman of this Committee. So far as I understand it, Mr. Gunewardene's first name means "jewel of fame"; thus, when he was born -- or soon after -- this title of fame was branded on him.

Ceylon is a very great and distinguished neighbour of India. I am very happy that we should have this opportunity of supporting Mr. Gunewardene's nomination for Vice-Chairman of this Committee -- a nomination which has been moved by my distinguished colleague from New Zealand, another of India's neighbours, being only a few thousand miles away from India, and seconded by the leader of the Latin American group of countries.

Mr. Gunewardene is well known in this building for the active work he did in promoting the membership in the United Nations not only of his own country, but also of all those countries which were waiting to be admitted. We are all familiar with Mr. Gunewardene's capacity for making friends, for taking an objective view of questions and for working very hard. For us from India, however, Mr. Gunewardene is most outstanding for his association with his country's nationalist movement and for his participation in the campaign for his country's freedom.

It is a matter of note that, in the very first year of Ceylon's membership of the United Nations, the Chairman of Ceylon's delegation to the United Nations should be nominated for the high office of Vice-Chairman of the First Committee. I have no doubt that the Committee will elect him unanimously.

It is both a personal honour and a privilege for my delegation and country to support the nomination of this distinguished son of Ceylon for the Vice-Chairmanship of the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If there are no other nominations, I shall, in conformity with the Committee's usual practice, declare Mr. Gunewardene unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the First Committee.

Mr. Gunewardene (Ceylon) was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Are there any nominations for the post of Rapporteur of this Committee?

Mr. VITETTI (Italy): I have the honour and the pleasure to propose the nomination of Mr. Franz Matsch, permanent representative of Austria to the United Nations, as Rapporteur of the First Committee. Mr. Matsch's distinguished performance in his many years in the Austrian diplomatic service and his long experience with international organizations and conferences make his election to the post of Rapporteur highly desirable.

Among the many assignments which Mr. Matsch has carried out and which make him worthy of our highest consideration are the following. He was a member of the Austrian delegation to the Disarmament Conference in 1932, at which I had the pleasure of meeting him for the first time. He was a delegate to the United Nations Trade Conference in Havana in 1947 and 1948. He was a delegate to the United Nations Technical Assistance Conferences in 1950, 1952 and 1953. He was Chairman of the Austrian Atomic Energy Commission in 1955-1956 and head of the Austrian delegation to the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva in August 1955. Coupled with his personal qualities, these and many other responsibilities -- discharged with the highest competence -- make Mr. Matsch worthy of our confidence and equal to the outstanding requirements of the post of Rapporteur of the First Committee. I therefore propose and recommend Mr. Matsch's election to that post.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I am very happy to second the nomination of Mr. Franz Matsch for the post of Rapporteur of the First Committee.

Mr. Matsch is a well-known Austrian diplomat and jurist. He is his country's permanent representative to the United Nations. My friend, Mr. Vitetti of Italy, has with his usual eloquence already given the high points of the career of the representative of Austria. The experience which Mr. Matsch has had represents, I think, the best guarantee that he will carry out his tasks efficiently. The traditional ties between his country and mine and the fact that my Government

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

was one of the Governments most deeply interested in the admission of Austria -- a centre of the art and culture of the Western world -- to membership of the United Nations are additional reasons why I am pleased to be able to support Mr. Matsch's nomination as Rapporteur of the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If there are no other nominations, I shall, in conformity with the Committee's usual practice, declare Mr. Matsch unanimously elected Rapporteur of the First Committee.

Mr. Matsch (Austria) was unanimously elected Rapporteur.

Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon) (Vice-Chairman): I appreciate very much the compliment you have paid me and my little country by unanimously electing me Vice-Chairman of this very important Committee, a committee in which many of the burning questions of the day will be discussed. I am conscious of my own limitations. I have been in this Assembly for barely a year, and it is a high honour indeed to be elected as Vice-Chairman to help in the deliberations of this Committee. I am heartened, however, by the fact that during the short time I have been here I have made many friends and received the hearty co-operation of all delegations.

I am also heartened by the fact that we have, to preside over our deliberations, an elder statesman of the calibre of Mr. Belaunde, who has always been an inspiration to me. I welcome the opportunity of collaborating with him, since I had the opportunity only a few months ago of being associated with him in a great enterprise, when I made efforts to secure the admission of my country to the United Nations. I still remember with gratitude the hearty co-operation I received from all sections of this Assembly, and I shall never forget the part that was personally played by Mr. Belaunde.

I am deeply grateful to my many friends who have been most generous with regard to me. I particularly wish to refer to my old and esteemed friend, Sir Leslie Munro, who has always been a model of correct parliamentary conduct, and a man for whom I have the greatest esteem, respect and regard.

I should also like to mention the seconder of my nomination, the representative of El Salvador, who also played a very vital part in my efforts to secure the admission of my country to the United Nations. I have had the privilege of his assistance in other conferences, and he is also a gentleman for whom I have an extremely high regard. His high juridical knowledge, his experience and his eminent fairmindedness have always attracted my attention. It is also, of course, a great privilege that a distinguished Asian leader, Mr. Krishna Menon, whose name is a household word in all parts of Asia, should have associated himself with this proposal. I am deeply grateful to him. I am equally grateful to all the members of the Committee for so generously accepting me as Vice-Chairman.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

It remains for me to express the hope that, at the end of this session, this Committee, under the able guidance of Mr. Belaunde, will have to its credit distinguished work done for the peace and well-being of the world.

Mr. MATSCH (Austria) (Rapporteur): I wish to thank the members of this Committee for the honour they have bestowed upon me by electing me Rapporteur of this Committee. In particular, I should like to thank the representative of Italy for submitting my nomination in such flattering terms, and the representative of Mexico for seconding that nomination. I consider my election to be a tribute to my country, and I can assure the members of this Committee that I shall do my best to justify the confidence they have placed in me.

AGENDA OF THE COMMITTEE: LETTER DATED 15 NOVEMBER 1956 FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/C.1/777)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has now to consider document A/C.1/777, which is the letter dated 15 November 1956 from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the First Committee, and which contains the agenda of this Committee. According to rule 100 of our rules of procedure, this Committee "shall adopt its own priorities" with regard to the items on its agenda. Therefore, it is for the Committee to decide in what order the items shall be discussed.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a very simple suggestion to the Committee. As is usual, all the items on the agenda of this Committee are important, and we cannot make any assessment of the urgency of these items. However, some order of discussion must be set up, and we must recall that in this session of the General Assembly a situation different from that of other sessions obtains. A number of extremely thorny questions have been thrashed out, many speeches have been made, and countless words have been spoken. The attention of all representatives has been so concentrated on these debates that the majority of the delegations have not had sufficient time to study any of the other items or to consider the many other questions.

(Mr. Umana Bernal, Colombia)

Therefore, I should like to suggest that we should first discuss the first two items that appear in document A/C.1/777, that is, the Korean question with its two fundamental aspects, and then the question of disarmament. These are two pre-eminently topical questions in the United Nations that have a tremendous bearing on the international situation. In order to make our work easier, I believe we should postpone the discussion of the order of the remaining three items until later. As we progress in our work, we could set up the order of discussion of items 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. KASE (Japan): I had thought that some of my colleagues of the Asian-African group would have wished to speak on this question, so that this is an unexpected honour for me. However, I justify my intervention by the coincidence or, perhaps, accident that I happen to be the Chairman of the Asian-African group for the month of January.

With regard to the order of discussion of the items on the agenda of this Committee, the Asian-African group met and exchanged views fully and carefully. As a result of their deliberations, the members of the group came to the conclusion that, because of the urgency of the question of Algeria, we should request the Committee to take up that matter as its first item. Later, after carefully weighing the situation prevailing in the United Nations, we came to the conclusion that we might proceed first with the Korean item and then, if possible, discuss the Algerian question. However, we are in the hands of the Committee, and we do not wish to insist that the Algerian question should be taken as the second item, although that still remains the desire of the group. If the Committee cannot see its way to accept this suggestion, then I think the group might be persuaded to accept the Algerian question as the third item on the agenda.

(Mr. Kase, Japan)

But if the Committee takes up this question as the third item, the group would accept it, I hope. At least, that is the minimum, shall I say, request on the part of the group. In my humble capacity as President for the month of January, I ask the Chairman and the Committee to be good enough to have this desire of the Asian-African group weighed carefully. I also appeal to the members of the Committee to give the Algerian item at least the third place.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): First of all, there is a question of principle. I regret that I am at variance with the views of the representative of Colombia who feels that the various delegations have not yet crystallized their positions on various issues. As a matter of fact, the Assembly has been in session for over two months; two-thirds of the present duration of the Assembly has already elapsed. Therefore, we must determine the sequence of all the items. In fact, I am prepared to ask for a vote on this point. The Committee cannot select two questions and relegate the others to the Greek calends. I do not say this just because the Greek delegation feels that the Cyprus question is an important one, but because I believe that the prestige of the United Nations is directly involved. If the United Nations gives the impression that it is seeking to eliminate problems relating to colonialism and if it gives the impression that it is unwilling to discuss anti-colonial issues, the prestige of the United Nations will be endangered, even though its prestige is now rising.

That is why I ask, as a question of principle, that we decide on the sequence of all the items. For me it is a question of principle. Therefore, I am opposed formally to the suggestion of the representative of Colombia.

As for the order of our work, I think that we should not examine first the most important questions, as all the questions are important, but we should take up those that are most urgent, those on which the peace of the world depends.

Two items may be classed in that category: the problem of Algeria and the problem of Cyprus. Blood is flowing in these two countries, and we must first decide on these two items.

(Mr. Cassimatis, Greece)

The problem of Korea is one which has slipped into the background. The disarmament question is an important one, but for the United Nations its importance is rather theoretical. In fact, I do not know if the two great Powers concerned, the United States and the Soviet Union, are in fact prepared to advance concrete proposals which will enable us to advance under this item.

Therefore, in my opinion, the sequence to be chosen is this: the Algerian question; the question of Cyprus; disarmament; and the question of Korea. That is the order I suggest.

Mr. FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil): I should like to support the Colombian proposal suggesting to examine first the Korean question and then the disarmament question. My information is that the Asian-African group has decided on two alternatives: first, the question of disarmament, then to take up the Algerian question; secondly, to discuss the Korean question and then the Algerian question afterwards. Therefore, if we vote for the Colombian proposal, we will almost be meeting the alternative of the Afro-Asian group, which means first taking up the question of Korea and then the question of disarmament. Both alternatives are there. I therefore propose that we should first take up the Korean question and then disarmament. I do not think that because a question is being discussed more fully in the world now that there is more chance of a solution of that question here. We must hope that solutions will be found for these questions and that we can have such a solution before the Assembly disbands.

Therefore, I support the proposal of the Colombian delegation.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to make some observations as to the suitable sequence of items on the agenda of this session of the Assembly, a question which has been referred to the First Committee for consideration.

As the material before us indicates, we are to examine a number of items. In our opinion they are all of great importance, with the exception of the Korean question, for the reduction of tension in various parts of the world. However, relations in some parts of the world affect relations throughout the world. These problems await solution in the interests not only of the peoples of these countries, but also they have a bearing on the maintenance of peace in general.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

I should like to dwell on one problem in our agenda, a problem of importance which, in our opinion, calls for careful consideration. This problem is the problem of disarmament, the cessation of the armaments race and the prohibition of the atomic weapon. The peoples of the entire world are vitally interested in the maintenance and strengthening of peace and in the consolidation of international security. This relates equally to the peoples of the Western countries and to the peoples of the Eastern countries, to the peoples of under-developed countries and to peoples of advanced countries. All people are interested in the maintenance of peace, regardless of the social systems under which they live and regardless of their ways of life. Is it not clear that the continuing armaments race, especially the race for new types of weapons of mass destruction, has implanted insecurity and uncertainty for the future among peoples, causing anxiety and alarm? This is so because the people know that the danger of a new war grows together with the armaments race. It is impossible to live in peace and calm on top of a box of dynamite, especially when there are certain parties which play with fire near that box of dynamite.

We are obliged to draw the proper conclusions from the lessons of history. We must all take measures to ensure that the tragic events of the past should not be repeated. We must do everything in our power to prevent a new war. There is no special need to prove that decisive significance for the maintenance and strengthening of peace is held by the cessation of the armaments race, the prohibition of atomic weapons and the carrying out of general disarmament. The peoples resolutely repudiate the armaments race which is a straight road to war. They demand that international relations be seriously recast with the ensuring of lasting, genuine and sound peace.

The more rapidly that States, especially States which possess the largest military potential, reach agreement on disarmament, the more quietly and calmly will the peoples live in peace throughout the world.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

Some have said that this is not the proper time to deal with disarmament. However, I would say that the contrary is true: if we wish to remove the danger of a new war, the present international situation requires insistent efforts toward the solution of this problem precisely now, and more than ever before. The cessation of the armaments race would contribute to the strengthening of international confidence. The reduction of the vast expenditures allocated to armaments would lead to a raising of the well-being of the people. The Soviet delegation is convinced that, given a modicum of goodwill, all the necessary conditions are at hand for successful progress toward the solution of the problem of disarmament.

The Soviet Government's well-known proposals of 17 November on disarmament and on the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the testing of such weapons, and on the question of ensuring effective international control over observance of these measures, open new possibilities for agreement. We are profoundly convinced of this.

It is quite obvious that the Committee faces an important and difficult task in finding ways and means to bring about a rapprochement of controversial points of view on the basis of existing proposals, working out an agreed position, and giving the peoples hopeful and promising prospects for the solution of the disarmament problem. This is the most important task before all of us, and the Committee must tackle this problem at the very outset of its work, as being the most urgent one.

The main task of the United Nations, as is well known, is to be a mighty instrument for the maintenance and consolidation of international peace. The Charter of the United Nations confers directly upon the Organization the duty of examining and working out principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments. The Organization as a whole and its important organs have all the necessary facilities for carrying out this great and important mission. The peoples expect the General Assembly to take genuine steps for the creation of necessary conditions for a tranquil and peaceful life and for the creation of insuperable barriers against any new world war.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The affirmative solution of the disarmament problem meets the vital interests of peoples and would also create favourable conditions for the solution of other problems which are on the agenda of this Committee. It is therefore our duty to deal with this problem without delay.

However, the agenda presented to the First Committee places the Korean item first. There is no need to prove that the consideration of such a question before other questions would be entirely unfounded, and the peoples would fail to understand it if the First Committee, to which the General Assembly has entrusted the disarmament question, were to decide to postpone that question until a later stage. It would be difficult to persuade world public opinion that the United Nations has more important and urgent problems than the questions of disarmament and the prohibition of the atomic and hydrogen weapons, these latter being problems which are of such essential significance for the maintenance of peace and security.

Proceeding from these propositions, the Soviet delegation proposes that this Committee should consider the disarmament problem among the first and that the Korean item should be listed last in our order of priority. This would certainly be in line with the relative significance of the disarmament problem and other problems and would moreover command the assent and support of all the peoples of the world.

For its part, the Soviet delegation is prepared, as always, to make every effort, in concert with other delegations, in the direction of carrying out practical steps for the solution of the disarmament problem.

We have listened to the observations of the representatives of Japan and Greece. If the Committee considers it proper to deal with the Algerian problem first, or, for that matter, with the Cyprus problem first, the Soviet delegation will not press for consideration of the disarmament problem as the first item.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I recognize the representative of Japan on a point of order.

Mr. KASE (Japan): I am sorry to intervene again; I do so because I fear that, when I said a short while ago that the priority of the items should be (1) Korea, and (2) disarmament, I perhaps did not explain the position of the Asian-African group quite adequately. I now want to say that the view is quite strongly held among the members of the Asian-African group that that priority should be changed to read (1) disarmament and (2) Korea. As regards the Algerian item, what I said before stands -- that is, the Algerian item should be given as high a priority as possible. That is the position of the group.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq): I agree with the representative of Colombia that all five items on the agenda of this Committee are important, and I also support his elaboration of that matter. But, to me, it is a question of the arrangement or sequence of these items. There are questions among these five which have been discussed by this Committee and the General Assembly in the past, while others have not yet received sufficient attention by this Organization.

To my mind, the item concerning Algeria should receive very high priority. It is a question of war and a question of destruction. A war which has been carried on for more than two years by organized armies, with modern armaments manufactured in France and other NATO countries, should not receive simply the same weight which is given to other matters concerning disputes and differences between States. What has been going on in North Africa has been disturbing the whole region -- politically, economically and socially. Moreover, it has created tension between a large number of Member States of this Organization. Thus, failure to consider this matter of the war in Algeria or to give it a high priority would simply represent neglect on the part of this Organization of its duty regarding a matter involving the destruction of a whole people by organized and advanced industrial countries.

We are faced here with two questions. One is the question of settling a war. The other is an effort to promote a basis for furthering peace. I think that everyone here agrees that the settlement of a war and the ending of the butchery of people must receive higher priority.

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

To settle such a war has its own advantages. First of all, it will create a new atmosphere of peace in the world; secondly, it will increase the confidence of the peoples of the world in the United Nations as an organization capable of settling disputes and wars; thirdly, it will pave the way for the consideration of other highly important questions, which have already been referred to, including the question of disarmament.

For that reason, I think it should be the first item on the agenda of this Committee; if not, it should receive second place.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I should like to state the view of my delegation in regard to the arrangement of these items.

It so happens that we meet here in this Committee after a recess without any adequate time for delegations to come to an agreement with regard to their respective points of view. It is unfortunate that our main business has been interrupted in this way. That perhaps explains our difficulty.

My delegation wishes to make known its position in regard to the Korean item. We think it not only undesirable but extremely inconvenient that this item should be placed first on the agenda. Either it must be argued that it is of very great urgency and importance or it may be that some people regard it as merely a formality. We cannot subscribe to either of these views but, especially as the time available to the Assembly is limited and important items are on this Committee's agenda, we have no desire to prolong procedural discussions. We hope it will be possible to obtain some decision whereby the Korean item will come at a later part of the agenda where it may be possible to reconcile the different views that existed in the Assembly last year in some form. If that is not possible, in view of the fact, as I understand it, that some delegations that are principally concerned are not yet ready to open the discussion on disarmament, then I hope that at least the resolution stage of the Korean item will be postponed to a later time. That is to say, if the Assembly in its wisdom should decide that the Korean item must come first -- if a vote should be taken, we should vote against it or probably not participate -- but if it is decided that the Korean item must come first because those primarily taking part in initiating the disarmament debate are not ready or it is not possible to take the other two items on Cyprus and Algeria as number 1 and number 2, then we should request

that those who are initiating the Korean debate would through the usual channels have consultations and approach you, Mr. Chairman, to see whether the resolution stage on Korea can be postponed after the general debate is over, thus giving time for representatives to be ready for the discussion of disarmament and at the same time giving us time to see whether such resolutions as may come will not divide those who need not be divided unnecessarily.

The view expressed by my colleague from Japan shows the general mixture of ideas that exists among everybody. We are concerned about giving urgency to the disarmament question. We think it is the most important question before the Assembly, irrespective of the fact that over the years we have not been able to come to any fruitful decisions in the way of accomplishing disarmament, but both in order to assure world public opinion of the concern of this Assembly in this matter and also because the problem itself, as each day goes on, becomes more urgent. If my delegation is participating in the beginning, we should prefer that the disarmament question come first, but we quite realize that there may be technical and procedural difficulties, the Disarmament Commission having met only a short time ago.

We support the priority for the Algerian problem, that is to say, a proposal to give it as high a place as possible. Therefore, my delegation will refrain from moving any resolution or taking part in any vote on this question. We hope it can be decided, in your great wisdom, in some form that will suit everybody.

Our main caveat is on Korea, and, if we can so persuade those who are responsible for it that we may leave this item after the general debate and take the resolution at some other stage, that would probably be a way out.

Mr. TSIANG (China): The choice that the Committee faces in regard to this matter of priority of items is obviously a difficult choice. There are all sorts of reasons for placing this or that item at the top of the list.

So far as my delegation is concerned, we support the proposal made by the representative of Colombia and are particularly pleased that he saw fit to put the item of Korea at the very top of this list. Members of the Committee cannot forget that it was in Korea that the United Nations made the greatest effort in the ten and more years of its existence. So many of the sons of so many Member States sacrificed their lives in Korea that that any attempt here to minimize or belittle

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

the importance of the Korean problem would not be fitting. The Korean problem is also an unfinished task of the United Nations. If today we should leave the impression that the United Nations regards the Korean problem as a routine matter not of urgency or importance, it would create the general impression that the United Nations cannot hold steadfastly to any set purpose.

For these reasons, I hope that Korea remains at the top of the list and that for the time being at least we go ahead with the proposal made by the representative of Colombia.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States believes that the proposal made by the representative of Colombia is reasonable and we also think that the remarks just made by the representative of China are extremely cogent and really very persuasive. The United States also supports consideration of the disarmament item upon the conclusion of the discussions on Korea. I might say that we agree with the Soviet Union on the vital importance of this disarmament question. We attach great weight to the early discussion of disarmament. The meeting of the Commission on 20 December has opened the way for this discussion, and we believe that within a week enough time will have gone by for the delegations to have studied the reports of the Commission and its sub-committee.

Mr. BEN-ABOUD (Morocco) (interpretation from French): The views so far expressed are justified by factors in the background of each item. I do not think there is a single item on our agenda that does not deserve adequate consideration.

Korea has been a scene of war. Peace prevails in that area today, but a solution, as has just been very aptly pointed out, has not been completed.

The problem of disarmament is one of topical and universal importance. No delegation present can question the importance of urgent discussion of such a problem for the present and for the future.

In general, however, the United Nations has to think about human beings first and specific problems next. We also have to take into account the necessary time that must be devoted to study, consideration and possible compromise.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

The Colombian proposal is a bit odd, as we see it. It selects two items and relegates all the other items to the magician's box. What is going to happen to these other items? Are they to be relegated to the Greek calends, as the representative of Greece has just stated, and he should certainly know the meaning of the expression very well? Are they to be kept in suspense until circumstances decide what should be done? We have no right to think or act vaguely on this question. The question of the agenda must be decided in a clear-cut manner.

In the world today the order of urgency of problems must be measured by the blood which is flowing, and that flow must be stopped. The delegation of Morocco speaks with knowledge of this matter because the Moroccan and Tunisian problems have been discussed in the past in this Committee. What was of primary interest to us was not the particular Moroccan or Tunisian aspect of the matter but the stopping of the flow of blood. That is why we believe that any priority should be commensurate with the moral value of the question, rather than the reverse.

Prompt consideration of the Algerian question might avoid certain great dangers, such as the extension of the conflict. Everyone knows either from experience or from reading that wherever there has been an insurrection in a country it has never been stopped except by the just fulfilment of the national aspirations of the people. There is no other way of stopping it. If we take this into account, then we should realize that the requirements for agenda priority are clear. We should bear in mind that there is always a possibility of the spreading of the conflict from country to neighbouring country. Insecurity may spread in the same way. Algeria is flanked on one side by Tunisia and on the other side by Morocco. These countries are closely linked with the destiny of Algeria.

Therefore, without in any way questioning the importance of the Korean question, not to mention the importance of the disarmament question, which is a universal one, the Algerian question, logically and morally, towers above the other questions and deserves priority.

Other questions are of great importance to various delegations, and we are anxious to understand their points of view. In conformity with the spirit of compromise, which always characterizes United Nations discussions, we are eager to reach mutual understanding. I shall propose no particular order for the agenda.

(Mr. Ben-Aboud, Morocco)

items, but my delegation would be happy if the following order were accepted: the disarmament question, the Algerian question, the question of Cyprus -- blood is also flowing in Cyprus and that question should follow the Algerian question because of certain considerations of numbers -- the Korean question and the question of West Irian. Before arriving at any decision we should determine the criteria for establishing priority for agenda items.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Colombia, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to clarify somewhat the meaning of the suggestion which I made at the beginning of the debate. In particular, I should like to clarify one point for the benefit of the representative of Greece. In referring to my suggestion, he stated that I intended to eliminate the other items of the agenda. That is not at all what I proposed. I stated that all items were important. It would not be correct to say that I would eliminate anything that I recognized to be important.

The other observations that were made by the representative of Greece were extremely interesting, but I feel that I need not refute them in view of the magnificent statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. He illustrated quite clearly the exceptional importance of the disarmament question. He stated that we were sitting on a powder-keg. We certainly agree that before we can sit back and relax on this keg we should make sure exactly what it contains.

I believe that we can arrive at a cordial agreement. The representative of Japan, in clarifying his proposal, also accepted my suggestion in principle. I stated that it might be better to put as the first item of the agenda the disarmament question, and, as the second item, the Korean question. The importance of the Korean question is increased because it has already figured first on the agenda. As the representative of China has pointed out, there would be no justification in now setting aside a question which had been discussed previously and which called for the first international armed force to be used by the United Nations. We feel that world public opinion would not forgive us if we jumped around from one question to another. We must act here calmly and carefully. I believe that we can arrive at an agreement before our discussion ends today.

Our suggestion has been most cordially supported by the representatives of Brazil, China and Iraq. I believe that we could leave for later the decision on the other three agenda items. As regards the disarmament question, I believe there is unanimous agreement on the urgency of discussing it either first or second.

I think that our differences are very small and that this discussion could easily result in a unanimous decision.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece)(interpretation from French): The representative of Colombia has asked for agreement on his proposal, but that is quite impossible. In the meantime, however, I have noted from the statements of the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union that they are prepared and, in fact, willing to begin the consideration of the disarmament question forthwith.

Therefore, in order to facilitate this discussion, I shall make a formal motion which I request the Chairman to put to the vote. We should determine immediately the sequence of all items of the agenda. Since the two great Powers have stated that the disarmament question should be considered first, I submit the following motion to be put to the vote, setting out the order of priority of agenda items: the disarmament question, the Algerian question, the question of Cyprus, the Korean question and the question of West Irian. This is an amendment to the order as proposed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I think that I did not make myself clear to the representative of Greece. What I said was that we favoured taking up the Korean item first and the disarmament item second, and we thought that by the time a week or so had expired we would then be ready. The United States did not say that we were ready now. I just wanted to make that clear as to our position.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I think that the amendment just presented by the representative of Greece is, from more than one point of view, the one that would take into consideration both the importance and the urgency of the questions before this Committee. It has at least the advantage, and a very practical one, of not leaving us in the dark with regard to the consideration of the other questions. It is quite important for many delegations to know the actual order of the items so that they can arrange their work accordingly.

At the present time there is only one war going on in the world. That war is the one in Algeria. It is not a war on a small scale, for over half a million troops are being employed. Destruction is being carried out every day. Blood is being shed, and the organized resistance of a whole nation up in arms has also, in its turn, caused this conflict to continue for over two years now. This is a situation which is not only of interest to France and Algeria; it definitely has very wide international implications. It stands to reason therefore that the problem which is more urgent than any on the list of items we have before us is the problem of Algeria.

As regards the question of disarmament, despite the fact that discussions have been going on with regard to this question for about ten years now -- and this is a matter of universal importance to all the Members of the United Nations -- and because there is a hope, though slight, that some further step can be taken through the United Nations, my delegation, like that of Greece, would agree to having this problem studied first. Therefore, the problem of disarmament would be considered first and the problem of Algeria would come next. But the problem

of Algeria is in fact of the same nature as the one in Cyprus, though of dimensions far bigger than the second problem. Therefore, the question of Cyprus might be considered, in our view, after the consideration of the question of Algeria.

As to the question of Korea, we all know that for all practical purposes the question of Korea is now at a standstill. Little more can be done than has been done in the past, and in that respect there is very little urgency attached to this problem. On the contrary, perhaps some discussions going on now might in the near future offer a possibility of taking a further step in the Korean problem. Such discussions would not, as it seems, be sure to bring about results at the present time.

Therefore, in all objectivity and in order to accommodate the various points of view expressed around this table, we believe that the amendment presented by the delegation of Greece would at one and the same time have the advantage of co-ordinating all our work -- not leaving any blanks -- in a manner which is relatively most appropriate and most useful for the discussion of the Committee. Therefore, we will support it and vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that I should sum up the results of the debate as objectively as possible. As the representative of Colombia has said, this discussion has been maintained at a very high level, and I am sure that we can come to a constructive decision on it. At present we have a number of proposals before us. Some are suggestions; others are formal motions.

The delegation of Colombia has proposed that we should decide today that the agenda should, for the moment, consist of the questions of Korea and disarmament, leaving for later -- and this in no way presupposes hierarchy of values but rather giving each of the problems *its* due importance -- the decision as to the order in which the other three items will be discussed. The representative of Japan has hinted -- because he made no concrete proposal -- that we ought to discuss the question of disarmament first, then go on to the Korean question, and thirdly to consider the question of Algeria or the question of Cyprus.

(The Chairman)

The representative of Greece modified his initial suggestion as follows: The order of the items on the agenda would be complete. Nothing would be postponed for a later decision. We would decide immediately on the following order of items: Disarmament, Algeria, Cyprus, Korea, West Irian.

Now the representative of the Soviet Union has proposed that we should begin immediately with the question of disarmament, and that later we can continue with the third or fourth item, but that we should postpone the discussion of Korea until the end of the agenda.

We have listened with great interest to what was said by the representative of Syria. But according to the rules of procedure and the usage in the Political Committee -- and I am rather aware of usage in our Committee -- there is no amendment possible to these questions, because an amendment either adds to, deletes from, or changes a substantive question. These are all substantive questions and the only way that any suggestion can be made is through a separate suggestion or motion. If the Committee has no contrary views, I will have to put to the vote the motions formally submitted. Basically, there are three proposals. There are two which only cover part of the agenda, namely the Colombian and Soviet proposals. The third one covers the entire agenda, and that has been submitted by the delegation of Greece. The proposals have been submitted in the following order: the first proposal has been submitted by Colombia; the second proposal was submitted by Greece, and substituted by a new proposal; and the third proposal was submitted by the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make the position of the Soviet Union clear.

The Soviet delegation attaches great importance to the problem of disarmament. However, having listened carefully to the observations and proposals of various representatives, we consider that the proposal of the representative of Greece will meet the interests of our delegation. For this reason the Soviet delegation supports the proposal of the representative of Greece and will vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, we have only two proposals before us: the proposal made by the representative of Colombia, and that of the representative of Greece. Apparently these two proposals have been discussed sufficiently.

Mr. ULIRICH (Czechoslovakia): The discussion concerning the order in which the items on the agenda of the First Committee should be taken up has shown that the importance of the disarmament question is generally recognized. All those who have spoken before me have stressed both the importance and the urgency of the problems concerning disarmament, the prohibition of arms of mass destruction and the banning of nuclear tests. The Czechoslovak delegation fully shares the opinion that not only is the present time appropriate for discussion of the disarmament question, but that the matter requires urgent action on the part of all concerned in order to achieve the solutions of which all mankind is so desirous.

In deciding the order of business of our Committee, we should keep in mind the fact that progress in the field of disarmament would have good effects as far as outstanding international problems are concerned and would contribute to diminishing the present international tension. For these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation supports the proposal that priority should be given to deliberations on the question of disarmament.

(Mr. Ullrich, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak delegation is not unaware of the importance and the urgency of the situation prevailing in Algeria. If we support the proposal for priority to be given to the disarmament question, therefore, it does not mean that we are opposed to an early discussion of the Algerian question. In this connexion, the Czechoslovak delegation considers the order suggested by the representative of Greece to be most appropriate and is prepared to support his amendment.

Mr. MENEMENCIOLU (Turkey): I should like to have some clarification. The Chairman has summarized for us the position and has told us exactly where the two proposals stand. However, my delegation is not clear as to the exact proposal made by the representative of Japan, which was not taken up by the Chairman as a separate proposal. That is why I venture to ask whether my understanding is correct.

My understanding is that the representative of Japan said that certain Members of the United Nations shared his view that the first two items -- as the representative of Colombia had suggested -- could be accepted as such and, as I understand him, he wishes to go further and to fix a precise place for a third item, namely, the question of Algeria.

Therefore, if my interpretation is not erroneous, I think that the representative of Japan has, in fact, proposed a formal amendment, which adds something -- as you, Mr. Chairman, said a moment ago -- to the proposal of the representative of Colombia. In other words, it is between the two proposals. The representative of Japan wishes us to discuss the first two items, then a third one. That, if I am not mistaken should be considered as an amendment in itself.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall try to clarify the matter for the benefit of the representative of Turkey.

I understand that the representative of Japan did not make a formal proposal. However, in order to satisfy the view of the representative of Turkey, and so that the Committee will understand the matter fully, may I mention -- of course, if the representative of Japan wishes to change his suggestion and make it a

(The Chairman)

formal proposal, naturally it will be taken into account by the Chair -- that the representative of Japan summed up his views as follows: first, disarmament, then Korea, and third, either Algeria or Cyprus. Therefore, basically, we have only two formal proposals before the Committee -- unless, as I said before, the representative of Japan wishes to change his suggestion to a formal proposal. Unless he does so, I cannot consider his suggestion as a formal proposal and put it to the vote, because of the rules of procedure.

Mr. RIFAI (Jordan): Since, as I understand it, the representative of Japan has not made a formal proposal -- and perhaps he does not intend to do so -- it seems to me that we have two proposals before us, namely, those of Colombia and Greece.

As the proposal of the representative of Greece seems to me to be the more comprehensive and covers all the items on the agenda, I should like to suggest that the Greek proposal should be voted upon first, followed by a vote on the proposal of Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The proposal of the representative of Jordan constitutes a question of priority and must be decided upon by the Committee.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): As the proposal put forward by the representative of Jordan has priority, and since it was my intention to speak on a point of order on another question, I shall delay my intervention until a vote has been taken on the proposal of the representative of Jordan.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to inform the representative of Syria that the suggestion of the representative of Jordan was concerned with priority with regard to the vote, not to the formula itself.

Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation does not object to a vote being taken on the proposal of the representative of Colombia; that is to say, that the first item to be considered would be the Korean question, followed by the disarmament question. The representative of Colombia stated clearly that this did not eliminate other questions. However, would it not be more satisfactory to all of us if we could follow the agenda as it appears before us in the letter of 15 November from the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/777) wherein the items allocated to this Committee are listed as follows: the Korean question; regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; question of Cyprus; question of Algeria; question of West Irian (West New Guinea). As I said earlier, the representative of Colombia has already clarified his suggestion, but if we decide on the first two questions only, we would appear to be withholding our views on the other three matters. My delegation would prefer to take up the items on the agenda in the order suggested by the President -- not because we feel that discussion is more urgent on some problems than on others, or that we are more emotionally concerned with one or other question, or that some question can be solved while others cannot. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain, in referring to the bilateral solution of questions, stated our views on these matters. We have heard views expressed by representatives of those countries most concerned with such questions.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

We know that these matters must appear on our agenda, but to limit our proposals to two items would indirectly leave one or the other of these questions to be postponed and relegated to a less important position. Therefore I would suggest that we add to the Colombian proposal concerning the two first items to be discussed -- Korea and disarmament -- the third, fourth and fifth items, as they appear in the letter addressed to the General Assembly by the President.

Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): I do not desire to prolong the debate but there are a few observations which I should like to make. It seems to me that we have a choice, and a choice only, between the proposals of the representative of Colombia and the representative of Greece.

The reason why I believe we must support the proposal by Colombia is because, firstly, the representative of Greece has suggested a fixed order in which to deal with the items. Experience has shown that it is not wise to adopt such a method. It is better to determine the first two items, and sometimes even the first one item, with which we propose to deal and to leave the others for determination at a later stage. I think this is a very substantial reason why we should not support the proposal of the representative of Greece, and it is clear that there would be very few delegations in this assembly who would be prepared to discuss disarmament at this stage, were it decided to proceed with that question first. That of course is inherent in the proposal of the representative of Greece.

We have heard from the representative of the United States of America that his country is not prepared to discuss the question of disarmament at the present time. I suppose the United States desires some time to crystallize the views they wish to place before us.

For these reasons it appears to me that it would be unwise for us to decide to proceed with the question of disarmament as the first item, in accordance with the Greek proposal, when the majority of nations represented in this assembly are not presently able to discuss the matter intelligently. This is particularly so in view of the fact that one of the major Powers involved, the United States of America, is not prepared to discuss the question immediately. Therefore we feel that we should give support to the proposal of the representative of Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The situation is, I believe, as follows: we have two concrete proposals still before us -- the proposal of Colombia and the proposal of Greece. According to rule 132 of the rules of procedure, if two or more proposals relate to the same question the Committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. The representative of Jordan, if I am not mistaken, has asked that priority be given to the Greek proposal, so therefore, the first thing we have to decide is whether to vote first on the Colombian or the Greek proposal.

I should like to ask the Committee to express its view in regard to this, and I shall put to a vote the proposal of Jordan to vote first on the Greek proposal.

The proposal of Jordan was rejected by 29 votes to 29, with 14 abstentions.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to amend the proposal submitted by the distinguished representative of Colombia by adding to his proposal the other three items to be discussed: first the question of Korea, second disarmament, third the question of Algeria, fourth the question of Cyprus and fifth the question of West Irian. I would like to make it clear that this is a formal proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): After the vote is taken on the Colombian proposal we will consider the suggestion of the Lebanese representative.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece): I would like to request a roll-call vote on both the Colombian and the Lebanese proposals.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the Colombian proposal, while the priority given to the disarmament problem will surely command the support of many delegations, it seems to me at the same time, that the fact that the Korean item is the first item for discussion will make it difficult for many delegations to express their views.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation therefore proposes that separate votes be taken on which item is to take the first place. Not, in other words, the first two items as proposed, together, but that there should be a separate vote cast on which item should be first on our agenda.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I understand that this is really an amendment to the Colombian proposal. I will have to remind you that, generally speaking, we have decided in previous meetings that there can be no amendments on the question of the agenda, so that unless the Committee decides otherwise, I will have to follow the usage of the Committee in this matter.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is conceivable that I did not express my thought clearly. My proposal is simply this -- that we should put to the vote, separately, the Korean question and then the disarmament question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that the Colombian proposal, as any other proposal, is a unit and we cannot disintegrate this unit without the agreement of the proposer. The Korean question is proposed as the first item and the disarmament question as the second item. For these reasons we regret we cannot accede to the suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): May I refer to the suggestion made by the Soviet representative. The Colombian proposal is a whole and contains a numerical order with respect to item 1 and item 2. Frankly I do not quite understand what the representative of the Soviet Union has suggested, because it is not a question of voting for disarmament and then for Korea or of voting for Korea and then for disarmament. There is no election here. What we are trying to do is to establish some order. We cannot say that we choose disarmament or that we choose Korea. We have to decide on whether we shall consider Korea first and then disarmament. There is a certain incongruity in the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am sorry that I have to take more time, but I consider that the question is one of importance. Therefore, I venture to speak again.

According to rule 130, we in this Committee are allowed to use a procedure which will make it possible to vote in parts or to present amendments. Consequently, with this as a basis, the Soviet proposal is rather simple and I make it formally. I propose that we take a vote on each of the items. The representative of Colombia has proposed that we vote on two items together. My delegation would add that a separate vote be taken, first on the place of the Korean question and then on the place of the disarmament question. I think that this is a perfectly legitimate and fair request, and I hope that the Chairman will act in accordance with this rule of procedure.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I wanted to speak on a point of order. However, although many problems are arising, the point of order on which I wanted to speak has not yet arisen. Therefore, with the permission of the Chairman, I want to defer my remarks until the question brought up by the representative of the Soviet Union is resolved. At that time, we shall know more clearly the order that is to be followed.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I should like to offer an explanation. The gist of the Colombian proposal is not the sequence of the Korean and disarmament questions. What I feel is essential is the second part to the effect that we should decide later on all other items. My proposal is a more general one. Even if the Colombian proposal is adopted, mine should be put to the vote nonetheless. The representative of Colombia says, "Let us decide on the first two items. I make no proposal with respect to the others." I believe that the representatives should bear in mind this peculiarity of the Colombian proposal.

Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): My submission is that the procedure suggested by the representative of Soviet Russia does not apply at all in this case. The proposal made by the representative of Colombia is an indivisible one. He says in sequence that the first item should be Korea and the second item should be disarmament. The matter can be tested in this way: if separate votes were taken and if there was an adverse vote upon the first part and a vote in favour of the second part, disarmament would come second and the first item would not be determined at all. For those reasons, the practice of this Committee has been and is consistent with the rules, namely, that in determining the sequence, the proposal must be voted on as a whole.

Mr. RIFAI (Jordan): I leave it to the wisdom of the Chair to decide how to proceed with the present debate. I am sure that the Chair is conscious of the fact that we are still in the process of voting on my proposal with respect to the priority.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Unfortunately, we have finished with that item. We have voted upon it.

Can we avoid wasting any more time? I should very humbly like to put before you my views on this question. I am not handing down a ruling.

The essential question in a matter of order is order itself. Therefore, I cannot subdivide the Colombian proposal because it consists of three parts which are indivisible: the questions to be considered, the order and then the part mentioned by the representative of Greece, the authorization of the Committee to

(The Chairman)

decide the order of other questions in the future. Therefore, the Colombian proposal is indivisible by nature, as are all proposals with respect to the order of things. In view of the situation at which we have arrived, it would be better for us to proceed to a vote, unless the Committee feels otherwise.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): A few moments ago, when you, Mr. Chairman, said that there was a precedent regarding amendments to the agenda and the order of priority of discussion of the matter in the Committee, you rather surprised me, because to a certain extent I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that the Colombian proposal could be divided as far as the order of the first two items are concerned, in other words, Korea first and disarmament second. But you have very correctly mentioned the third aspect of the Colombian proposal, which is the cement that holds the proposal together: that the Committee should decide to leave to a later time its decision on the other three items. That being the case, it is impossible for the Committee to vote, as the representative of the Soviet Union has suggested, first of all with regard to the first item to be put on the agenda and then with regard to the second item. After that, there would have to be a third vote held with regard to the other three items. This third aspect is the part that holds the Colombian proposal together. That is why I do not think that rule 130 applies. I therefore believe that the representative of Colombia and you, Mr. Chairman, are right in your opinion that the Colombian proposal should be voted on only as a whole.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The rules of procedure definitely allow proposals to be put to the vote in parts. In this case we have a request to that effect. There is a proposal before us which consists of two paragraphs. First we must decide what question should be dealt with first and then what question should be dealt with second, if we follow the Colombian proposal.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

I therefore entirely fail to understand why certain representatives consider that the Soviet Union delegation's proposal is at variance with the rules of procedure.

Hence, I again request the Chairman to take account of the Soviet Union proposal; namely, that the Committee should vote separately on the order of discussion of the Korean item and the disarmament item, respectively.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Spanish): I had the honour to submit a proposal. When the Committee proceeds to the vote, I should be grateful if the Chairman would give priority to my proposal and put it to the vote by roll call.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall take note of the request just made by the representative of Lebanon and shall deal with it at the appropriate time.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): Although the Chairman has said that he has made no ruling, I should like to make some remarks at this time.

The Committee is about to proceed to the vote on the Colombian proposal. Representatives should understand clearly what the result of their votes on that proposal will be. If the Colombian proposal is not put to the vote in three parts, what will be the result? The Soviet Union representative has asked for separate votes on the Korean item and the disarmament item. If the Colombian proposal is thus to be sliced into two parts, there must be a third slice made up of the general question, which is in fact the most important one. As I said at the outset, the essence of the Colombian proposal is that the Committee should decide to postpone until the end of the session -- that is, until a time when there can be no possibility of adequate discussion -- the most important problems on its agenda: the anti-colonial problems. Representatives should keep this fact clearly in mind. What the representative of Colombia is attempting to have the Committee do is to decide on two items, leaving the consideration of the others to the Greek calends. I emphasize this point.

(Mr. Cassimatis, Greece)

We should not play on words and say that it is not a question of pigeonholing certain items. To discuss an item on the eve of the closing of the General Assembly session is the same as to pigeonhole the item. I wish to bring that out as clearly as I can.

I therefore ask the Chairman either to put the Colombian proposal to the vote in three parts or to make it clear that the adoption of that proposal would not prejudice the order of discussion of items other than those of Korea and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like respectfully to submit my views to the representative of Greece.

In dealing with any proposal, we must take into account what is the substance of the proposal. Now, as regards the Colombian proposal, the substance relates to the order of discussion of the various items on the agenda. If a representative feels that the order set forth in the Colombian proposal is incorrect, he will vote against the proposal. If the majority of the Committee agrees with that view, it will reject the Colombian proposal and will adopt a different order. The Committee will be entirely free to decide on any other order of discussion that is proposed.

The Chairman cannot, however, permit a proposal to be divided into parts unless the sponsor of the proposal agrees. It is a question not only of the rules of procedure, but also of logic. If the substance of a proposal relates to a certain order, then that order cannot be changed without changing the substance of the proposal. It is the order set forth in the Colombian proposal which will be submitted to the Committee for a vote. With all due respect to the representative of Greece, therefore, I must say that there are three elements involved. The first is the rules of procedure, which state that a proposal cannot be voted on in parts unless the sponsor of the proposal agrees. The second is the practice of the Committee. The third is logic, which makes it clear that if the Committee feels that the order set forth in the Colombian proposal is not the correct order, it will reject the proposal and decide on some other order, such as that submitted by the representative of Greece.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): The Tunisian delegation agrees with the point of view which has been expressed by a number of other delegations; namely, that all the items on the First Committee's agenda are exceedingly important. Nevertheless, we do feel that, even though all the items are important, some require more urgent consideration than others. We feel that there is one problem -- the rather grave situation in Algeria -- which is of concern to all the nations. We should like to find a peaceful solution to the Algerian situation.

Certain delegations, however, consider that the disarmament problem is exceedingly important and requires urgent discussion. We agree with that view.

The Colombian delegation has proposed that the Committee should discuss the item on Korea first, the item on disarmament second, and the other items in some order to be decided at the appropriate time. The proposal would seem to be that the order of discussion of the problems of Cyprus, Algeria and West Irian should be decided upon at some later date, in accordance with the progress made by the Committee and other relevant factors.

Thus, there is a previous question which must be decided by the Committee. Does the Committee wish today to determine the definitive sequence of discussion all the items on its agenda, or does it wish to determine the two items which should be discussed first, leaving the sequence of discussion of the other items for a later decision? That is the first question which the Committee must ask itself.

I would ask the Chairman to put that previous question to the vote. I shall repeat it: Does the Committee wish today to decide on the definitive order of discussion of all the items on its agenda; or does it wish, in accordance with the Colombian proposal, to decide on the order of discussion of only one or two items? Once that previous question has been settled, we can request the Colombian delegation to set out the order of discussion of the remaining three items. If, on the other hand, the Colombian delegation wishes to leave the proposal in its present vague form, the Committee can vote either for the Greek proposal, or for the Colombian proposal, or for some other proposal -- that is, the Lebanese proposal -- which would appear to bring together a number of

(Mr. Slim, Tunisia)

divergent opinions. I therefore ask the Chairman to put to the vote the previous question which I have already posed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With the permission of the representative of Colombia, I should like to make a remark which I think is appropriate at this point.

The Colombian proposal suggests a certain order for two items on the agenda, leaving the order of discussion of the other items somewhat vague. The Lebanese proposal completes the Colombian proposal. Thus, once the Lebanese proposal has been voted upon, the situation will be entirely clear.

(The Chairman)

I wished to make these remarks because I do not think it is necessary to bring up a previous question, since that previous question will be solved by the order of the proposals themselves. Therefore, after the Colombian proposal has been voted upon, I shall immediately put the Lebanese proposal to the vote.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to be able to dissipate the worries and the concern of the representative of Greece. He appears to think that the discussion on the order of the items not mentioned in my proposal will be postponed until the Greek Calends. Most of us know full well what is meant by that term.

I should like to refer also to the intervention of the Soviet representative. As the representative of Australia has stated, the Colombian proposal, as I submitted it, cannot be divided, as the Soviet representative has suggested. The question does not come under rule 130 of our rules of procedure, which the Soviet representative cited in support of his suggestion. For example, if we voted separately on the first item, that is, Korea, and that item was rejected, then there would be neither a first item nor the Korean question. It is suggested that we should then vote on the second item, namely, the disarmament question, but what would have happened to the first item? There would be a void. It is simply a question of logic.

I should like to insist on certain points, although I do not want to tax the patience of the Committee. I am not in my proposal trying to shelve or to postpone to the Greek Calends the other three items on the agenda. What I wish is for the Committee to decide today on the items which I consider to be of more immediate importance. I do not deny or under-estimate the importance of the other three items, but I wanted to see whether we could obtain agreement in the Committee. However, the representative of Lebanon has suggested that the order of the last three items should be, first Algeria, then Cyprus, and, finally, the West Irian question. He suggested that that order might meet with the unanimous agreement of the Committee, and, if that proves to be the case, since that is what I was trying to do with my simple suggestion, then certainly I would not object to the Lebanese proposal. I should be delighted if that proved to be the case, but I was afraid that those three items would prove to be thorny questions, and I did not

(Mr. Umana Bernal,
Colombia)

include them in my proposal because I wished to avoid controversy and discussion. If the majority of the Committee is in agreement on this, then let us agree. I would not oppose the inclusion of those three items in the order suggested, and if the Chairman puts the Lebanese proposal to the vote -- that after the Korean and disarmament questions we discuss Algeria, Cyprus and the West Irian question, in that order -- then I would bow to the will of the majority.

What I cannot accept is the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union, which might result in an empty first place, in an unknown quantity. If the first item were to be rejected, then we should be voting on the second item, namely, the disarmament question, and what then would happen to the first item? The representative of El Salvador has explained all this to the Committee, and I cannot understand how, logically speaking, we can divide what is indivisible.

The void referred to by the representative of Greece in his very wise suggestion would, I think, be filled by the Lebanese proposal that the third item discussed should be Algeria, the fourth item Cyprus and the fifth item the West Irian question. We would be very happy if such an order met the wishes of the majority of the Committee or, if possible, was agreed to unanimously by the Committee.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Committee has before it document A/C.1/777. Five items are listed in that document, and some delegations, including that of Colombia, have suggested that we should not now consider all the five items. They have stated that they would find it difficult to decide now upon the order of discussion of the five items. The same view can be expressed, with no less justification, in favour of the thesis that certain delegations have misgivings about the first two items. The Soviet Union, therefore, has proposed that there should first be a vote on the first item and then a vote on the second item. The questions asked by the representatives of Colombia and El Salvador about what would happen if the first item were defeated do not really raise as big a problem as they might appear to raise. If this should happen, then it would be very simple for the Committee either to fill the void with another item or to make the second item the first item.

I do not think that the objections that have been raised are serious objections, and the Soviet delegation, therefore, would press for the Soviet proposal to be put to the vote, namely, that the first and second items be voted upon separately.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the Soviet Union has just referred to document A/C.1/777 as the basis of our discussion. Naturally, our discussion does centre upon this document because, after all, this document contains the five items that are on our agenda at this session. The President of the General Assembly has notified us that the General Assembly decided to allocate these items to the First Committee. But we are not discussing the order of items contained in this document. What we are discussing are the concrete proposals which have been made regarding the priority to be given by this Committee to these different items.

The statement made a few moments ago by the representative of Colombia has clarified the situation for my delegation. In referring to the Lebanese proposal, the representative of Colombia said that he would not object to voting in the way requested by the representative of Lebanon. In other words, what the representative of Colombia wants is that first of all the Committee should vote on the first two items proposed by his delegation, namely, the Korean question and the disarmament question, in that order, and he has stated that he would not object to a vote being then taken on the Lebanese proposal that the remaining items be taken in the following order, namely, Algeria, Cyprus and the West Irian question.

(Mr. Urquia, El Salvador)

If I am not mistaken in this view, it means that the Colombian delegation has somewhat modified its position since at first it opposed the Soviet proposal of the divided vote because of the third element; that is, the Colombian proposal suggested that the Committee decide today only on the first two items and not on the other three. Well, this element now disappears from the Colombian proposal since the Colombian representative is willing to agree on the vote of the other three items. Thus the Colombian proposal boils down first to Korea and then the disarmament item. That being the case, I must refer to rule 130 of our rules of procedure according to which:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately."

I do this because the Colombian proposal is that item 1 on the agenda should be the Korean question and that item 2 should be the question of disarmament. The Chairman can very well take a vote on the first question and ask the Committee to decide whether Korea will be the first item. Likewise he can take a vote, whatever the result may be, on whether the next item would be disarmament. There would be no vote on the other part of the Colombian proposal since Colombia does not object to Algeria, Cyprus and West Irian being voted for priority.

If a member of the Committee objects to the proposal for a separate vote, then the motion for division will be voted on according to rule 130. I think that the parliamentary procedure is quite clear.

Mr. PERERA (Ceylon): With a view to obviating a discussion, my delegation suggests an amendment to the Colombian proposal, namely, that the first item should be the disarmament question and the second the question of Algeria. I move that as an amendment to the Colombian proposal and ask for priority in terms of the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation of Spanish): I want the Committee to come to an agreement as soon as possible, and I am sure that that view is shared by the Committee.

Mr. LEQUERICA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Previously, before the representative of Lebanon made his proposal, I suggested that we should adopt as our agenda the letter from Prince Wan Waithayakon, where the five items are included one after the other. That would avoid the doubts that many representatives have in mind with regard to the meaning and scope of the Colombian proposal which seemed to postpone certain items to the well-known Greek calends. If we accept the letter of the President of the General Assembly as regards the order which he, as President of the General Assembly, has communicated to us, then I am sure that we can achieve, if not unanimity, the approval of a great majority of the Committee. Thus we would avoid the fear of omission that was read into the Colombian proposal. Then we would have as the agenda of the First Committee all the items submitted to us by the General Assembly. I feel that this **would be better** than the Lebanese proposal because the Lebanese proposal changes the order somewhat. That may be a political element which may be good for one and not so good for others. If we turn the letter from Prince Wan into the agenda of the First Committee, we will find there a much better solution than the discussion of amendments and proposals that basically will never satisfy everybody, whereas the letter from the President of the General Assembly would be more likely to achieve a majority in the Committee. That is my suggestion to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to say to the representative of Spain that we are not bound by the letter from the President of the General Assembly, as he knows full well. At the moment, I think that his proposal is somewhat too late because we are coming closer to agreement inasmuch as the situation is as follows: the Colombian proposal and the Lebanese proposal follow one another.

There is the legal question that was very carefully put to us by the representative of El Salvador when he said that if anyone requests a vote on the division of a proposal, such a vote shall be taken. There is a question of courtesy, of interpretation and of logic. Anyone proposing something to the Committee has the right to see that that proposal is not divided, especially in a case like this where the proposal covers a matter of order. Naturally, if the

(The Chairman)

Committee decides by a vote that a proposal be divided, of course the Chairman will have to carry out the rules of procedure, as the representative of El Salvador has pointed out. However, may I say that after a debate which has been carried out at a very high level despite the difficulty of the problems discussed, we consider that there is urgency in each of these problems and there is a desire on the part of all of us to be able to discuss all five questions simultaneously but we cannot do so. However, we have the moral duty to see that all these questions are discussed as widely and completely and satisfactorily as possible.

May I make an appeal to the Committee and especially to the representatives of Colombia and Lebanon to meet together to offer a solution so that we can take a vote this afternoon that will meet with the approval of the entire Committee.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to state something as a matter of principle to be taken into account by the Committee; it is also a matter of logic. The Colombian proposal was submitted and if the Lebanese proposal had not been submitted later, the Colombian delegation would have insisted that its proposal was indivisible. As regards this, I entirely disagree with the representative of the Soviet Union, who is supported by the representative of El Salvador. Our proposal is indivisible. However, since the Lebanese proposal was submitted to the Committee, I have heard that it is quite acceptable to the majority of delegations. I am agreeably surprised that the matters that we thought would be most difficult to resolve now seem to meet with unanimous approval and may produce a unanimous vote. Naturally, I do not object to a proposal as follows: first, the Korean question; second, the question of disarmament as submitted by Colombia because we have not insisted on elimination, as the representative of Greece stated, nor have we asked to postpone some items to the Greek calends -- which I believe has been repeated now by ten delegations and even Mr. Lequerica felt that he had to refer to that historical point.

What we could do is to vote as follows: first of all, Korea; secondly, disarmament. If the majority of the Committee seems willing to accept the Lebanese proposal that the third question should be Algeria, the fourth Cyprus and the fifth West Irian, my delegation would not oppose it. On the contrary,

DR/mz

A/C.1/PV.813
69-70

(Mr. Umana Bernal, Colombia)

we would bow to the will of the majority and would support that proposal because we feel that in that way the desires of the Committee would be satisfied. I think that it will now be easier for the Committee to come to an agreement on this point.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I am very sorry to have to take the floor again, but there is one very slight point I should like to clarify, and it refers to what the representative of Colombia has just said.

In a previous statement, I said that, as far as the vote on Korea and disarmament is concerned, my delegation could well understand the view of the Soviet delegation that there should be a division of the vote, but we found it rather difficult to understand how a separate vote could be taken on these two points if the third element were added -- that is, no vote to be taken at the moment on the other three items, but the three other items to be postponed until the first two had been completed. But, in view of the position adopted by the Colombian delegation, I said that, if anyone insisted on a division of the vote, we would have to appeal to the Committee on this point and a vote would have to be taken; we would have to find out whether there were delegations for or against a division. But now the delegation proposing the order of the first two items has changed that original proposal -- and that is that, if the Korean question comes first and the disarmament question second, the Colombian delegation would not object to the Lebanese suggestion but, on the contrary, would support the Lebanese suggestion. I would therefore ask the Colombian delegation whether it would be ready to vote jointly on the five items: (1) Korea; (2) disarmament, as the delegation of Colombia wants; and then (3) Algeria, (4) Cyprus, (5) West Irian. I think the Colombian delegation would not object to a vote being taken on that proposal as a whole.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The representative of Colombia has supplemented his proposal in regard to the order of items. As regards the sequence as a whole, the Soviet delegation has already stated its views. If the new Colombian proposal is to be put to the vote -- I mean the one covering all five items -- I would request that the first item be voted on separately.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will have to decide on this point -- and I refer to rule 130, invoked by the representative of the Soviet Union. Although no formal proposal is before us, a formal proposal has been voiced -- a joint formal proposal, since the Colombian representative does not oppose the amendment.

(The Chairman)

Before I go on, may I ask a question: Will the representative of Colombia permit us to consider his proposal and that of the representative of Lebanon as one proposal?

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia)(interpretation from Spanish): I have no objection. I would prefer it if the Chairman's question and that of the representative of El Salvador were to be asked of the representative of Lebanon. I think I have asked enough.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon)(interpretation from Spanish): I think that the representative of Colombia will agree with me that it is the Lebanese proposal itself that must be put to the vote, because it is the Lebanese proposal that is the synthesis of both the Lebanese and the Colombian views.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I would have preferred it to be only one proposal, instead of two. But, if that is the case, we will put to the vote the Colombian proposal and then we will put to the vote the Lebanese proposal. However, before that we have a previous question --

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon)(interpretation from Spanish): May I ask that the Lebanese proposal be put to the vote before the other? When the Lebanese proposal is voted upon, I think the situation will become clear.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am sorry to tell the representative of Lebanon that the priority of the Colombian proposal was already decided upon when we discussed the Greek proposal -- and, once a priority has been voted upon, we cannot vote again on the priority of the same proposal. May I therefore say to the representative of Lebanon that he should wait his turn; I shall be happy and shall deem it an honour to put the Lebanese proposal to the vote. However, according to the rules of procedure, there is one matter I must put to the Committee. I want to start my Chairmanship by fulfilling the rules of procedure, so that all delegations will be convinced of the fact that I respect the rules of procedure. The representative of the Soviet Union has suggested that

(The Chairman)

the Colombian proposal, as originally suggested by ~~that~~ delegation, or as amended by the Lebanese proposal, should be voted on in parts. Generally speaking, the separation or division of a proposal is not voted upon unless the sponsor agrees to it. But, if there is insistence on the division, then the Committee has to decide upon it by vote. I therefore must put to the vote whether or not to divide the Colombian proposal.

Mr. COOPER (Liberia): I feel that the original proposal of the Colombian representative no longer exists. His proposal was that we should take the two items and then stop --

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I explain something to the representative of Liberia. We are in such a serious position at the moment that I am truly happy to hear these dialectical games, really, because they prove very fine intelligence and wisdom. But I nevertheless feel that we should be more constructive at the moment. There is a formal proposal before the house. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a division of that proposal despite the objection of the sponsor.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to give one final clarification. I think the view of the delegation of Colombia could not have been more conciliating in this question. And, when I say that I am ready to accept the Lebanese amendment, which to a certain extent changes the third part of my proposal, I am astounded to find that the representative of Lebanon, who I thought was on my side of this debate, says "No". Now he turns to me and says that his proposal should be voted on before mine. That being the case, my delegation must say, in a very cordial and friendly way, that the only thing we can do is to maintain our proposal as it was originally suggested. If we offer our hand and it is rejected, then I must oppose the division suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union and I must maintain my proposal as I originally suggested it, unless the representative of Lebanon is willing to make a statement that I can take as a statement coming from an ally of mine in this debate.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon)(interpretation from Spanish): I must say that the representative of Colombia and I do agree. I thought that the Colombian representative had withdrawn his proposal and accepted the Lebanese proposal, because the final goal is the same, and I am very sorry that he has taken the stand he has.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that this discussion is ripe for a vote. There is a previous question, however, which is the one suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): I do not know whether I can properly call this a point of order, but to the extent that it will give order to a procedural disorder I might call it a point of order. The parliamentary situation as I see it is as follows.

There is no dispute as to West Irian remaining as item 5. The dispute and the procedural difficulties around this dispute centre on the Korean question and the disarmament question, as to which comes first and which comes second, and on the Algerian and Cyprus questions as to which comes third and which comes fourth.

I might offer a compromise proposal or suggestion, if you like to put it that way, by which we can resolve all these difficulties by one single stroke. We might distribute ballots to all the delegations, leaving aside the West Irian question, because there is no dispute as regards West Irian remaining as item 5, and the delegations might simply be asked to resolve the following question by ballot. They might vote that either Korea or disarmament be the first item and that the third and fourth items be either Algeria or Cyprus. Then the relative majorities will determine the precedence of the items on the agenda. I believe that this compromise suggestion will resolve all procedural difficulties and that it will resolve once and for all the question of the precedence of these items.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, as you have suggested, I think that the Committee is ripe for the vote. The difficulties have to a certain degree been overcome. I take it that the representative of Greece has courteously refrained from pressing his proposal; therefore we have only one proposal before us: that of the delegation of Colombia, as amended by the delegation of Lebanon; the only outstanding issue is the one of a division. If the representative of the Soviet Union did not press his request for a division, the question would be very simple; it would simply be necessary to put to the vote the joint proposal of Colombia and Lebanon.

If the representative of the Soviet Union presses for separate votes, it will be up to the Committee, and not the sponsor, to decide. Under our rules a sponsor has no right to oppose such a vote, and, even if he does, it cannot be regarded as decisive unless the Committee endorses him.

(Mr. Entezam, Iran)

We are opposed to a division, for the simple reason that it should not be forgotten that the First Committee has no right to decide whether it should discuss or not discuss a question. The First Committee must consider all items submitted to it by the General Assembly. The question is simply as to which item the Committee will consider first.

Suppose that each item is put to the vote separately -- this is a conceivable hypothesis -- and suppose that none of these items obtains a majority. What will be the result of such a procedure? Will it mean that the First Committee will have decided not to discuss these questions?

The desired results will not be obtained by the request for a division. The whole proposal must be put to the vote, and, if the whole proposal is rejected, then some other order of priority must be thought up. Therefore I hope that the representative of the Soviet Union will understand my objection and will not press for the division, because I am opposed to such a division. If he does insist, Mr. Chairman, you will have to put the proposal to the vote. According to article 130 of the rules, only two speakers may speak against and two for; and so far, I believe, more than two delegations have spoken for and against.

My proposal is that the question of division be put to the vote immediately if the representative of the Soviet Union presses the point. If he does not, the Colombian proposal, as amended by Lebanon and graciously accepted by the representative of Greece, should be put to the vote.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have listened carefully to the observations of the representative of Iran but I must say regretfully that his arguments have not convinced me. The representative of Iran seems to be alarmed at the possibility of what would happen if there were no majority on either of the first two items. I have already touched upon this in passing, when answering other representatives, but I should like to emphasize once again that, if this should eventuate, what reason is there for fear in this Committee? This would simply mean that the Committee had pronounced itself as to the desirability or otherwise of considering the Korean question first. If the Committee decides that it should not be considered first,

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

it will not drop out of the agenda; it will simply have to be assigned another place on the agenda, and that would be at the end. That is the first point I wish to make.

The second point is this. I should like to emphasize that under the rules of procedure it is perfectly legitimate for separate questions to be voted on separately, or for separate parts to be voted on separately. I therefore press for a separate vote on the first item.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): I should have preferred not to intervene but I have intervened now for the second time as I feel I should answer the representative of the Soviet Union. First of all, I should like to remind him that the request for a division is no longer automatically granted. It used to be so, but we have changed our rules of procedure. If you will read rule 130, you will observe that the request for a division is not automatically granted. If there is an objection, the Assembly or the Committee must vote on whether the division shall be granted.

My second point is this. He said that if the Korean question does not command a majority this simply shows that the Committee does not wish to discuss the Korean question first. But I would ask him another question. What happens if all five items fail to command a majority? Where are we going to start? This hypothesis is conceivable, to say the least, and it might complicate our work considerably.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that we have reached the point where arguments are being repeated. So in order to safeguard the constructive nature of our work I am going to put to the vote the request of the Soviet representative for a division of the Colombian proposal. This was objected to by Colombia, but nevertheless it may be put to the vote in accordance with rule 130 which has just been invoked by Mr. Entezam.

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Accordingly there will be no division of the vote. Therefore I put to the vote the proposal of the representative of Colombia.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon)(interpretation from Spanish): On a point of order. I presume, Mr. Chairman, you are going to put to the vote the Colombian proposal jointly with the Lebanese proposal, as they are one and the same proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall have to ask the representative of Colombia whether such a joint vote is acceptable to him.

Mr. UMANA BERNAL (Colombia)(interpretation from Spanish): In view of the fact that the Lebanese representative has, with great understanding, been able to accept the fundamental essence of the Colombian proposal, that is, the first two paragraphs of my proposal, I am honoured to consider him as a co-sponsor and a joint vote on the two is acceptable to me.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has only one proposal: the proposal by Colombia and Lebanon. I shall explain exactly what the Committee is going to vote on: the first item to be the Korean question; the second, disarmament; the third, Algeria; the fourth, Cyprus; the fifth, West Irian.

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

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): It is happy indeed that this vote has avoided what I called the elimination of items, though the representative of Colombia said that there was no elimination of items involved. This vote ensures that we shall discuss all items. I have full confidence in the Chairman of the Committee that he will see to it that all the items of the agenda will be discussed as rapidly as possible. I rely on his guidance for ensuring that these two items in particular will be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I can assure the representative of Greece that the Chair will stint no effort to see that all items of the agenda will be fully discussed.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to speak very briefly to explain my vote. The Soviet delegation voted against the Colombian proposal because it placed the Korean item first on the agenda. As regards the order of consideration of the other items, the Soviet delegation agrees to that order and supports it.

Mr. LALL (India): Now that the Committee has adopted an order for its agenda, may I request the Chairman once again, before we close our remarks on this item, very kindly to bear in mind the statement of the chairman of the Indian delegation, namely that when we come to the consideration of the Korean item, we trust that it will be possible after a debate on that item to adjourn further consideration of it to a later stage of our session.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I trust that the representative of India will make that suggestion again at the appropriate time.

The Committee will meet again tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. to discuss the Korean question.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.