

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records



718th PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 19 November 1957,
at 10.30 a. m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 24:	
Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction:	
(a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;	
(b) Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee;	
(c) Collective action to inform and enlighten the peoples of the world as to the dangers of the armaments race, and particularly as to the destructive effects of modern weapons;	
(d) Discontinuance under international control of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons	
Report of the First Committee (continued)	465

President: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 24

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction:

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee;
- (c) Collective action to inform and enlighten the peoples of the world as to the dangers of the armaments race, and particularly as to the destructive effects of modern weapons;
- (d) Discontinuance under international control of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/3729 AND CORR.1)
(continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will renew this morning its consideration of the remaining draft resolutions in connexion with the disarmament question.
2. There are, in fact, two types of draft resolutions before the Assembly. One which deals with certain substantive aspects of disarmament has been submitted by the delegation of India [A/L.232]. The other relates to the composition of the Disarmament Commission, concerning which the Soviet Union has submitted a draft resolution [A/L.230], and Canada, India, Japan, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia have jointly submitted another [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. In connexion with the latter, an amendment has been submitted by Albania [A/L.236].
3. Following the procedure which the Assembly has adopted during the meetings already held on this item,

I should like to suggest that perhaps it would be appropriate to deal with and vote on the Indian draft resolution before turning to the draft resolutions which affect the composition of the Disarmament Commission. If this suggestion meets with the approval of the Assembly, I would call on members who wish to address themselves to the draft resolution submitted by India. After the Assembly has voted on this draft resolution, members could speak on the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union and by the six other delegations, as well as on the amendment submitted by Albania.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: That means that we have the Indian draft resolution before us first, and I wish to know whether any Member of the Assembly wishes to speak on the Indian draft resolution.

5. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation wishes to say a few words about the Indian draft resolution [A/L.232] on the suspension of tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.

6. The urgent need for this action has again been confirmed most convincingly here in the General Assembly during the discussion of the disarmament problem and related questions. No one has been able to disprove the fact that the continuation of nuclear weapons tests represents an increasing danger to the health of the present and future generations. The urgent and pressing need to prohibit tests of nuclear weapons has been acknowledged by leading scientists throughout the world. Such a prohibition is also demanded by the peoples, concerned about the danger of increased atomic radiation.

7. Confronted by this popular demand, not even the representatives of the Western Powers dared deny the need for such action. Yet they do not, in reality, desire the suspension of these tests and constantly search for new excuses to prevent the adoption of such a measure, which could pave the way for a solution of the disarmament problem as a whole. There is, therefore, an obvious difficulty. Two Western Powers which possess atomic and hydrogen weapons wish neither to prohibit them nor to suspend further tests.

8. The Soviet Union is in favour of the complete and unconditional prohibition of nuclear weapons, the cessation of their production and their elimination from the armaments of States. An immediate suspension of tests would be an important step in the direction of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

9. The Soviet Union is prepared to suspend tests of nuclear weapons—as we have stated on many occasions—as soon as the United States and the United Kingdom agree to do the same. If the United States,

the United Kingdom and France desire to make some real progress towards disarmament, no matter how slight, not some time in the future but here and now, at this twelfth session of the General Assembly, they should prove their good will by adopting a positive attitude to the Indian draft resolution.

10. The Soviet delegation will vote for the Indian draft resolution which it regards as a first constructive step towards the relaxation of international tension and the creation of favourable conditions for a comprehensive solution of the disarmament problem.

11. Mr. THORS (Iceland): We are now approaching the final stage of the debate on our treatment of the so-called disarmament problem. As a matter of fact, we have had two general debates about this question. The first was during the opening debate in the General Assembly, when practically every speaker devoted most of his attention to the disarmament question; the second debate was in the First Committee under the item still before us.

12. My delegation has remained silent during these debates, and has listened with interest and patience to all that flow of eloquent words. We have seen no reason to repeat our annual speech of fervent desire for disarmament, nor have we felt any temptation to participate in the annual race of delivery of speeches and expressions of good intentions toward disarmament which takes place every year inside the United Nations while the armaments race continues and is intensified outside the United Nations and steadily reaches more gigantic dimensions of almost supernatural ingenuity.

13. This has to be stopped before it is too late. The question has become whether to exist or not to exist.

14. We now have before us the draft resolution presented by India [A/L.232] about the suspension of tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. This draft resolution "appeals to the States concerned to agree without delay to suspend" such tests and requests them to agree forthwith to the nomination of a scientific technical commission for inspection and control. Which are the States concerned? At present they are the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. All these countries have repeatedly expressed the desirability of suspending these tests. So has the General Assembly in previous years and in the resolution [1148 (XII)] approved on 14 November by 57 votes to 9.

15. My delegation was happy to vote for that resolution. What does it say? In it, we urge the States concerned to give priority to reaching a disarmament agreement which will provide for the following: the immediate suspension of testing of nuclear weapons, with prompt installation of effective international control; the cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and the complete devotion of future production of fissionable materials to non-weapons purposes under effective international control; the reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons through controlled reciprocal transfer to non-weapons uses; the reduction of armed forces and armaments through adequate safeguarded arrangements. Lastly, we urge a joint study of an inspection system designed to ensure that the sending of objects through outer space will be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

16. This we have approved, and we have approved even more details and other aspects of the question. I therefore venture to suggest that we need approve no more draft resolutions and that the Indian proposal, which has been submitted with great serenity and presented with the highest ability, has now become superfluous. We therefore see no reason to vote for it but find it more logical to vote against it, as at this stage its approval might confuse the issue.

17. Fortunately, India will have ample opportunity in the future to present its views in the enlarged Disarmament Commission which we hope we are about to establish. In all circumstances, India will become a member of this most important commission to which the whole problem will be referred.

18. Mr. LALL (India): At this juncture the Indian delegation is referring only to its draft resolution [A/L.232] on the suspension of nuclear tests. The Indian delegation has already introduced this draft resolution to the Assembly [716th meeting], and I do not propose to cover the ground which I have already covered.

19. We do continue to feel, however, that at this rather late juncture in our disarmament discussions the Assembly should consider with great seriousness this question of nuclear tests. I wish in this connexion to refer to a statement made by Professor Otto Hahn, the German scientist who, as we all know, has been a leader in the field of nuclear science and its development. This is a Reuter's report of what Professor Otto Hahn said at Vienna on 13 November:

"Professor Otto Hahn, the German scientist who helped to discover nuclear fission, has warned that thousands of persons are dying every year as the result of radio-activity from nuclear tests."

This is a quotation now from his statement:

"There cannot be any doubt that already thousands of people are dying yearly as a result of radio-active rays from experiments with nuclear material."

20. Can any Member of the Assembly, in the face of this statement by a scientist whose reputation is beyond question, vote against the cessation of nuclear tests at once?

21. We appeal earnestly to the Assembly to accept the Indian draft resolution. The Indian draft resolution has written into it full provisions for the monitoring of tests, full provision for seeing that there is no evasion of any part of the agreement to suspend tests.

22. Not only is this the view of scientists, but there is a new society in this country whose members are persons who cannot but command the respect of a group such as this Assembly. It styles itself the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. It includes names such as Mr. Clarence Pickett, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Norman Thomas, Dr. Paul J. Tillich and many others of that character, and this is what they say to the American people:

"As it concerns nuclear testing, America can say: That because of the grave unanswered questions with respect to nuclear test explosions—especially as it concerns the contamination of air and water and food, and the injury to man himself—we are calling upon all nations to suspend such explosions at once."

23. Is the General Assembly going to close its eyes to the growing world feeling for the suspension of tests, and close its ears to the words of scientists who have nothing to lose or gain from the suspension of tests but who tell us that yearly thousands of persons are dying because of the tests which have already taken place? We know perfectly well, sitting in this Assembly, that if tests are not suspended next year they will be undertaken by an increasing number of countries in the world, and that it is futile to consider that testing will continue at its present rate. The rate of radio-activity from tests is bound to increase and might well increase rapidly.

24. In these circumstances, we would appeal again to this Assembly to adopt unanimously the Indian draft resolution which calls for the suspension of tests and which has built into it full provision for control and inspection.

25. The PRESIDENT: Since no other representative has indicated a desire to speak at this time, I assume that we are now in a position to vote on the draft resolution submitted by India [A/L.232]. A vote by roll call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Nicaragua, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Bolivia, Cambodia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaya (Federation of).

The draft resolution was rejected by 34 votes to 24, with 20 abstentions.

26. The PRESIDENT: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union or on the draft resolution submitted jointly by six Members or the amendment thereto.

27. Mr. NESBITT (Canada): We now have before us a draft resolution on the expansion of the Disarmament Commission which Canada is pleased to co-sponsor in association with the delegations of Japan, India, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. I am glad to be able to announce that the original draft resolution submitted by Canada and Japan [A/L.231] has thus been altered to include the amendments suggested by the delegations of India, Sweden and Yugoslavia. The discussions and negotiations leading to this result have been long, complicated and, at times, disappointing. Nevertheless, my delegation has always been confident that a draft resolution

acceptable to a great majority of this Assembly could be found, and we have been persistent in trying to seek this goal. At the same time, we have always resisted any extreme and unreasonable solution which would be destructive of serious negotiations.

28. Our joint draft resolution now provides for enlarging the Disarmament Commission by the addition of fourteen Member States, and provides further that for the first year, from 1 January 1958 to 1 January 1959, these fourteen States shall be: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The draft resolution also requires the transmission to the Disarmament Commission of the records of the proceedings of the First Committee at which disarmament was discussed.

29. Members of the General Assembly will be well aware of the situation which has given rise to this new draft. In my final intervention on disarmament in the First Committee, shortly before the commencement of the voting, I reiterated the views of the Canadian delegation on this question of the composition of the Disarmament Commission.

30. We do not believe that the size or the composition of the Commission and its Sub-Committee has been a major factor in our failure to reach agreement on the substance of disarmament. But, by the same token, we do not believe that some practical alteration of the composition of United Nations disarmament bodies—provided, however, that this does not make the machinery so cumbersome and bulky as to be unworkable—should be allowed to block at least the opportunity for further negotiation.

31. The General Assembly's decision on this matter cannot and should not be unaffected by the Soviet statement in the First Committee announcing refusal to serve on the Commission and the Sub-Committee as now constituted.

32. But at the same time, and so far as Canada is concerned, I would reiterate that our fundamental attitude on this whole question was defined by our Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, in his statement in the general debate on 23 September [683rd meeting]. He made it clear at that time that we were certainly not opposed to associating other countries with these disarmament talks.

33. In the various discussions which have taken place in recent days, many different ideas for solving this problem have been put forward, and we have always been prepared to consider any reasonable and constructive ideas on their merits. It is my firm conviction that the suggestion contained in this joint draft resolution represents a very well balanced and thoroughly reasonable addition to the Commission.

34. We do not think that geography, and most certainly not ideology, is the main criterion for choosing these additional members. We feel that ability to make a constructive contribution to the disarmament negotiations should be the main concern. Nevertheless, the proposal which we now offer does give very fair weight to the principle of equitable distribution. It represents all the main geographical areas as well as other interests and groups with which we are concerned in United Nations matters.

35. I feel that, if this additional group of fourteen

members is honestly and fairly assessed, it will be found to be carefully and adequately balanced in its composition.

36. Our problem is not simply one of adjusting the machinery of United Nations disarmament bodies. If that were the only issue, it would not have been necessary to deal with it by introducing at this late date a new proposal in a plenary meeting. Our problem is how to ensure that serious disarmament negotiations can go on in the future. Surely, the peoples of the world would not understand it if we ended this session of the General Assembly not only without agreement among all the major Powers concerned on even a first step of disarmament, but also with a complete breakdown of the machinery for further discussions.

37. This would be a completely backward step, and it would leave us worse off on this matter than before the session of the Assembly began. Such a situation would be intolerable and would most certainly cause a great increase in fear, apprehension and tension throughout the entire world. I feel certain that this Assembly will not permit such a situation to arise without making a genuinely conciliatory move to do everything possible to provide a disarmament body acceptable to all the major Powers.

38. It is my sincere and earnest belief that the proposal which Canada has the honour to co-sponsor does constitute just such a conciliatory move. I therefore strongly urge that our proposal be unanimously adopted by this Assembly.

39. I would hope that the broadly representative character of our present group of co-sponsors could be taken as some indication that our proposal will now have the Assembly's full support. The unanimous adoption of this proposal would at least open the door to further serious and constructive negotiations. It is hardly necessary for me to stress that we are still far from agreement on the desperately important matter of the actual substance of disarmament. Nevertheless, our resolution would keep alive the hope of all our peoples for a reduction of the crushing burden of armaments and a lessening of the danger of war and all the horror and destruction which war would mean in this age of the hydrogen bomb.

40. I should like to close with an earnest appeal to all Members of this Assembly to rally to the support of this draft resolution so that we can end our discussion of disarmament on a note of hope, however limited, and not offer to the world a picture of division and frustration in this Assembly.

41. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan): In the course of the debate in the First Committee, my delegation had an opportunity to express its views on the ways to improve the functioning of the disarmament machinery.

42. It is my delegation's considered opinion that it would be to the advantage of the disarmament discussions to add to the actual members of the Disarmament Commission countries whose views on the subject would reflect wider segments of world opinion. On the other hand, my delegation noted with dismay the Soviet Union representative's declaration to the effect that his Government would not participate in the discussions of the Disarmament Commission if its present membership were not enlarged.

43. In order not to permit the tenuous endeavours

of the disarmament discussions to come to an abrupt standstill, and also in order not to disappoint world public opinion—including that in my own country, which is anxiously looking for a successful conclusion of these discussions—my delegation considers it appropriate to do its utmost, to the extent compatible with the newly created situation, to find means to prevent the deterioration of the circumstances surrounding the discussions.

44. In that sense, duly conscious of the Assembly's responsibility in this matter, and in full cognizance of my country's duty with regard to this noble task on which mankind's fate depends, my delegation has the honour to submit, along with the delegation of Canada and other delegations, the draft resolution now before the Assembly [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. My delegation is of the opinion that, in view of the short term of office of each member of the Commission—a term which does not exceed one year—the names of the members of the Disarmament Commission are not so important as the determination to save the disarmament discussions from interruption and failure; and this is a determination which, my delegation submits, will obtain the general approval of the Assembly.

45. In this spirit, my delegation is very happy to incorporate the four names suggested, first, by nineteen Latin American countries represented by Paraguay and, second, by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia—in the amendments contained in documents A/L.233 and A/L.234. I wish to congratulate the authors of these amendments for their most sincere efforts and co-operation. My delegation is convinced that this enlarged composition of the Disarmament Commission will, in the most satisfactory way, represent every segment of world opinion on this matter.

46. My delegation therefore trusts that the Soviet Union Government will continue its endeavours to reach agreement on the disarmament problem, through its participation in this newly organized Disarmament Commission.

47. My delegation, together with the other sponsors, hopes this draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States is opposed to the Soviet Union draft resolution [A/L.230] calling for an eighty-two-nation disarmament commission, because the proposal is clearly impractical; indeed, it is an understatement to say that it would not improve the prospects for disarmament.

49. The United States supports the draft resolution submitted by Canada, India, Japan, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. We hope this draft resolution will contribute something of value to serious disarmament negotiations, which we firmly believe are in the best interests of all concerned, including the Soviet Union. We hope that the draft resolution will be adopted without any amendment. We say this, of course, without derogatory implications as regards any Member, but because the draft resolution as it stands does contain a very representative balance and the Albanian amendment [A/L.236] would destroy that balance.

50. I said on 4 November, in the First Committee [890th meeting]:

"We do not believe that any nation seriously wishes to stand for all future time before the world and before recorded history as the nation which broke up and which ended humanity's effort to achieve disarmament and to achieve peace."^{1/}

Surely the Soviet Union cannot now disregard the conciliatory step which is before the Assembly in the form of this draft resolution submitted by Canada, India, Japan, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

51. The United States hopes that this new draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of the General Assembly and that it will improve the prospects for disarmament.

52. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it the USSR proposal for the establishment of a permanent disarmament commission [A/L.230]. We feel it our duty to draw the General Assembly's attention to the great importance of this proposal. The abnormal and intolerable situation in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee is a source of justified concern to all peace-loving peoples, to all persons who are sincerely anxious to avert another war and who, not in theory but in practice, desire the end of the armaments race which aggravates international relations and undermines cooperation among States.

53. In the First Committee, the Soviet delegation explained what, in its opinion, prevented the solution of the disarmament problem. Despite the persistent efforts of peace-loving States, this most important international problem remains unsolved. Surely it is clear—and will be recognized by anyone who makes an objective appraisal of the present situation and the positions of the States participating in the disarmament negotiations in the Sub-Committee—that responsibility for the deadlock on this important and urgent question rests squarely on the Western Powers.

54. The history of the negotiations on disarmament in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee reveals the complete bankruptcy of these bodies in their present form. Although they have been in existence for a long time, they have not made a single step forward in the solution of the disarmament problem. All their efforts have produced nothing but endless and fruitless discussions. Those who seriously desire to pursue disarmament negotiations on a realistic basis should eschew this approach to the disarmament problem and stop using the Commission and the Sub-Committee as a screen for the armaments race.

55. In their present form, these discredited institutions enable the Western Powers to lull public opinion, to conceal the real state of affairs from the peoples of the world and, under cover of disarmament negotiations, to continue preparations for an atomic war.

56. We have already pointed out that one of the basic reasons for the failure of the Commission and the Sub-Committee was that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations were precluded from participation in the discussion of the disarmament problem. Disarmament negotiations have, in fact, become a sort of monopoly of a small group of Powers,

of which only the Soviet Union makes sincere efforts to find a solution to the disarmament problem. The other four members of the present Sub-Committee, belonging as they do to the militaristic North Atlantic bloc, which was formed not to preserve peace but to prepare for war, and to pursue a policy of "negotiation from strength", are not interested in disarmament. They want disarmament negotiations but not disarmament itself.

57. The Disarmament Commission, as was quite clearly shown in statements made in the First Committee, does nothing, and its functions have been reduced to transmitting the Sub-Committee's reports to the General Assembly. The harm done to the cause of disarmament by the secret character of the Sub-Committee's work was illustrated convincingly enough in the First Committee. The cloak of secrecy is used by the Western members of the Sub-Committee to mislead public opinion on the true course of the negotiations.

58. This was and is the purpose of the fanciful statements that negotiations are proceeding in earnest and even that progress is being made, whereas in point of fact the Sub-Committee is making no headway at all. These illusions are fostered in order to undermine the will of the peoples to put an end to the armaments race.

59. The Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee with their present membership and procedures have completely exhausted any usefulness they might have had and are unable to cope with their task of drafting an agreement on disarmament. The disarmament question, which affects the vital interests of all peoples, should of course remain the focus of their attention. It is precisely for that reason that all States, large and small, western and eastern, European and American, Asian and African, must be allowed to participate in its solution.

60. These were the considerations which prompted the Soviet Union to submit its proposal for the establishment of a broadly representative permanent disarmament commission, consisting of all the States Members of the United Nations. This permanent commission should examine all proposals on disarmament submitted to the United Nations, it should be the only body to prepare recommendations and proposals for submission to sessions of the General Assembly.

61. The establishment of a permanent disarmament commission would not prevent individual States or groups of States from engaging in informal consultations and exchanges of views on disarmament questions. A permanent commission would be able to and should create more favourable conditions for expanding contacts and relations between States in their common efforts to solve the disarmament problem. States should receive every assistance in carrying out such informal consultations from the officers of the commission, namely, the chairman and the vice-chairman. Temporary working groups consisting of several States could also be established for this purpose, but they should act exclusively as advisory and auxiliary bodies and should not usurp the functions of the permanent commission.

62. In submitting its proposal, the Soviet Union is acting in the belief that this would represent a most radical solution, capable of breaking, at long last, the deadlock on the disarmament problem.

^{1/} This passage is quoted from the provisional verbatim record. The official printed text appears in summary form.

63. The delegations of Canada and Japan have submitted a draft resolution [A/L.231] designed to enlarge the Disarmament Commission by the addition of ten States. This proposal is quite unacceptable because the majority of the States represented on the Commission are members of military blocs under the leadership of the Western Powers. The amendments to this draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia really change the situation very little. For these reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against the six-Power draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. The Soviet Union will not take part in the work of the Commission as provided for therein.

64. The Albanian delegation has submitted a proposal that Austria, Bulgaria, Ceylon, Finland, Indonesia, Romania, and the Sudan should be added to the list of countries mentioned in the draft resolution. This amendment would improve the membership of the Commission. It would ensure that all the groups concerned were more or less equitably represented on the Commission, and that would make the Commission a more effective and suitable instrument for the accomplishment of its task. The Soviet delegation will vote for the Albanian amendment.

65. We should like to hope that the work of the Disarmament Commission, if it is enlarged in accordance with the Albanian amendment, will be more successful, but the USSR Government feels that even this solution is a half-measure and does not fully meet the needs of the situation. These needs would be met by the establishment of a permanent disarmament commission consisting of all the States Members of the United Nations. The establishment of such a commission in which all Member States would participate on an equal footing would inject new life into the disarmament negotiations and would contribute to a successful solution of this vitally important problem.

66. The USSR Government therefore reserves the right, if its proposal for the establishment of a permanent commission is not adopted, and if the Disarmament Commission, as enlarged in accordance with the Albanian amendment, does not make any progress in disarmament negotiations, to raise again, at the next session of the General Assembly, the question of the establishment of a permanent disarmament commission consisting of all the States Members of the United Nations.

67. It is quite obvious, of course, that even if the Commission were enlarged, disarmament negotiations cannot take place on the basis of the draft resolution prepared by the United States, the United Kingdom and France and known in the Committee as the twenty-four-Power draft resolution, in which the position of the Western Powers on disarmament questions is set forth. This position is inconsistent with the objective of ending the armaments race and eliminating the threat of atomic warfare, and is therefore unacceptable.

68. The PRESIDENT. I call upon the representative of India on a point of order.

69. Mr. LALL (India): On 15 November [717th meeting], the General Assembly was about to give attention to the item which we are now discussing. At that point an amendment was moved to the draft resolution of Canada and Japan [A/L.231] and, as a result of that amendment, the President adjourned the meeting so that time might be given for further consultation.

70. Today we find ourselves in much the same state of affairs. We find on the table before us today the amendment of Albania [A/L.236], which seeks to add the names of seven Member States to the names appearing in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1, of which India is a co-sponsor. There is also the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.230]. So we have before us three proposals, one of which was made today just as we took our places in the meeting.

71. Having regard to the clear statements which have been made by the representatives of the countries mainly concerned that they are deeply interested in the continuance of negotiations on disarmament—and I may say that, undoubtedly that feeling is shared by every single Member of this Assembly—and because there is now a new proposal before us, in the opinion of the delegation of India it would be desirable, in the interests of seeking an agreed solution, to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion under rule 79 (c) of our rules of procedure, and I do so propose.

72. The PRESIDENT: The representative of India has moved the adjournment of the debate. Under rule 76 there can be two speakers on either side in respect of such proposal.

73. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (translated from French): My delegation very much regrets that no agreement has yet been reached on the composition of the Disarmament Commission, in spite of the praiseworthy efforts made by many delegations and in particular by those of India, Yugoslavia, Canada and Japan. This has now become very clear after the statements made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union.

74. In my delegation's view, the purpose of the draft resolutions and amendments submitted on the question of the composition of the Commission was simply to permit the resumption of conversations between the great Powers, with which, ultimately, lies the responsibility for disarmament; if the great Powers are not agreed about the composition of the Disarmament Commission, I see no point in our voting on these draft resolutions. For that reason and for the reasons which the representative of India has just given we support his proposal for the adjournment of the debate.

75. We think that this problem could be solved if the great Powers undertook direct conversations with a view to reaching an agreement on the new composition of the Disarmament Commission—if they want a commission to be set up. The adjournment of the debate would give the great Powers time to find a solution to the problem. There is no need for me to stress the importance of this.

76. Mr. NESBITT (Canada): With great respect to the representatives of India and Egypt, the Canadian delegation is opposed to adjourning or delaying Assembly action on this matter. It has been under discussion for a long time now and there have been repeated postponements to allow for further negotiations. These have resulted in a proposal co-sponsored by six delegations widely representative of this Assembly as a whole. It represents a thoroughly conciliatory and reasonable compromise. I strongly urge that we proceed at once to conclude the debate and to come

to a vote on this proposal. Further delay will, in our opinion, not help the cause which we all have at heart and may indeed hinder it.

77. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States is opposed to the motion to adjourn, with all due respect to the representative of India. We feel that the Assembly has considered disarmament, including the question of the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission, for many weeks; we do not think that further delay will be helpful. The issues are very clear and we should bring this matter before us to a speedy close.

78. The General Assembly has before it a reasonable proposal for the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission which has been sponsored by six nations representing broad elements of General Assembly opinion. We are sure that, as time goes on, the reasonable and constructive character of this proposal will become evident to all, even to those who are opposed to it now. Let us, therefore, move ahead and adopt this proposal, which represents a genuine conciliatory step in the right direction and which is put before the Assembly in the utmost good faith.

79. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the proposal made by the representative of India to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion under rule 79 (c) of the rules of procedure.

80. In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to rule 80, which reads in part:

"As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though these amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day."

This means that it is possible to consider proposals or amendments submitted the same day, but there is nothing in this rule about voting. Therefore it is quite clear that the amendment submitted today cannot be put to a vote this morning.

81. The PRESIDENT: I have permitted the discussion of the amendment and I think it would be in order for the Assembly to vote on it this morning. I shall now, however, put the motion for adjournment to the Assembly.

The motion was rejected by 42 votes to 28, with 7 abstentions.

82. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): In connexion with the draft resolutions that are now before us, I wish briefly to restate the view of my delegation on this question of machinery for the disarmament talks.

83. Let me make it clear that we have not changed the opinion which I expressed in the First Committee, that the question of machinery is in no way the heart of the disarmament problem. The disarmament problem is a problem of security and of political attitudes and policies.

84. It is the differences of policy that have hitherto prevented agreement. I cannot admit that it has been

in any way the fault of the existing machinery. Disarmament, as I think everyone here agrees, depends, in the first place, upon an accord between the major Powers or "The Powers principally involved", as General Assembly resolution 715 (VIII) of 28 November 1953 put it. What is needed is for those Powers to negotiate and reach agreement.

85. It follows that a change of machinery by itself will not necessarily bring agreement nearer. What is needed for that, I must emphasize, is good will and patient negotiation.

86. We now have two draft resolutions before us. In dealing with the regular political machinery of the talks, I need say little about the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.230] proposing an eighty-two member permanent commission. This is, of course, substantially the same draft resolution as was submitted in the First Committee and there rejected. No further argument from me is needed, I think, to suggest to Member States that a commission of eighty-two members could not be an efficient body in which to pursue a practical consideration of disarmament. My delegation will therefore vote against the Soviet proposal.

87. The other proposal before us is the six-Power draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1] calling for an expansion of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation will support this draft resolution. The enlargement proposed is substantial and it seems to my delegation that it should amply meet the desire of some delegations to associate other Member States with the talks. The Soviet representative has just said that he does not like the balance of this new commission. If one considers the balance of voting on the twenty-four-Power draft resolution last week, I would say that the Soviet representative should have no complaint about the proposed commission.

88. As I emphasized in my remarks on 14 November [716th meeting], the immediate object of my delegation is to see effective disarmament discussions continued with all possible dispatch. If the six-Power draft resolution is adopted—and I hope that it will be—we hope that this, combined with the resolutions adopted last week, will provide both the machinery and the guidance needed for a further and vigorous effort to make progress in this field, which my country has so much at heart.

89. Mr. THORS (Iceland): It is in fact no pleasant role for a small country like mine to be thrust into this discussion, which is mainly between the big Powers, but I wanted to make known our views about the composition of the Disarmament Commission.

90. Up to now it has been composed only of the members of the Security Council plus Canada, which from the beginning of 1958 will become a member of the Security Council. Therefore, after the new year, there would be eleven members on the Disarmament Commission, unless otherwise decided now. In view of the increased number of Members of the United Nations, it would be only natural that the membership of the Disarmament Commission should be increased, as has been the case in many other instances. But how many countries should sit there and what additional countries we should elect, this is not so important.

91. Let me, however, state that my delegation considers that a commission of eighty-two members, as suggested by the delegation of the Soviet Union, is too

big to be able to work on a settlement constructively. In such a numerous body much time would be lost in useless oratory, and the danger of it becoming a propaganda forum is evident. Although it may be found logical to increase the membership somewhat, it is also clear that a commission of eleven should be fully competent in discharging its duties and arriving at a solution, provided its work meets with the approval of the big Powers. We are of the opinion that each nation will objectively view the problem and try to find ways and means that will lead to a settlement.

92. We have now before us a draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1] presented by Canada and Japan, two of the new members of the Security Council, together with India, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia. This proposal suggests the addition of fourteen countries to the Commission. We know which these countries are. My delegation has only one objective in this matter, and that is that disarmament should be initiated. We therefore welcome this revised conciliatory draft resolution and will vote in favour of it in the hope that this will finally and in due course be conducive to the resumption of negotiations with the participation of all the big Powers.

93. This would bring the number of countries in the Disarmament Commission up to twenty-five, and there should therefore be no doubt that all groups are well represented and that all shades of opinion will be fully explained. Let us also bear in mind that these countries are only to serve for one year, after which there will be an open opportunity to change the list of countries and bring in new countries, should that be considered advisable and opportune. We cannot expect the disarmament problem to be solved in the course of one year, therefore a vast variety of countries can expect to be called upon to participate in the work of the Disarmament Commission.

94. A few moments ago an amendment was tabled by Albania [A/L.236] whereby seven countries would be added. Now, this amendment has not yet been presented. However, I should like to remark that if these seven countries were added the Disarmament Commission would be composed in a manner contrary to the composition of the United Nations, and that it is even against the idea supported in the Soviet proposal, that all the Members of the United Nations sit on the Disarmament Commission.

95. It seems evident to my delegation that the care of the endeavours for settlement will have to be borne by the Sub-Committee. There a stalemate has occurred and it would seem to be useful to open the windows and bring in some fresh air. In the Sub-Committee only the States most concerned have been sitting, that is, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and, as it has developed, on the other side, the Soviet Union. It may seem advisable to include in the Sub-Committee a country like India and some other one country.

96. It truly would be most regrettable if we should now have to declare to the world that we are so far from a settlement of the disarmament problem that the big Powers cannot even agree on any machinery for its implementation. This would be serious news to the world, and we can only warn those responsible for the collapse of the negotiations of the unforeseen and serious consequences and the catastrophe that may be its aftermath.

97. It is much to be hoped that all the Governments most concerned will very seriously reconsider their attitude on this question of procedure. The heart of this great matter in this ultra-modern nuclear age is that the nuclear Powers should finally sit down to business together and put their pious words into positive deeds and thus begin to relieve mankind from the nightmare of threatening bombs, circling satellites and all other warlike phenomena. It is high time that man's greatest achievements in science and inventions be turned from destruction to construction, from fear to blessing.

98. Let us hope that, despite all omens to the contrary, plain common sense will prevail and that the great Powers will finally agree on the first steps on the road to reduction and limitation of armaments. That is what humanity awaits and claims from its leaders.

99. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): The Cuban delegation explained in the First Committee why it opposed the proposal for enlarging the membership of the Disarmament Commission. We then said that in our view an increase in the number of members would not facilitate the disarmament talks but would in fact complicate them still further.

100. My delegation also believes that it would be a bad precedent for the United Nations if the General Assembly gave way as soon as one of the great Powers threatened to withdraw from the Commission unless the increase in membership desired by that Power was approved.

101. For these reasons, the Cuban delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution originally submitted by the delegations of Canada and Japan [A/L.231], or, a fortiori, the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/L.230].

102. Similarly, as my delegation is opposed to an increase in the membership of the Disarmament Commission, it is unable, much to its regret, to support the amendment of certain Latin American countries [A/L.233] calling for the addition to the list of new members of Mexico, a country with which, I need hardly say, Cuba is bound by close ties of friendship and solidarity.

103. For the same reasons, we shall be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1] which calls for the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission by the inclusion of a further fourteen Member States, although we wish to place on record our view that the inclusion of Mexico in this group—which we note with great satisfaction—is right and proper, since we believe that Mexico would make a valuable and constructive contribution to the negotiations. Nevertheless, we cannot commit ourselves to voting in favour of a draft resolution which, far from facilitating a solution of the difficult and complicated problem of disarmament, would, we are convinced, complicate it still further.

104. As in earlier cases in which we have taken a similar stand, time will show that we are right.

105. Mr. NASE (Albania) (translated from French): In the general debate on disarmament in the First Committee, the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania stressed the fact, of which everyone is well aware, that disarmament is not only the key prob-

lem at this session of the General Assembly but the key problem of our time.

106. The soundest criterion by which to judge whether a State is in favour of peace and international co-operation is its stand on the disarmament question.

107. Disarmament talks have been going on in the United Nations for over ten years, but still nothing has been achieved. Continuing its unchanging policy of peace, with a view to securing an agreement on disarmament, relieving the peoples of the ever-mounting burden of expenditure entailed by the armaments race and saving them from the scourge of a new world war, the Government of the Soviet Union, through its delegation to the Assembly, has made a number of highly constructive proposals which provide for practical measures of disarmament and could be accepted by the parties concerned. Unfortunately the Western Powers, foremost among them the United States, giving further proof of their manifest lack of any desire to reach agreement, persist in their negative attitude.

108. That attitude is reflected in the resolution [1148 (XII)] adopted by the General Assembly on 14 November, which in fact embodies the proposals made by the Western Powers on 29 August last. But we are bound to note that, although the United States and the other Western Powers managed to obtain a majority in favour of the twenty-four-Power draft resolution, they have not taken a single step towards the solution of the disarmament problem. On the contrary, they have merely deepened the rift and made the problem more difficult.

109. As we have pointed out on other occasions, we believe that the use of such methods by the United States will solve nothing and does not serve the cause of peace. One of the reasons for the failure to make any progress in the matter of disarmament is the procedure which has hitherto been followed in considering the problem. But the aforementioned resolution once again recommends that same procedure to us, namely, reference of the question to the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, as at present constituted.

110. Events have shown that the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee are not the right bodies to make progress towards the solution of the problem within the United Nations. They have been sitting for years without achieving any practical result.

111. During the discussion of the disarmament question at this session of the Assembly, certain delegations, anxious to break the deadlock on the disarmament question, have rightly stressed the insignificant role of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee and their structural and procedural defects. The limited membership of these bodies not only does not help, but seriously hinders, the solution of the problem. Only twelve States are represented on the Commission, and only five on the Sub-Committee. As far as the work of the Sub-Committee is concerned, apart from the Soviet Union, which is genuinely anxious to reach an agreement and is making every possible effort to that end, the other four Powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada, faithful to the policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, of which they are members, are raising numerous obstacles to block any progress towards agreement. The negotiations in the Sub-Committee

are in practice held behind closed doors, thus preventing public opinion from finding out what actually happens in the debates and making it impossible for it to exert its influence to promote a solution.

112. We believe it is the duty of the United Nations to spare no effort to remove all obstacles to the solution of the disarmament problem, including obstacles of an organizational nature. Measures of an organizational nature are in fact urgently necessary.

113. The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/L.230] satisfies this requirement. The establishment of a permanent commission, consisting of all the States Members of the United Nations, which is what the Soviet draft resolution proposes, would permit all Member States, large and small, to participate actively and thus to help in the solution of a problem of vital concern to them and to all mankind, and would make it possible for public opinion to follow the debates and observe the attitude of the various States, thus permitting it to make its contribution towards an agreement. The participation of all States Members in the commission and the fact that the commission would be permanent and would conduct its business in open meetings would undoubtedly facilitate progress towards a solution acceptable to the parties concerned. For these reasons, my delegation strongly supports the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation.

114. The General Assembly has before it a six-Power draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1] which proposes the addition of a further fourteen States to the Disarmament Commission. We have already stated our views on the Disarmament Commission and have stressed the need for a permanent commission consisting of the eighty-two Member States of the United Nations. However, in view of the differences of opinion that exist and in order to reach an agreement on this procedural question, which is of considerable importance to the solution of the problem, my delegation is prepared, in a spirit of compromise, to support the six-Power draft resolution if our amendment [A/L.236] is accepted. We feel that the increase proposed by the six Powers is not satisfactory, either as regards the number of new members or the additional States proposed, since the majority of States represented on the new Disarmament Commission would in fact stand for the policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

115. In view of the need for the establishment of a sufficiently broad commission, whose membership would reflect the different positions on the disarmament question and ensure better geographical distribution, the delegation of Albania proposes an amendment which, we hope, will receive the backing of all delegations. Despite the United States delegation's arguments to the contrary, we believe that our amendment will in fact ensure the necessary balance between the States represented in the Disarmament Commission.

116. If our amendment is rejected, we shall be unable to vote for the six-Power draft resolution in its present form.

117. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) (translated from Spanish): Latin America is deeply interested in the question of disarmament, as was shown by its persistent efforts in the First Committee to

ensure that the problem was considered in realistic terms, taking into account the facts of the political situation.

118. We have always sought, and we shall continue untiringly to seek, points of contact that will permit a reduction of international tension. The United Nations is familiar with the efforts of Latin America to find ways and means of facilitating an understanding among the great Powers concerned with the difficult question of international disarmament.

119. Eighteen Latin American countries joined in sponsoring an amendment [A/L.233] to the original draft resolution of Canada and Japan [A/L.231], thus demonstrating that the problem of enlarging the Disarmament Commission is of special concern to Latin America. This position served as a basis for later negotiations.

120. Paraguay has now joined with Canada, India, Japan, Sweden and Yugoslavia in sponsoring a revised draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1]. This text is the result of strenuous efforts and negotiations aimed at laying before the Assembly a sufficiently broad formula for enlarging the Disarmament Commission.

121. Our proposal is to enlist the co-operation of fourteen Member States in considering the problems of international disarmament, which are, as everyone knows, of universal concern.

122. We hope that the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission as proposed in our draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of the Members of the Assembly. We believe that the proposal will bring about an atmosphere of greater confidence and optimism in regard to the much debated question of disarmament and will lead to constructive results on the lines the world desires. With this hope and in this belief, we appeal to the General Assembly to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

123. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (translated from Spanish): During the debate on the item concerning disarmament, my delegation stated in the First Committee that, however delicate the world situation might be, it was in our opinion the primary duty of the General Assembly to find a formula for agreement which would make it possible to continue negotiations and would open the way to agreement and understanding. With this idea in mind, I shall now proceed to comment on the draft resolutions before us.

124. My country was one of the twenty-four Powers sponsoring the draft resolution which has now become General Assembly resolution 1148 (XII) on disarmament. This document maintained the existing structure of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, as they were expressly mentioned without suggestions for changes of any kind. It is well known that the present Disarmament Commission was established under the Security Council by General Assembly resolution 502 (VI), and that it held its first meeting in Paris on 4 February 1952. Resolution 502 (VI) simply confirmed the provisions of resolutions 1 (I), creating the Atomic Energy Commission, and 41 (I), entitled "Principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments", as it stressed not only the primary responsibility of the Security Council, under Article 24 of the Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security, but also the close relation-

ship between the Security Council and the General Assembly with regard to the consideration of the disarmament problem and the regulation of armaments.

125. In that connexion, we must take into account Articles 11, 26 and 47 of the Charter. On the one hand, Article 11, paragraph 1, provides:

"The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both."

On the other hand, Article 26 provides:

"In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security...the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

126. From the foregoing, it is clear that when resolution 502 (VI) established "under the Security Council a Disarmament Commission", it was reaffirming the principle enshrined in Article 26 of the Charter, which makes the Security Council directly responsible for formulating plans for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

127. In the same line of thought, we may observe—and this is admitted in the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs (vol. I, p. 290, para. 27)—that, apart from the special case of Canada, which for obvious reasons was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and became a member of the Disarmament Commission even when not a member of the Security Council, the membership of the former Atomic Energy Commission and the former Commission for Conventional Armaments, like that of the Disarmament Commission, has always been the same as that of the Security Council.

128. Let us now look into the history of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission. The Sub-Committee was established in April 1954, when the Disarmament Commission met to consider the organization of its work in conformity with the provisions of resolution 715 (VIII), approved by the General Assembly on 28 November 1953. At that meeting, the United Kingdom representative proposed that the Commission should take note of the afore-mentioned General Assembly resolution, and of the communiqué on disarmament issued by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union in Berlin on 18 February 1954. He accordingly requested the Commission to decide to establish a Sub-Committee consisting of Canada, the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union then proposed that the membership of the Sub-Committee should be extended to include the People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia and India; but that proposal was rejected on the grounds that the members of the Sub-Committee must also be members of the Commission.

129. But what I want to emphasize is the indisputable fact that the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Com-

mission was established on the basis of a General Assembly resolution, and also of an agreement between the United States, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom. This agreement takes on added importance in view of the unfounded accusations brought by the Soviet bloc against the Western Powers to the effect that they are trying through the Sub-Committee to keep the disarmament negotiations secret, to avoid public debate and to confine participation in the negotiations to a limited number of countries.

130. A consideration of recent events will once more convince us of the wisdom of the Chinese proverb which has it that a clear conscience is often the product of a bad memory; for the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission was established at the request, and with the concurrence, of the Soviet Union.

131. Let us see what was the nature of the agreement to which we have referred. Everyone here will remember that from 25 January to 18 February 1954, the Foreign Ministers of the four great Powers met in conference at Berlin for the first time in five years. As a result, Mr. Dulles of the United States, Mr. Bidault of France, Mr. Eden of the United Kingdom and Mr. Molotov of the Soviet Union issued a quadripartite communiqué containing the following passage:

"Convinced that the solution of international controversies necessary for the establishment of a lasting peace would be considerably aided by an agreement on disarmament, or at least on a substantial reduction of armaments,

"Will subsequently hold an exchange of views to promote a successful solution of this problem as provided for in paragraph 6 of the United Nations resolution of 28 November 1953."

132. A reading of paragraph 6 of resolution 715 (VIII) reveals that the Soviet Union openly agreed to the following: first, that the membership of the Disarmament Sub-Committee should be confined to the Powers "principally involved", and second, that the work of the Sub-Committee should be done "in private".

133. A reading of paragraph 6 proves beyond all doubt that the Soviet Union expressly agreed that the negotiations on disarmament should be carried on in a small committee consisting of the Powers principally concerned—which, as we all know, meant the Soviet Union itself, the United States, the United Kingdom and France—and that the Sub-Committee's meetings should be held in private. There is therefore no moral or legal basis for the statements made by certain countries of the Soviet bloc which have been trying unjustly to make the Western Powers responsible for the membership of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee. The responsibility which the Soviet Union assumed in that connexion at the Berlin conference cannot be concealed, but is manifest to the whole world.

134. In contrast to the attitude which it adopted three years ago, the Soviet Union has submitted to us at this session, a draft resolution [A/L.230] designed to abolish the existing Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, in order to establish in its place a permanent disarmament commission consisting of the eighty-two States Members of the United Nations.

135. This draft resolution is in our view unacceptable, for the following reasons: first because, departing from the provisions of resolution 502(VI), it removes the new

disarmament commission from the authority of the Security Council, and secondly because it thereby ignores the provision in Article 26 of the Charter, under which the Security Council is required to be responsible for formulating plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

136. But we cannot refrain from remarking that paragraph 3 of the operative part of the Soviet draft resolution, although couched in different terms, goes some way towards an acceptance of the idea put forward by Mr. Padilla Nervo, the Foreign Minister of Mexico, for the establishment of a United Nations High Commissioner for Disarmament, an idea worthy of consideration by the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission.

137. For the reasons which I have stated, my delegation will vote against the Soviet draft resolution, which it regards as part of a ruse to spread confusion and to mislead world public opinion.

138. I say this because we cannot think otherwise in face of the evident inconsistency of the Soviet position as demonstrated on 15 November 1957 by Mr. Khrushchev, the supreme artificer of Soviet policy, when he stated in Moscow that the United States and the Soviet Union alone could settle the great problems of the world by means of a conference confined to those two countries. No one will dare deny that one of the foremost of those problems is that of the regulation of armaments and the cessation of the armaments race. But in essence the meaning of Mr. Khrushchev's declaration, which appeared in The New York Times on 16 November, is that the Soviet draft resolution suggesting the establishment of an eighty-two member disarmament commission is designed to achieve ends which we will refrain from describing, as they have nothing to do with the real convictions of the Soviet Union, which still believes that itself and the United States could alone reach fundamental agreements, without the other Western Powers, not to mention the other eighty States Members of the United Nations.

139. But who could give the United States any assurance that this was not just another Soviet trick to spread mistrust and resentment among the Western allies?

140. My delegation made it clear in the debate in the First Committee that it was not in favour of increasing the membership of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, but at the same time it stated that it would be in favour of continuing negotiations until a solution acceptable to all parties had been found.

141. A joint draft resolution sponsored by Canada, India, Japan, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add.1] has been submitted in a generous attempt at conciliation. This draft resolution would enlarge the Disarmament Commission by the addition of fourteen members, bringing the total up to twenty-five, and the revised text incorporates an amendment, submitted by the Latin American group, ensuring proportional representation for Latin America by the inclusion of Argentina, Brazil and Mexico among the new members of the Disarmament Commission. This formula deserves acceptance by the States principally involved, and, in consideration of its lofty conciliatory spirit, my delegation, which is sincerely concerned for the achievement of constructive results,

will vote for this draft resolution, in the hope that it will provide an opportunity for the conversations on disarmament to continue.

142. In my opinion, this draft resolution suffers from none of the disadvantages of the Soviet text, because the first paragraph of the preamble recalls the principles of resolution 502 (VI), thereby seeking to maintain the functions of the Security Council and adhere to the requirements of the Charter. But I repeat that the principal virtue of the joint draft resolution lies in the fact that it offers a formula for the continuation of negotiations between the great Powers of East and West. Mankind is entitled to hope that these conversations may lead to peaceful formulae for settlement whereby men, women and children throughout the world will be freed from the fear of physical destruction or spiritual enslavement.

143. It is inconceivable that, with all the extraordinary technological advances made in our age, science should not serve the cause of peace. If we are to fight successfully in the psychological war instituted by the enemies of Western Christian civilization, the destitution that afflicts large areas of the world must be speedily relieved by programmes of economic development which will exalt human dignity and the personal moral values.

144. But I must say that we do not believe that the Soviet Union's reluctance to participate in the work of a disarmament commission other than that which has been proposed either by itself or by the delegation of Albania will in any way change the course of world events. If we simply read Articles 13 and 26 of the Charter, we shall find that the Soviet Union has to honour the obligations which it assumed when it signed and ratified the Charter of the United Nations. As the Soviet Union is a permanent member of the Security Council, under Article 23, and as, under Article 26, it is a function of the Council to formulate plans for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments, it is obvious that the Soviet Union will have to go on discussing the disarmament problem in the Security Council and to comply with the resolutions of the Assembly. If it failed to do so, it would also be failing to fulfil its duties and obligations and would in consequence be contravening both the letter and spirit of the Charter.

145. By its attitude, the Soviet Union is vainly seeking to intensify the psychological war in order to weaken and break down the morale of the Western Powers, but in that it will never succeed because the free world cherishes human, religious, ideological and spiritual values which cannot be destroyed.

146. The PRESIDENT: May I respectfully remind Members that we are now listening to explanations of vote. The general debate has been concluded. This discussion will be accelerated if we bear in mind what we really are supposed to be doing.

147. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of the joint draft resolution [A/L.231/Rev.1 and Add. 1], because we believe that it will tend to facilitate negotiations between the countries primarily concerned, the objective that has guided us throughout our discussions on this item.

148. It is to our mind unlikely that a commission of all

States Members of the United Nations, as envisaged in the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.230] would stimulate such conversations.

149. I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the delegations of Canada and Japan, and also the delegations of India, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia, on their tireless efforts to devise a balanced and constructive formula, which now holds out some promise of success.

150. I should also like to express the Mexican delegation's appreciation to the various Latin American delegations which originally submitted the name of my country in an amendment [A/L.233] to the original draft of Canada and Japan [A/L.231]; furthermore, I should like to thank those delegations which later included the name of my country in their proposals.

151. In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's earnest hope that this new instrument will help towards the achievement of practical measures that will help to slow down the arms race.

152. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) (translated from French): In the course of the talks concerning the establishment of a new disarmament body which have been in progress since 4 November, we have been asked by those who have made such commendable efforts to bridge the gap between the opposing schools of thought whether Finland would be willing, if necessary, to serve on such a body. We replied that, while not wishing to put itself forward as a candidate, Finland would be guided in this matter by the constructive and conciliatory spirit which determines its attitude in regard to international problems in general.

153. As we said in the First Committee, we wish to support and, if possible, to facilitate all efforts towards reasonable and practical solutions in the matter of disarmament. In particular, we voiced the hope that the specialized disarmament bodies might be able to continue their work in a form acceptable to all the principal parties concerned. In this spirit we said, when we were consulted on the subject, that if, in the course of the conversations, it was found that Finland's participation would contribute to the success of the enterprise, we would give our consent in principle, although we wished to know the proposed membership before taking a final decision.

154. As we know, until this morning Finland's name did not appear in the lists submitted to the Assembly for its approval. My delegation was surprised today to read Finland's name in document A/L.236. As we did not participate in the talks which led to its submission, we regret that we cannot indicate our position on this matter.

155. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (translated from Spanish): I shall be extremely brief. My delegation feels that as it took a considerable part in the debate on disarmament, it should make its views known regarding the very important question of expanding the membership of the Disarmament Commission.

156. I must first express my disappointment at the fact that, after postponing the question a number of times, we have been unable to reach a solution.

157. Everybody knows the background of the item at present under discussion, and I shall therefore not go into it here. The fact is that there were no more than three possible ways of setting up the Disarmament

Commission. As the representative of the United Kingdom said so clearly, the success of disarmament depends chiefly on the will of the Powers not only directly concerned but also directly responsible, and that the means used by those Powers to reach agreement is incidental and secondary.

158. For all that, I believe the General Assembly to be quite right in making every effort to facilitate such an agreement; if the Soviet Union considered that the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee were obstacles to progress, then it was proper that those representing the views of the different sectors of the General Assembly should seek a solution that would as far as possible meet the desires of the Soviet Union.

159. There could be no question of going to the length of establishing a permanent eighty-two-member commission on disarmament, for such a body would serve no constructive purpose. Thus, there emerged first of all the idea of increasing the Disarmament Commission's membership by four or five, then by seven, later by ten and finally by fourteen. This figure was reached in an attempt to give representation to all sectors, with a fairly equitable distribution on a geographical basis. Thus we reached, with some satisfaction, the solution which has been proposed, but unfortunately we see that today it is not accepted by the Soviet Union, which insists on an eighty-two-member commission, and furthermore gives us to understand that even if the proposal were modified by the Albanian amendment [A/L. 236], adding seven more members to the twenty-five, the Soviet Union would not take part in the discussions, as it does not accept what it considers the inflexible terms of reference contained in resolution 1148 (XII).

160. At this stage of the debate there is nothing for

us to do but to carry out our duty. A fairly satisfactory formula has been devised with regard to the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission. Let us therefore vote as unanimously as we can in favour of this formula, for unanimity or a vast majority will be more eloquent than any speech in showing the Soviet Union how important it is that it should again collaborate in solving the problem of disarmament. This is our desire and the desire of the whole human race. Today all feel the urgent need to bend every effort to ensuring that the disarmament negotiations are renewed. This statement of mine is therefore an appeal to all delegations to support unanimously, or at least by an overwhelming majority, the draft resolution submitted by the six Powers, which was the result of entirely disinterested negotiations aimed solely at serving the interests of mankind.

161. The PRESIDENT: I call now upon the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to be heard in exercise of the right of reply.

162. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to reply briefly to the Peruvian representative, who said that the Soviet Union would refuse to take part in the work of the Commission even if it was enlarged by the addition of the seven States proposed by the Albanian delegation.

163. I should like to make it clear that the Soviet Union supports the Albanian amendment. If this amendment is adopted, the Soviet Union will vote for the six-Power draft resolution and will take part in the Commission's work. The Soviet Union considers, however, that resolution 1148 (XII), based on the draft resolution of the twenty-four Powers, cannot provide the basis for negotiations in this Commission.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.