



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Agenda item 8:</i> | |
| <i>Adoption of the agenda (continued)</i> | |
| <i>First report of the General Committee (con-</i> | |
| <i>cluded)</i> | 89 |
| <i>Second report of the General Committee. . .</i> | |

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

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (continued)

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/4214) (concluded)

SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/4222)

1. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. President, the debate on this item at this time early in the session gives me the opportunity of offering the felicitations of my delegation on your unanimous election to the high office you occupy. It would be preposterous for me to recount the qualities which fit you to be President of the General Assembly because there is hardly a representative in this Assembly who has not had personal experience of your kindness and courtesy and your great wisdom. The Assembly indeed is to be congratulated, as well as yourself, on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly.

2. My delegation placed the item on the provisional agenda on the question of the representation of China [A/4139]. I believe there have been some twenty-six or twenty-seven speakers engaging the attention of the Assembly for the last eight or nine hours on a question which has continually engaged the attention of the Assembly, I believe, at some ten succeeding sessions and, what is more, in the many debates of every one of its organs. While the question is old, the situation cannot be called old in that it is stagnant but still subsisting and compelling. The considerations which have moved some of the speakers to inquire why India has put down this item once again, and this year, stem from two points of view: one, the fact that it has been so many times brought forward and not been carried in the Assembly; and the other, the context of particular developments in recent times.

3. I come to this rostrum at a very late stage in this debate, not because of any hesitation on the part of my delegation to put forward its point of view; nor because we think it can be taken casually. Fortunately for us, our friends from Nepal put down an amendment [A/L.261] to the recommendation in the report of the General Committee [A/4214, para. 7], which is the form in which this matter comes here. That amendment, whatever may be its procedural

structure, in effect asks for the rejection of the recommendation of the General Committee. The presence of my delegation here at a late hour only serves to indicate, if anything, that we are anxious to place before the Assembly our position as fully as we can. The Government of India has never lacked candour as far as the Assembly is concerned. We have never refrained from putting forward our point of view, even if it were unpopular, as it often has been. We placed the item of the representation of China on the provisional agenda for the same reasons as we have done year after year or participated in it from 1949 onwards.

4. Before I go into the history of this question, I should like first of all to deal with the constitutional aspects of this matter, which concerns us as a Government and as a delegation, not only in regard to this item but to the general procedures of the competence of the Assembly and its organs. One of the speakers, in quite another context in the course of this debate, referred to the standards of the United Nations. We are concerned that the rules and the law of the United Nations should not be tortured, should not be contaminated, or in any way adversely affected by particular political considerations.

5. We raised this point, somewhat briefly at the thirteenth session [753rd meeting]. Under your presidency, Mr. President, once again an unhealthy precedent has unfortunately been followed. An item is proposed on the provisional agenda. The General Committee is strictly enjoined by the rules of procedure not to enter into political considerations. The only function the General Committee has in this context is either to accept or to reject an item. It may be argued that the first part of the draft resolution of the General Committee before us probably does it. The only thing that might be said against it is that it is unnecessary; that a contrary vote is sufficient, instead of having a draft resolution. But that is a matter of choice, with which we do not quarrel. However, the second part is not covered by the item at all, because the item simply says "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations". On that there is a draft resolution of a political character, which is strictly barred by rule 41 of the rules of procedure, which states:

"[The General Committee] shall assist the President in the general conduct of the work of the General Assembly which falls within the competence of the President. It shall not, however, decide any political question."

6. It may be said that this is not "deciding" a political question but is solely making a "recommendation", that it is merely a decision to recommend rather than making a political decision. Therefore, I submit—though I know it is not going to carry me any further—that the whole posture adopted by the General Committee in regard to this matter is *ultra vires* as regards the rules and the competence of the General

Committee. This Committee, which is also called a Steering Committee, is a business committee to deal with some of the problems of the Assembly beforehand in order that our work may be facilitated. Instead of that, like many other organs of the Assembly—and I shall not specify any—it tries to usurp the sovereign functions of this body, and I submit that no such committee, least of all a Steering Committee, is qualified to pronounce politically.

7. Having said that, I should now like to refer to the fact of our repetitive appearances on this rostrum on this subject. It has now become an annual subject but it is by no means a hardy annual in the sense that a hardy annual means that there is no flexibility about it and nothing has changed, that it is merely a kind of habit of ours to bring it up. That is not the position.

8. However, in this connexion, may I refer to the history of this matter, which directly leads to the reasons why we are here. When I say "the history of this matter", I do not intend to cover the events in chronological order or even the whole history of it. All I say is this. As soon as the present Government and régime of China established itself—and I believe that is what was expected—they applied to be recognized as representing the Chinese people. That was about ten years ago. They came here then before the Security Council, and at no time was their application rejected out of hand. Committees were appointed and, what is more, as a result of this, the Assembly deliberated and came to a decision at the fifth session to the effect that, where there is a dispute as to who should represent a people and two parties are claiming the same seat, the matter must be discussed in the Assembly [resolution 396 (V)]. However, at no time has any decision been reached on this matter.

9. The second aspect of it is that year after year—for the last two years anyway—a draft resolution has come here from the General Committee, not from a delegation but from the General Committee, asking that there should be no consideration of this matter for the duration of the session. I submit that several errors are being committed in this procedure. First of all, we are putting the Credentials Committee out of court. That is to say, by a resolution we decide that the credentials of a delegation should not be looked into. I think that is not only *ultra vires*; it is an affront to the dignity of this Assembly. No one has the right to say beforehand who shall represent any of us. We shall not normally be removed from here, because our credentials are good, but, legally speaking, we are not fully here until the Credentials Committee has pronounced upon us.

10. Secondly, by this draft resolution recommending postponement, those who are the initial authors and the General Committee itself do not simply say that the matter will be postponed but they go into the merits and argue more particularly that the position taken by those who support inscription is "ill-timed". That is a matter of discretion. There have, however, been no final decisions, as far as the Assembly is concerned, on this question.

11. Reference has been made to recent incidents—and I do not want to mince my words—these recent incidents refer to the rebellion in Tibet and the handling of it by the Chinese Government in ways that have shaken public opinion in our country and has also stirred people elsewhere. This is not the occasion either to go into the constitutionality or otherwise of

various issues. I want to say that there is considerable public feeling in our land on this matter and therefore we are not speaking without emotion or on strictly legalistic grounds.

12. The second is about our frontiers. Various speakers have spoken differently as to the invasion of India, or the incursions into India or aggression on our frontiers. We certainly appreciate the concern of people about the integrity of India. I wish this concern had been expressed when other violations took place, when year after year we went before the Security Council and sat there to witness ten out of the eleven members supporting aggression. Therefore, it is not merely the concern about aggression against India. But I shall put that on one side. Let us look at it this way: the Government of India cannot accept the position that delegations here, all eighty-one of you, barring us, are more concerned about the integrity of our soil than we are. I think it is doing us a dis-favour in suggesting that anyone else could be more concerned about the integrity of our country than we are. So far as the Chinese are concerned, we have told them in plain words that, while we were prepared to discuss any question, however difficult it is, while we were prepared to make adjustments and compromises and while our policy remains one of continuing friendship and settling matters by negotiation, we shall not be intimidated, we shall not yield our territory, and what is more, we shall not permit unilateral action with regard to unsettled disputes. That is our position. Therefore, as far as China is concerned, we tell them that if there are disputes, "we shall sit down and talk like civilized people and friendly Governments and that these matters are not to be settled unilaterally".

13. Thus, on the one hand the Government of India is firm in the policy of the maintenance of its sovereignty. What is more, the 2,000 miles of our frontier—it is our frontier, and we should be expected to know about it as much as anyone else. What is more, if there is a strong country on the other side and it represents a menace or a matter of concern for us, I think the Government of India must be regarded as having a sufficient sense of maturity and political judgement to know its consequences. At the same time, we are sufficiently mature and sufficiently devoted to the purposes of the Charter and the general orientation of the United Nations not to create a war psychosis. We have no desire to exaggerate events any more than to minimize them. As my Prime Minister said, it is not a question of two mountain tops or some grazing rights or anything of that kind. When a people feel that their country has been treaded upon, there is an emotional uprising among the people, and therefore we shall resist. At the same time, we shall not permit either in our country or elsewhere the situation to be used to become one in which the peace of the world is affected. The reason, therefore, for our bringing this item here is obviously not our self interest.

14. We are asked, "In view of your disillusionment about China, then why do you bring this item here?" There again, I submit, that it is not, shall I say, a very generous way of looking at us. We do not bring the question of China here because China is our neighbour or because China is on friendly and diplomatic relations with us. We asked countries like the United States, for example, or various other countries who have hostile feelings towards China, if you like,

quite legitimately perhaps, who are unfriendly to her, who do not regard China as trustworthy, who regard China as having committed aggression, we have asked them in the past to let China take her place here. We have said "This may be so, we do not want to change your opinion of China; but you must allow her to come here." Now, if it is sauce for them, it must be equally sauce for us!

15. We could not come here this year and say, "We have had a bit of trouble on our frontier, so the whole basis of our approach to the United Nations on a particular question has changed." If that is the attitude Governments take in this Assembly, then this Assembly cannot hope to make progress. Therefore, I think, if anything, we deserve a degree of appreciation from a large number of people, that even when we ourselves have been hurt, we were willing to bring up this question of principle in the interests of the United Nations and in the interests of world peace and co-operation. That, Mr. President, is our position.

16. If we thought that we should not bring up this matter here this year, it could be only because there was a change in our foreign policy, in its fundamentals, or because we think principles are so elastic that they can be forgotten when one's own interests are concerned. That is not the position so far as we are concerned.

17. This matter being a serious one and with consequences not only in the debates here but everywhere else, I should like to present as fully as possible the point of view of my Government. It is not, as someone has suggested, that we have put down this item on the provisional agenda before the troubles which there have been, occurred, and that if we had had any apprehension that they would occur, we would not have done so. Actually, this item was submitted to this Assembly in June, long after the troubles in Tibet took place—these recent ones, not only the older ones of previous years. After deliberate and due consideration we put down this item. So, there is no question of our having made a mistake in this matter on this score. Our explanatory memorandum which is document A/4139, dated 14 July—not long ago—makes it very clear. I quote:

"It is necessary to consider the question of the representation of China in the United Nations not only from the point of view of the legitimate rights of the Chinese people and their Government, but also from the point of view of the effectiveness of the organization itself. There is no doubt that only the People's Government of China is in a position to comply with those decisions and recommendations of the United Nations which affect the Chinese specifically or which are addressed to all Member States."

18. The fact that China has behaved towards us ungenerously, unfairly, if you like, the fact that its action, as we see it, has not been to their benefit or to ours or to that of the world, should not alter our position. The Prime Minister of India when speaking on this matter, when he was specifically questioned in the Legislature, said:

"Our policy in regard to the entry of China into the United Nations remains as it was. It is not that it is based on certain facts by these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That

would mean that we have no firm policies, that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world."

A few days later he said:

"... we have earnestly striven to stand by these principles of our foreign policy and I do not think we have offended them ... we have tried to do that not because of some temporary reasons, not because these so-called five principles have been declared in some agreement ... but because we have felt that that is the only way to function in this world."

19. We have repeatedly come to this rostrum, we have repeatedly gone to conferences and proclaimed these principles as our basis and our view that it is in the world's interest that we and other countries should practise them. The Prime Minister said that

"... if these principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is willing to adopt them. Naturally, we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world; we cannot live in isolation. But a principle should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it."

20. That is to say, even violations by the very other party to the original formulation of the five principles, namely China, would not justify our going away from it without a great deal of consideration. And the Prime Minister added:

"... we hold by them and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do."

21. That is our position in regard to this matter, and therefore the Assembly should not be led into some wrong view of things, thinking they are acting in sympathy with us. We are the people who brought this here and we make no apologies for it.

"The basic reasons for our foreign policy"—said the Prime Minister—"were not based on merely being friendly to China or to some other country. It is not merely a matter of sentiment or relationship. We wanted to be friendly with other countries"—but our approach to it is basic. "These principles" we think "are right, and they do not become unright," as he says, "because somebody does not agree with it. I do not understand what the present situation which has developed, serious as it is, has got to do with putting our foreign policy in what is called a melting pot. So far as I am concerned"—says the Prime Minister—"and so far as our Government is concerned, our foreign policy is firm ... and the present Government will hold to non-alignment, because it is a matter of principle, not of opportunism or the convenience of the day."

22. I think it is necessary to declare on this rostrum that our misfortunes or whatever may happen one way or another will not induce our Government to be drawn into cold war attitudes or into war blocs. In maintaining our rights, our dignity and our self-respect, in not allowing ourselves to drift into wrong and hostile attitudes and in trying to help in removing or solving each problem as it arises, we may help a little. That is the line we propose to take. That is the utmost we can do in the circumstances, and in the creation of this atmosphere we have to play our part.

23. Then there is the general atmosphere that is sought to be created as though there is a major war developing on our frontiers. While I have had no intention of speaking about the territories of Bhutan or Sikkim, references were made on this rostrum about the invasion of these areas by hostile armies, by foreign elements and so on. Now you may say: Why do you go into this? I do not feel called upon to speak in the defence of Chinese policy and have no intention of doing so. But it is very much our concern that the world should know the extent of this matter both ways, large or small.

24. The Maharajah Kumar of Sikkim, who is one of the most active political personalities in that territory, spoke publicly and to the Press only a few days before I left India. There were no foreign elements who had entered the territory. There were no concentrations on that side and the press stories were incorrect.

25. About Bhutan, a telegram received today says:

"Prime Minister of Bhutan, Jigme Dorji has said (in Calcutta) there has been no intrusion into Bhutan territory by Chinese troops. Nor does he apprehend any. Dorji was speaking to newsmen."

26. I say this, not in order to minimize the nature of unfriendly actions that you and we have spoken about today and yesterday. We shall defend our territory, if and whenever it becomes necessary, to the best of our ability. But we shall also seek to solve the main problems in the usual way by negotiation. Negotiation does not mean that we shall negotiate on the basis of giving up what is our sovereign homeland but we are willing to discuss minor adjustments that are required in what is called the MacMahon Line.

27. Friendship with China is something that we regard as necessary for them and for us. The Prime Minister said on 10 September:

"... we were right in working for their friendship and, may I repeat and say, we shall continue to work for it. Any person who has the least responsibility for India's future cannot allow himself to be frightened and angered and behave in fright and anger. No country should do that, more especially in a crisis. ... we have to think of the future of these two great countries. This idea of settling things by this kind of compulsion and force or by threats and bullying is all wrong."

28. On 4 September, the Prime Minister said:

"I have always thought that it is important, even essential if you like, that these two countries of Asia, India and China, should have friendly and, as far as possible, co-operative relations. ... It would be a tragedy not only for India, and possibly for China, but for Asia and the world if we develop some kind of permanent hostility. ... May I say that, in spite of all that has happened and is happening today, that it (friendship of China and India) is still our objective, and we shall continue to work for it."

29. These are the observations made to the Indian Parliament, and therefore they are well considered political statements. We shall, therefore, on the one hand, not have a policy of appeasement, nor, on the other hand, shall we be the victim of war psychoses of any kind. Nor do we want to exaggerate matters.

30. But all this does not change the character of the situation so far as Chinese representation is con-

cerned. One may ask: What has happened? It is quite true that there have been certain happenings which increasingly change the position of the world. The main and ominous factor is the development of the world in the matter of atomic weapons. While China may or may not be relevant in this context immediately, it is well known that several Powers have the prospect of the explosion of these weapons in different parts of the world. It is also known that scientific advances have reached the position that most nations can make and use these weapons. Therefore, if there is to be disarmament and suspension or prohibition of nuclear weapons, that can be done only if the great nations and the small nations of the world are parties to it. My Government is not particularly concerned with going into the statistics of Chinese industrial or agricultural production or otherwise or the nature of the communes. For one thing, they are internal matters.

31. Secondly, I say with all respect that it is not the gigantic size of China or its production that makes us think it should be here. It is the fact of sovereignty; we have as much respect for the smallest of our members, Iceland, with a population of some 200,000 as for China with a population of some 650 million because they are countries and nations, large or small and for the peoples concerned they are their homelands and their nationhood. Therefore, we are not particularly anxious to reiterate the amount of steel they produce or the amount of food with regard to which they have increased production and so on. That, of course, is a matter of interest as is any matter of increase in general production of wealth in the world. In our neighbour we have an interest, but that is not the argument.

32. We are not saying that because China is big and mighty it is therefore dangerous to keep her out. What we are saying is this. If we are to have a general world settlement, if we are to settle the affairs of the world, we cannot have a great part of the world out of it. Here is a country which is now in diplomatic relations—not necessarily in friendly relations—with some thirty-four countries of the world, carrying on trade all around. It would be impossible to keep her out of the international context.

33. Now I ask: who would be the greater loser? China is certainly a loser. It would be idle to pretend that it is not because any country that cannot be here is a loser thereby. But the world is also the loser. It is possible for China to reap the rewards of relationships without having to conform to obligations. It is impossible to think of any scheme of disarmament, let alone atomic weapons, when a country reputed to have a standing army of 5 million people and probably another 5 or 10 million in reserve is outside the ambit of the discussions. I would say that it does not seem sound and reasonable, to put it very mildly. Therefore it is the United Nations, the world as a whole, that stand to lose by the exclusion of a country. I have said before that we cannot just wish away a people or a nation, great or small. Just because we shut our eyes the world does not become dark. We remain ignorant. Therefore, we have to recognize these facts as they stand.

34. While the voting in this Assembly may follow the traditional patterns, opinions seem to have changed. I do not like quoting statesmen of other countries except when absolutely necessary. It may

not always be fair. But even after the beginning of all these troubles we have statements by countries which in the past have voted against the discussion of this item or abstained from doing so, like, for example, our good friends the Canadians where two former foreign ministers have come out and said that this cannot go on for long; we must do something about it. I could give many, many instances which have already been quoted on this platform, all of which goes to show the increasing concern in this matter. The parties quoted are, however, also concerned about keeping to their own side in general world politics, so to say, and not let their side down. But to what extent can this go on? I think it was Mr. Pearson who said somewhere that we cannot carry this business for a long time. Only in February of this year, Mr. Pearson, a former President of the Assembly, said:

"... how long are we going to be able to support the United States position, because it is a United States position, that this question cannot even be talked about at the United Nations. ... How could Peking be asked to accept and carry out any such obligations, take part in control and inspection, which we rightly claim to be essential, and yet be considered as unrecognizable. It does, to say the least, present a dilemma."

35. The same applies to his successor, and I refer to these merely to show that there is considerable development of opinion in this way.

36. We have therefore brought this item here not at the present moment so far as procedures are concerned but to discuss the merits of this matter. Mr. President, you have been sitting here for so many hours in succession listening to these debates. Does it sound to you that this matter is unimportant? If it is unimportant, would twenty-eight people come to speak and speak at great length on it, going into the merits of the matter? So when this subject is mentioned and it is said that the matter should be discussed, people feel concerned. If it is a matter of obvious and considerable concern in the Assembly, then is it not right that the matter should be discussed in full rather than piecemeal?

37. What happens? Each time we say, "Let this item be put on the agenda", and the President rules that procedurally we may not discuss the merits of the question. Some accept and observe the injunction. Some representatives do, however, discuss the merits of the question and therefore what we get is a very incomplete discussion.

38. We have not at the present moment suggested either that anybody should be seated or that anybody should be removed from the Assembly. We have asked for an examination of this question. We have asked for a going away from the attitude that just because we prefer to ignore it, therefore it ceases to exist.

39. Then we are told that there have been sins committed by the concerned party which makes it wrong and impossible for us to consider this matter. I have no doubt that sins have been committed. There are many things in China of which we disapprove. There have been actions in regard to us which we have protested and with regard to which we propose to remain very firm, and we shall act appropriately and to the best of our ability. But I would suggest in the interests of facts that there are other countries, other

States, who also have deviated, including ours, from one or the other of the principles of the Charter in letter or spirit. There is not one of the eighty-two nations here who could stand up and say that they have not violated, consciously or unconsciously, any of the provisions of the Charter or against whom any allegation of such evasion could not be laid by one or another Member State if they so wished.

40. When the United Nations was founded, it was laid down, even before the conclusion of the war, that those who were on the other side fighting the Allies should also come into the United Nations at the proper time. So the founders thought in terms not merely of having some nice people here, but of having the world as it is. It was the basic idea of the United Nations that even those who were engaged in the overthrow of liberty in the Second World War should, after the conclusion of peace, the termination of hostilities and the passage of time, join the comity of nations in order that the world may develop towards a more peaceful and whole family.

41. Therefore, how can we justify keeping someone else out? It is said that, while Governments may change or die, States do not die. China is a primary Member of the United Nations. Some of the signatories of the Charter are now members of the Peking Government, just as some others are members of the Authority in Formosa. Secondly, if there are resolutions condemning aggression in regard to China, there are resolutions also condemning other people, very firm ones, and repeated not on some occasion when there was an excitement but deliberately thought out, that it was part of the constitution that certain countries should not be admitted. We rescinded that in effect and we disregarded those resolutions. My country was in the forefront in trying to enlarge the membership of this Organization. Even now there are some countries standing outside, like Outer Mongolia or the countries that have been divided through no fault of their own, who are not here.

42. What is more, this is an Organization, with its vast economic, social and other national and international functions, from which a large tract of territory like the Chinese continent cannot be excluded. Now under our decisions, not even the specialized agencies can touch China.

43. Therefore, really, apart from all political theory and legal subtleties, we are excluding the 650 million people of China from such healthy influence or from such impacts that this Organization can make. It has been said of us here that what we are asking the General Assembly to do is something very bad. We are told by a distinguished delegate:

"And I must add in all candour that the representative of India, whose Government admits many of the indisputable facts of Red China's record, when he insists on this item, is in effect insisting that the United Nations modify its standards in order to accommodate the power of lawlessness." [800th meeting, para. 130.]

44. I hope that this was not so meant. However, I must plead not guilty. We do not want the United Nations to accommodate the power of lawlessness. We ask it to conform to law, and the law should be equal for everybody.

45. Reference has been made to another matter also. I do not want to refer to this matter because it may

come up in the United Nations in some other form. But the Government of India happens to be the Chairman of the International Commission for the Supervision and Control in Indo-China. It has been stated here that there are incursions into Indo-China by China and therefore there is a further element of Chinese aggression taking place. This subject is not under discussion and I have no wish to go into it in detail. But I think we would be failing in our duty, both to ourselves and to our two colleagues on the International Commission, if we did not point out that there is no evidence whatsoever, in the reports of the Commission, or in such knowledge as we have, that there has been penetration of this character. I do not say it will not take place in the future, but there is no evidence of this kind and we think that if the international authority constituted under the Geneva Agreement to which Laos is a party had been maintained in that part of the world, perhaps conditions might have been different. Anyway, I have no desire to go into the details of it. All I am saying is that we should not create a mentality which would allow an impression to get around that there is a large-scale war brewing in South-East Asia, that Bhutan is invaded, Sikkim is invaded, Laos is invaded and somebody else is invaded. I say, with equal candour, that the Chinese Government has behaved in a way, so far as we are concerned, that is both unwise and unfair and of no profit to themselves, to us or to the world.

46. What is more, so far as our territory is concerned, we are as much concerned about it as anybody else at least, and no one can say that we shall be oblivious to whatever dangers there are. But from there to go on and say that in the foothills of the Himalayas a large war is waging in inaccessible regions, is fantastic. I have some responsibilities in this matter. It is not so much for the Assembly, but for all those who desire to know, that I say that we shall not permit unilateral action so far as we are concerned. We may be a weaker country, we may be economically backward, we have our own ideological approach, but we certainly have sufficient sense of our own homeland to protect it whatever may be the sacrifices. I do not wish to express myself in stronger terms or in bitterness. We believe that, like any case of difficult situations, this is a trying time for us. Instead of this being the occasion where we are inviting the United Nations to adopt a lawless attitude, as alleged, I submit that if we had, on this occasion when the first difficulty hits us, departed from what we have been advocating from this rostrum year after year, we would have not deserved from the Members of the United Nations either their consideration or their respect nor could we feel that we had acted with a sense of integrity or self-respect.

47. Since we have put down this item, it is not necessary for me to say that I support the amendment moved by the distinguished representative of Nepal. I hope the Assembly will accept the amendment as proposed by the representative of Nepal, reject the recommendation of the General Committee and agree to the request of India for this item to be placed on the agenda. Then everybody will have an opportunity to discuss this problem.

48. I say quite frankly that those who will vote for the placing of this item on the agenda may be against any change in the present position. That, however, is a different matter. All that we are saying is that

we should not adopt this ostrich attitude. I am not saying that our item has no political implication. It certainly has. It is not a mere procedural problem. But once a discussion takes place, then we are on the merits of the question. This great body, this world Assembly, cannot just afford to ignore the reality of the existence of a problem which no one has denied is a matter of concern to it and to the world or is outside the Assembly's competence. We cannot ignore the realities either of the poverty or the richness of China, or its army of five or ten million, or its great scientific advance, or, what is more, the fact that it particularly lies in that part of the world where stability can only be maintained by co-operation of the great and small countries in that area.

49. The last few years have shown that whenever a problem of some importance, as some of the representatives have said, has arisen, then another forum and another universe of discourse is to be found somewhere and other platforms are to be created. The United Nations will be reduced to a position that whenever any important matter comes up, it must be discussed somewhere else. I am sure that this is not your desire and therefore I commend the admission of this item to the Assembly.

50. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If no other representative wishes to speak, I shall invite the Assembly to vote on the two amendments proposed by Nepal [A/L.261] and then on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of the General Committee's first report [A/4214]. The vote will be taken by roll-call, since there has been a request to that effect.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the first Nepalese amendment.

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

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden.

Against: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Austria, Cuba, Iceland, Israel, Libya, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia.

The first amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 30, with 11 abstentions.

51. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote by roll-call on the second Nepalese amendment.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Iraq, Ireland, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia.

Against: Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras.

Abstaining: Israel, Libya, Mexico, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Austria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Iceland.

The second amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 29, with 11 abstentions.

52. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee, which is contained in paragraph 7 of its first report [A/4214]. I put to the vote paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran.

Against: Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland.

Abstaining: Libya, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Venezuela, Austria, Cuba, Iceland, Israel.

Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to 30, with 11 abstentions.

53. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote paragraph 2 of the General Committee's draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain.

Against: Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sudan.

Abstaining: Tunisia, Austria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Iceland, Israel, Libya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia.

Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 29, with 10 abstentions.

54. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I shall now put to the vote the whole of the draft resolution proposed by the General Committee. A request has been made for a roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Against: Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Iceland, Israel, Libya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Austria, Cuba.

The draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 29, with 9 abstentions.

55. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I shall now invite statements from those representatives who have asked to explain their votes. I call upon the representative of Mexico.

56. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The vote or, more precisely, the votes cast by the Mexican delegation on the item with which we have just dealt were identical with those which we cast last year on the same item. It would therefore be redundant and superfluous to explain here the reasons underlying those votes, since they are the

same as those put forward by the representatives of Mexico last year and set down in the records of the 118th meeting of the General Committee of the General Assembly, held on 19 September 1958, and of the 755th plenary meeting, held on 23 September 1958.

57. It appeared to us again this year, as in the past, that it would be neither opportune nor constructive to discuss the item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations". I should, however, like to emphasize that there has been no change in our position regarding the procedure used this year, for the third time, in disposing of the item in question.

58. It is still our firm opinion that the powers of the General Committee are limited by rule 40 of the rules of procedure to recommending one of three things to the Assembly in respect of items proposed: the inclusion of the item in the agenda; its non-inclusion; or its postponement by means of its inclusion in the provisional agenda of a future session.

59. We are still convinced, moreover, that the adoption by the General Committee of resolutions such as that appearing in paragraph 7 of its report involves, as we have repeatedly pointed out in the past, a serious overstepping of its powers, and that the Committee can rightly be reproached with having exceeded its authority and acted *ultra vires*. We hope that the serious concern felt by the Mexican delegation will not continue to be disregarded; it is shared by many other delegations, and seems to us quite legitimate.

60. Mr. ARCAYA (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain the reason for its vote on the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee.

61. The draft resolution, which was finally put to the vote in parts, contains two points. The first involves a permanent question of principle, and is related to the attitude which should be adopted with regard to a possible substantive debate on the representation of China in the United Nations; the second deals with a proposal of a circumstantial nature, on whether or not it should be at this session that the General Assembly should take a final decision as to which Government ought, legitimately, to represent China in the United Nations.

62. Venezuela's position in the vote just taken was designed to provide the following clarification: in connexion with the first part of the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee, which proposes that the request of India for the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations" should be rejected, my delegation, despite the high authority of the General Assembly organ which made this recommendation, regrets that it decidedly could not vote in its favour. The tradition of free debate is an integral part of democratic Venezuela's way of life. Discussion throws light on a question and prepares the way for the greatest possible measure of understanding. We feel that the world Organization can lose nothing and, on the contrary, might be strengthened by an enlightening exchange of opinions. What is at issue, moreover, is the representation of a State on which the Charter confers very special privileges and responsibilities: a permanent member

of the Security Council and, as such, a State whose concurring vote is essential for the adoption by that organ of substantive decisions, which may profoundly affect the life of the United Nations and perhaps the peace of the world. My country cannot oppose the holding, in this world forum, of the debate proposed by India; and it has therefore abstained from voting in favour of the recommendation for its rejection made by the General Committee. In this way it records its view that this question will have to be considered by the General Assembly in due time.

63. The second part of the draft resolution contains a recommendation to the effect that there should be no consideration, at the Assembly's present session, of any proposal to take a decision on the substance of the matter. My delegation studied this proposal of the General Committee most carefully, in the light of the peculiar circumstances at present prevailing in the international field, of the strong statements which have been made, and of the vital requirement that any decision should be taken by a large majority, so that our world Organization may emerge permanently strengthened.

64. We consider that the proposal involves only a procedural decision, dictated by an objective appraisal of present political circumstances. The signs of a possible rapprochement between the great Powers, which have become more apparent with the interchange of visits between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States of America, lead us to believe that many problems resulting from existing tensions may be satisfactorily resolved in the immediate future. It would not seem desirable at this time to press for a decision on the delicate problem of China's representation in the United Nations. If a decision were to be adopted at the present juncture, the final result might jeopardize the future of the United Nations, because it might conflict with the universal character of the Organization and the full representation of all nations within it, or because a decision might be adopted by so small a majority that instead of strengthening the United Nations it might well serve only to weaken it.

65. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have now concluded consideration of the question of the representation of China, which is dealt with in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the report. I would call the Assembly's attention to paragraph 9, which requires no decision on its part.

66. Paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report refer to the following matters: the report of the Disarmament Commission, the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara, and the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. The General Committee adopted a proposal by Brazil to the effect that these four points be placed under the single heading of disarmament, it being understood that such a classification would in no way hinder or obstruct the freedom of the First Committee as to the manner in which this problem should be discussed and resolved. Is there any objection?

67. Mr. KING (Liberia): At the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, I wish to express my personal congratulations to you—although the leader of my delegation will do so at a later date—on your election as

President of this Assembly. We are certain that your wisdom and statesmanship will make the fourteenth session a memorable one.

68. During the consideration of the Moroccan item entitled "Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara" in the General Committee, most Member States indicated that the substance of the item merited consideration by the General Assembly. It was felt by these countries that the Moroccan item should be inscribed on the agenda under a separate and distinct heading.

69. The Secretary-General in his memorandum "Adoption of the agenda and allocation of items" of 11 September 1959 [A/BUR/151] observes that item 59 on the provisional agenda and items 2 and 5 on the supplementary list, dealing with matters relating to the general question of disarmament, might be recommended by the General Committee for inclusion on the agenda as sub-headings under the general heading of "Question of Disarmament", which has been proposed as an additional item in document A/4209.

70. Some Member States supported the idea of sub-headings. The reasons advanced by the proponents of this view, as we understand them, revolved mainly around the questions of "saving time", "the logic of the case", and "methodical procedure".

71. The representatives of Morocco and India have stated clearly that they would desire their respective items to be discussed separately. My delegation strongly supports the stand taken by these two delegations. These two items, in our view, do stand apart from the general question of disarmament. They relate to specific and immediate issues, particularly if taken in the context of present international tensions. There is urgent need to try to persuade France, through the pressure of world opinion, not to conduct nuclear tests in the Sahara. The Sahara is not "no man's land", and no Power has the right to contaminate this area.

72. It is indeed encouraging to my delegation that the representative of the United Kingdom stated in the General Committee [122nd meeting] that the grouping of items under one heading should in no way circumscribe the consideration of each item on its merits. We are of the opinion, however, that, while under normal circumstances questions which deal with the general substance of nuclear tests are all related to disarmament, in this instance the Moroccan item warrants immediate consideration by this Assembly.

73. Africa would be directly affected were these tests to take place. This is not a procedural question nor is it a political one. This is clearly a question of life and death—the life and death of millions of Africans. Scientists tell us that every bit of radioactivity added to an already polluted atmosphere endangers all of mankind. At this time of the year the wind in our part of the world blows towards the south, towards Africa. These tests, therefore, will submit Africa to the immediate effects of fall-out.

74. In our statement in the General Committee [122nd meeting] we pointed to the fears and apprehensions with which we in Africa view these tests. We drew attention to the known and unknown consequences of nuclear tests. Not even in the most advanced countries, countries with scientific, medical and industrial know-how, has any method been found to control the effects of fall-out, as far as we are aware. We do not

here want to present detailed data showing the terrible aftermaths resulting from atomic tests. Suffice it to say that, according to the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation,^{1/} the hazard of explosions will affect not only our lives but the lives of generations to come. It affects the ocean and edible fish, it contaminates our milk and crops, it poisons the air we breathe.

75. The air, the ocean and the elements are still the common property of mankind. Has any nation the right to expose the African continent, then, to the worst by-products of the atomic age?

76. Those leading Powers which conducted tests in the past have felt a potential danger; they have carried out their tests as a defensive measure. We can understand this, even though we may feel they were unjustified. But these reasons do not seem to exist in the case of France. I dare say there is not a single member of NATO who believes that any potential danger to France from nuclear attack is imminent.

77. The world breathed easier when the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union agreed to stop their rounds of tests at least for the time being. Can we then allow anything at this time to upset this already precarious agreement?

78. Some have suggested that France's sole aim in wanting to conduct test explosions in the Sahara is "status-seeking" or an attempt to "regain her grandeur". If this is so and if France must conduct these tests, we wonder why the tests are to be conducted in Africa. Why should the peoples of Africa be exposed to the incalculable risks and grave dangers which are the inevitable outcome of such tests, for the restoration and glory of France?

79. In a most friendly and courteous note to the Government of France my Government protested these tests and expressed its justifiable fears for the safety of the lives not only of our citizens but of millions of other people in Africa. Similar notes were sent to the French Government by the other nine independent African States. The Prime Ministers of both Nigeria and Sierra Leone, respectively, have joined in these solemn protests. Some members of the French community have also protested. From all parts of Africa we are receiving petitions and pleas asking us to do everything in our power to bring this matter to the attention of the General Assembly.

80. France has apparently turned a deaf ear to these protests. France insists that the explosions will be carried out under conditions and in an area which they, the French, consider safe for Africans. They relate their tests to the ones that have already been carried out by other Powers. But France fails to point out that, whereas the other tests have been conducted recently on home territory, as in the case of the United States in Nevada and by the Soviet Union in the remotest parts of its own vast territory, the French plan to conduct their tests not on French soil but on African soil.

81. Liberia has not only followed with avid interest the question of disarmament since 1922, but she has made it a part of her national foreign policy to support the total banning of all nuclear tests. My Government hopes that under proper supervision some agree-

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 17 (A/3838).

ment among the heavily armed nations of the world for a reduction of, and parity in, armaments will be reached.

82. The report of the Disarmament Commission which met at Headquarters during the early part of this month appears on our agenda [A/4209]. From this report it might appear that the general question of disarmament might be postponed pending the outcome of the Geneva talks on disarmament. Even though there is a new and urgent item—the USSR proposal [A/4218]—on the agenda and even awaiting the outcome of the Geneva talks, the immediate urgency—I repeat, the immediate urgency—of the Moroccan item will not be met.

83. One of the representatives, during his intervention in the General Committee, stated that more time had been devoted to this issue "than its intrinsic value warrants". How soon are we mortals to forget the past and sometimes even the immediate present? We recall that the question of "consuming time" was not relevant when the General Assembly discussed the questions of Formosa, Korea and Hungary. Must a different yardstick continue to be employed here? Does not the Moroccan item, which concerns the testing of nuclear weapons in Africa, warrant the immediate attention of the General Assembly? Can there be any doubt about the urgency and importance of this item? How long must vital problems affecting Africa be relegated to a minor place or status in the United Nations?

84. We feel confident that this Assembly will rise to its stature and give immediate attention and prominence to the Moroccan item. In view of the aforementioned, my delegation is co-sponsoring together with Morocco and India a draft resolution, which has by now been tabled [A/L.262], asking that the two items 66 (c) and 66 (d) be inscribed on the agenda as separate items.

85. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before calling upon the next speaker, I should like to point out here that, as the question at issue is the inclusion of items on the agenda, we should so far as possible avoid discussing the substance of these problems, because otherwise we should be taking the place of the First Committee, to which these items will be assigned. I hope that representatives will bear this recommendation in mind.

86. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): May I take the opportunity, Mr. President, as I address the General Assembly for the first time, of offering you on behalf of myself and my delegation our warmest congratulations on your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its fourteenth session. Your election is not only a token of the great esteem in which you are held, not only a well-earned reward for the valuable services you have rendered to the United Nations, but also a clear expression of the wish of all delegations, at the beginning of an extremely important session, to entrust the presidency of the Assembly to a member who possesses outstanding abilities as a diplomat and whose high intellectual and moral powers provide a firm foundation for the United Nations and offer the surest pledge of its longevity.

87. Since the year when my country was first admitted to membership of the United Nations, it has always stated very clearly its attitude to disarmament

and nuclear weapon tests. This attitude signifies unequivocal condemnation of any policy which might lead to an armaments race, and thus increase international tension. We have likewise condemned nuclear tests, not only on political grounds, connected with international stability and understanding, but also for the sake of the safety of mankind, which is being exposed to ever more imminent danger by the numerous tests which are being carried out.

88. In recent times, efforts made by the United Nations, supported by some of the great Powers, had contributed to the establishment of a more peaceful atmosphere, giving rise to genuine optimism among the peoples of all continents. The United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Soviet Union had each announced its intention to suspend nuclear tests at least for a trial period. But just when there seemed to be some hope of the re-establishment of international peace and stability, France announced its intention to hold nuclear tests at the risk of making certain Powers, as they themselves have stated, reconsider their decision to suspend their own tests.

89. As a Member of the United Nations, anxious to seize any opportunity of reducing tension, Morocco felt bound to request the inclusion of this question on the agenda of the General Assembly's present session. We are glad that this request has been agreed to, and we regard inclusion of the item on the agenda as the first justification of our anxiety. My delegation cannot, on the other hand, accept the General Committee's recommendation that this specific question be considered jointly with other questions, which perhaps fall within the same context but are different in character. Morocco's request for inclusion of this item on the agenda does not relate solely to the general problem of disarmament and resultant international tension; it is not intended merely to bring into prominence the disastrous consequences of nuclear tests.

90. The Assembly has been discussing these matters for several years, and it may have to go on discussing them for a long time to come. The Moroccan request, on the other hand, is based on specific aspects of the problem; it calls attention to an imminent danger in a particular region, which constitutes a definite threat to all the peace-loving peoples of the African continent. Our country, of course, lies immediately next to the area where France intends to carry out these tests, and the anxiety felt by our people has now assumed the proportions of a panic. The peoples of the Moroccan Sahara have begun a long and weary trek from their homes, which has presented my Government with serious social, economic and humanitarian problems; and following a statement by the Minister of the Interior to the cabinet, His Majesty's Government decided, in view of the inadequacy and inefficacy of all its appeals to the French Government, to bring the matter to the attention of the United Nations.

91. The question is so important that, when the date of the test is fixed, there is likely to be a crisis in the relations between France and Morocco, and between France and the other African States, nearly all of which condemn nuclear tests. Our request is based on the idea that, if the question is considered here with all the attention it deserves, such a situation will be prevented from arising. For these reasons, my delegation expresses the hope that the question will be considered separately and by the General Assembly.

92. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): The Ghana delegation is making this brief intervention in this debate for the sole purpose of making an appeal. We appeal to all the representatives to adopt the draft resolution proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco. It is a very innocuous resolution. It merely seeks to re-number agenda items 66 (c) and 66 (d) as 67 and 68 and, really, there can be no quarrel with this proposal.

93. The question of disarmament is one which every Member of the United Nations regards as of the greatest importance, and my Government shares the concern of many other Governments that progress toward world disarmament has been so tragically slow. We sincerely hope that the great Powers, on whom the greatest responsibility for disarmament rests, will be conscious of their duties and will strive to achieve the conditions under which disarmament will be possible.

94. However, while we can talk about disarmament in general terms and express hopes for the future, there are certain issues which, although having a bearing on disarmament, are nevertheless distinct and require immediate attention. Such an issue is the much vaunted French nuclear tests in the Sahara which has necessitated the item proposed by Morocco. The testing of nuclear devices in the Sahara will bring into immediate danger the populations of many countries—including my own—which have the misfortune to be near the area in which France wishes to give another expression to its grandeur. Some of these countries are non-self-governing like Sierra Leone and Nigeria and therefore cannot speak for themselves. Their only champion can be the United Nations, and we cannot treat their fears and anxieties in a cursory manner.

95. My Government cannot consider this question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara merely as one of disarmament; it is rather a question of bringing into imminent danger populations who have nothing to do with the grandeur of France or the objectives of the nuclear Powers. That is why my country deeply regrets that the General Committee recommended that this item 65 should be discussed as a sub-item of the general question of disarmament. What in effect the General Committee has tried to do is to bury this urgent question, which is of such vital importance to those of us who live in Africa, in the complicated maze of the disarmament debate. We all know how interminable and fruitless discussions of the question of disarmament have been in the United Nations owing to the rigid positions which have invariably been taken by certain delegations. We in Africa consider the impending French nuclear tests in the Sahara as a specific and urgent problem which cannot be treated in abstract terms. My delegation cannot, therefore, accept the recommendation of the General Committee on the merger of this particular item under the question of disarmament. In concert with all countries who have consideration for the fate of Africans also, my delegation calls on the General Assembly to reject the recommendation of the General Committee to include the question of French Saharan tests under the portmanteau item of disarmament.

96. We feel very strongly that a deliberate attempt is being made in certain quarters to confuse and frustrate a proper discussion of the item submitted by Morocco. Once again I would appeal to the Assembly to reject the General Committee's recommendation and to reinstate item 65 as a separate item on the

agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly.

97. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before the debate goes any further, I should like to establish the connexion between the proposal of India, Liberia and Morocco and the General Committee's report. This proposal implies an amendment to item 66 as given in the report, because it provides that item 66 (c) (Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara) and item 66 (d) (Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests) should be separate items bearing the numbers 67 and 68. I therefore ask representatives to consider document A/L.262 in relation to item 66 contained in the General Committee document.

98. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (United Arab Republic): I shall limit myself of course to the remarks necessitated by the Indian, Liberian and Moroccan draft resolution before us concerning the report of the General Committee. But in order to do so, we deem it necessary to put before the Assembly all the facts that can be taken into consideration with a view to taking a decision on this matter.

99. The question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara is a question which has a history behind it that needs to be recalled now. Indeed, it has been the subject of discussions and a decision at the Conference of Independent African States held in Monrovia in August. It has also been the subject of discussion and a decision by the Arab States meeting at the Council of the League of Arab States at Casablanca early this month. Furthermore, it has been the object of wide international exchanges of view. The net result of these discussions and exchanges was such that it called upon the Moroccan Government to ask for the inscription on the agenda of this Assembly of a special, separate and distinct item. The Moroccan Government has duly done so and has asked for the inscription of this item in full knowledge of the fact that other items related to disarmament would be coming before this Assembly, namely, the report of the Disarmament Commission, the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Since then another item has been introduced in the agenda this morning by the Soviet delegation.

100. There are special reasons which militate in favour of keeping the Moroccan item distinct from other questions of disarmament. First and foremost is the urgency which the question of the French tests in the Sahara calls for. France has intimated its desire to go into the business of atomic explosions, grim as that business of destruction is, in some haste so as to be able to undertake such tests before the international situation would make their happening more difficult than that happening is at the present time. But instead of utilizing French territory for such a purpose, the French Government has chosen to use territory which is not French and to undertake this explosion at the proximity of countries which would necessarily be affected by such tests.

101. Therefore, the action of France is one which is condemned and opposed by the peoples concerned in Africa, and the question is not merely a question of undertaking a test on one's territory but has this peculiar nature and is at the same time a matter for urgent consideration in view of the fact that France

is in a hurry to do so. A decision by the United Nations which may hinder France is therefore an urgent and timely one. A discussion of the item that Morocco has presented is therefore a discussion which should be undertaken separately and as soon as possible.

102. The French Government has chosen a time to undertake such tests when other Governments, like those of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries concerned, are deeply interested in seeing these tests stopped once for all. There is possibly in the French thinking, as was said a moment ago, an effort to try to regain the French grandeur by atomic bombs. In our view, that grandeur does not need to be adorned by atomic fireworks. That grandeur resides in culture, civilization and art. Atomic bombs do not belong in culture; nor are atomic explosions fit to be attributes of true civilization. For that matter, the French Government might be called upon by the Assembly to reconsider its position on this matter.

103. The action of the General Committee tended towards grouping all the items which the General Committee considered relating to disarmament into one item with subdivisions. The object of this was to facilitate discussion and save time. In fact, what is being facilitated is the tangible loss of the identity of each one of those items to the extent which the grouping necessarily entails. By the grouping of these various items together with the report of the Disarmament Commission, they definitely lose much of their urgency, particularly the Moroccan item. We all know that the problem of disarmament is so complex that discussions about disarmament might be prolonged beyond measure and produce a great delay in the discussion and decision concerning the question of the French tests of atomic bombs in the Sahara. Indeed, if these items were to be grouped together, they would have to proceed at the pace at which the disarmament problem generally proceeds. That pace at present is not satisfactorily swift.

104. In view of the fact that the Moroccan item is an urgent one, in view of the fact that a decision by the United Nations Assembly might be helpful in persuading France to change its course of action, and in view of the fact that the item of Morocco has by its very nature its distinctive characteristics makes it advisable and even rather necessary to admit the proposal submitted by Morocco to re-number agenda items 66 (c) and 66 (d) as 67 and 68, as distinct items, as they were before.

105. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): I take the rostrum to speak in support of the proposal submitted by the delegations of India, Liberia and Morocco to consider sub-item (c) (Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara) and sub-item (d) (Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests) as separate items on our agenda.

106. In the General Committee, my delegation voted for the inscription of each of the issues now listed as sub-items under the general heading of "Question of disarmament" as separate items on our agenda. We did so in the firm belief that each one deserves the full and individual attention of this Organization.

107. First, the report of the Disarmament Commission refers to the general question of disarmament and in particular to the relationship between the United Nations and the ten-nation Disarmament Com-

mittee established recently by agreement among the four great Powers. There are also new proposals on disarmament which merit serious study and discussion.

108. Second, there is the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, and this concerns the need of both non-nuclear and nuclear Powers to exercise self-denial in the field of nuclear armament. In contrast to item 66 (d), it is a preventive measure to avert in the foreseeable future the emergence of a situation which would have the most vital consequences for the peace and well-being of mankind.

109. Third, on the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara, I need hardly stress that this item is in a category of its own. It has a special urgency. It concerns a particular situation in a certain very sensitive area of the world, as has been so conscientiously explained by the delegations of that area.

110. Finally, there is the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. Here we seek not to prevent but to remove forever an existing intolerable state of affairs. The inscription of this item separately gives our Organization an opportunity to study and to discuss the progress achieved so far among the great Powers that have been meeting in Geneva on this problem, and on this problem alone, since October last.

111. In other words, each of the items I have enumerated has distinctive merits that warrant full consideration by the United Nations. We do not have to worry about repetition or the overlapping of items. What we have to guard against is the submergence of one or more items owing to their collective inscription under the general heading of disarmament. If it is the general desire to discuss thoroughly each item, then surely there can be no objection to inscribing them as separate items on the agenda. We do not save or gain time by merely collecting them into one cumbersome item.

112. Moreover, looking ahead to the allocation of agenda items, it is clear that the First Committee is not over-burdened with work. Last year, the First Committee dealt with eight items, including four sub-items. It completed its work on time. This year, counting sub-items (c) and (d) as separate items on the agenda, the First Committee will still have only eight items on its agenda, including the two sub-items, "Report of the Disarmament Commission" and "Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons".

113. Since the Committee will be under the excellent chairmanship of Mr. Matsch of Austria, we know that it can dispose of its work efficiently and within the time allotted to it. The United Nations has a responsibility to discharge. It must show proper concern for each of the items bearing upon the most burning essential question of today. We can do no less than to consider them individually and comprehensively.

114. For these reasons, my delegation will vote for the three-Power amendment as contained in document A/L.262.

115. Mr. FEKINI (Libya) (translated from French): In my first statement to this August Assembly during the present session, I should like to express on behalf of the Libyan delegation my warmest congratulations on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly. I am convinced that under your wise and experienced guidance our work will proceed in a most satisfactory manner.

116. Next, I should like to state very briefly the reasons why the Libyan delegation thinks it highly desirable to support the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco proposing that items 66 (c) and 66 (d) of the provisional agenda be re-numbered items 67 and 68, entitled "Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara" and "Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests" respectively.

117. I want to mention at once the serious anxiety aroused in Libya by the terrifying news of the French Government's intention to test its first atomic bomb in the greater Sahara, at a date which is drawing ever nearer. The Libyan people have good cause to feel some anxiety and apprehension in view of the length of the common frontier between Libya and the Sahara region, and the nearness of Libya to the areas which will be directly affected by atomic radiation.

118. For the moment I shall say no more about the extremely harmful effects which the testing of what was described by the French representative himself at our last session as a "diabolical weapon" may be expected to have on the climate of Libya and the health of its inhabitants. What I should like to stress during the debate on the adoption of the agenda is the extreme urgency of the situation created by the threat to translate France's intention into the grim reality of atomic fact. In our view, the element of urgency alone should induce this august Assembly not only to consider the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara as a completely separate item on its agenda, but also to give it the priority which so imminent a threat demands.

119. The Libyan delegation, representing a country which emerged as an independent and sovereign State under United Nations auspices and which has relied entirely on the United Nations for the maintenance of its security and the protection of its citizens and all the inhabitants of its territory, is fully convinced that the Assembly should give the question special and separate consideration, having regard to the serious aspects of a situation which threatens and disturbs the lives and health of all the inhabitants of the African continent.

120. The question has now been formally submitted to the Assembly in the name of all the African peoples and their Governments which, before bringing the matter to the attention of the United Nations, have made every effort to induce the French Government by conciliatory and friendly means to abandon its intention to carry out atomic tests in the greater Sahara.

121. The question of the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests has also been placed before this august Assembly in the name of international conscience, and it too deserves separate consideration, which would supplement and amplify the debate on the more urgent and specific question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara.

122. The Libyan delegation believes very sincerely that separate discussion of these two questions by the General Assembly as soon as possible would make the French Government more clearly aware of the dangers inherent in testing atomic weapons in the Sahara, and would perhaps help it to realize how valuable and wise a step it would be to abandon this project. The debates in the United Nations on the dangers to which all mankind is exposed by frequent

atomic tests certainly influenced the Powers concerned in reaching their praiseworthy and encouraging decision to suspend atomic tests, at least for limited periods and, we hope, forever.

123. The urgent question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara is raised by the peoples of Africa in a special context, completely distinct from the General Assembly's traditional and routine discussions on the disarmament problem as a whole. In this connexion, the Libyan delegation shares the view expressed by the United States representative, Mr. Herter, a few days ago when he said:

"But the question of disarmament is much broader than suspension of nuclear weapons testing." [797th meeting, para. 68.]

This applies with even greater force to an atomic test which is due to occur at a specific place and time in the near future.

124. The Libyan delegation, which has taken an active part in the First Committee's discussions of the disarmament problem, considers that this special appeal to the United Nations to use its moral authority to save the peoples of Africa in general and those living near the test areas in particular, deserves urgent and separate considerations.

125. With regard to the French representative's statement in the General Committee on the need to give his country's experts time to come over and take part in discussions of this question within the general framework of disarmament, we think that an effort might be made to arrange for these experts to attend a separate and early discussion of this question.

126. I might add that the best way of convincing us that no danger is likely to arise from the Sahara tests would be to carry out the tests in metropolitan France itself. Such a course would have spared the peoples concerned all the apprehension and anxiety which, we are told, are groundless; and France's action would not have been interpreted as a demonstration of force, designed to intimidate the peoples directly concerned and the independent States of Africa.

127. In conclusion, I should like to say that, for the reasons I have given, and for other reasons outlined in statements by representatives who have preceded me, separate and urgent consideration of these two questions as proposed in the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco, would give the peoples of Africa and world opinion the best proof of the importance which the United Nations attaches to the safety of the world and the protection of its inhabitants, and of its high sense of international duty and human solidarity.

128. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I would ask speakers to confine their remarks to the formal question of inclusion on the agenda, without discussing the substance of the problem.

129. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco. When the matter was discussed in the General Committee, most members, including some of those who voted for grouping all these questions under one heading, expressed the view that there should be separate discussion and voting on each of these items. In view of this understanding, it seems rather pointless to insist now on grouping these items under the general question of disarmament.

130. It has been suggested that time will be saved by this procedure, but this argument falls apart if we are going to have, as indeed we should have, separate debates and voting.

131. This morning, the General Committee decided to leave to the First Committee the decision on how the new item proposed by the Soviet Union should be discussed. It is difficult to understand why the same procedure was not followed earlier in respect of the items relating to atomic tests. While there is some connexion between atomic tests and the general question of disarmament, these tests nevertheless give rise to distinct and special problems that should be treated separately in view of their urgency and their impact on the general international situation. Agreement on disarmament, which we all hope will be achieved, will inevitably take some time. This should not prevent the Assembly from dealing with the question of the suspension of nuclear tests, particularly the projected French tests in the Sahara which have aroused the concern of the peoples of Africa. This is a clear and specific issue which should be dealt with on its own merits and primarily within the context of its effect on the peoples of Africa and the peace and security of the African continent. For this reason, it should not be submerged within the larger and much more complex problem of disarmament.

132. My delegation will express its views on the Sahara tests at the appropriate time in the First Committee. But let me say now that we view with great concern and anxiety the decision of the French Government to conduct these tests in the face of the unanimous protests of the independent African States and in apparent disregard of world public opinion and also at a time when the other atomic Powers have halted their own tests. France's solitary attitude, we fear, might upset the present agreement between the great Powers and provoke a new round of tests with incalculable consequences for peace and human safety.

133. For all these reasons, it is our earnest hope that the Assembly will support the draft resolution presented by India, Liberia and Morocco.

134. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan): The delegation of Sudan strongly supports the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco.

135. In obedience to your wise injunction, Mr. President, the Sudanese delegation will refrain at this stage from entering into a discussion of the subject matter of the French tests in the Sahara and will confine itself to the procedural question of assigning these tests to a separate item on the agenda.

136. We believe that the question of the projected French nuclear tests in the Sahara and the question of disarmament present differences of kind, of degree, of effect and of the amount of the respective urgency. We feel that, while discussion of the question of disarmament has the aim of abandoning or regulating a process that has been going on, discussion of the prospective French tests in the Sahara is intended to prevent something that has not yet happened from taking place. In other words, it is a discussion primarily concerned with an injunction before it seeks a judgement.

137. The two questions are also not identical in their effects because we submit that, while the question of disarmament is of universal concern and a matter

whose benefits will accrue to the world at large, the Sahara tests are of particular concern to the African countries, especially to those which border the Sahara, because of the imminent and incalculable dangers to the life and security of these countries and to their people.

138. The questions under item 66 as passed by the General Committee share no identity on any of the essential aspects. The suppliants in the case are not identical, the respondents or the would-be respondents are not the same and the remedies sought are different. The discussions of the broader questions of disarmament are discussions which we believe are directed towards realization of lofty aspirations for which we all long and the attainment of desirable ideals for which we all care, while the question of the proposed tests in the Sahara, on the other hand, is a question of pressing necessity and extreme urgency because of its imminence and the tragic consequences that will inescapably flow from them. The discussions on the question of disarmament are by their very nature lengthy and cumbersome procedures. It may be—we pray not—that while discussions on disarmament and related topics are dragging on—and they are bound to drag on, recent history has convinced us of this—a bomb or two may be exploded in the Sahara. The damage to human and animal life that will result from such explosions will then be too late to remedy.

139. We therefore submit that there is not that much in common among the questions enumerated under item 66, as adopted by the General Committee, to justify their fusion under one item. We therefore appeal—and in making this appeal I am only endorsing an eloquent and more touching appeal addressed to the representatives by the representative of Ghana—to the representatives to support the draft resolution proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco.

140. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco, asking that the two items, 66 (c) and 66 (d), entitled "Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara" and "Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests", be inscribed on the agenda of the current session of the Assembly as separate items.

141. It was the complexity of problems concerning disarmament and the great urgency for at least some partial disarmament arrangements, especially those of nuclear weapons, that made the Member States, namely India and Morocco, put forward proposals to discuss these problems during the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. The above-mentioned items are burning issues and urgent ones and there is no doubt that both fully deserve individual treatment.

142. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation shares the concern of other delegations in maintaining that dealing with these important questions under one heading would be conducive to limiting the discussion and would prevent their full consideration, which is pertinent to their significance and urgency. On the other hand, their separate inscription on the agenda will create favourable prerequisites for their successful consideration.

143. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution which appears in document A/L.262.

144. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Item 66 of the agenda offered for adoption includes the following sub-items:

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons;
- (c) Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara;
- (d) Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests.

145. The objective of the proposal of India, Liberia and Morocco, as is evident from the title and from the explanations given in the General Committee and here, in the plenary meeting, is to bring about a solution of several urgent questions and, in particular, to put an end to atomic and hydrogen tests, and to the nuclear arms race and the threat of radioactive contamination which are connected with such tests. Reaching agreement on this matter would be the first step and would undoubtedly pave the way for subsequent more radical steps in the field of disarmament.

146. It is fully apparent that these questions should not be grouped with other items, since they require special attention and do not need to be considered at the same time as the other items. Consequently, the Soviet delegation supports and will vote for the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco.

147. I should also like to make some brief remarks about the second report of the General Committee [A/4222]. The Soviet delegation is happy to note the unanimous support given the Soviet request for the inclusion in the agenda of the fourteenth session of an item on "General and complete disarmament" [A/4218]. It is also important to agree on the procedure for the consideration of this item.

148. The Soviet delegation declared in the General Committee [123rd meeting] that it resolutely favoured the examination of the Soviet proposal on "General and complete disarmament" as a separate and independent item. The necessity for this is obvious and there is hardly any need to argue the point at length. We do not offer our proposal in opposition to the proposals of India [A/4186], Morocco [A/4183] and Ireland [A/4125]. On the contrary, we consider that steps should be taken without delay to execute the partial measures proposed by these States. However, the sub-items included in item 66 of the agenda and the USSR proposal of 18 September differ both as to objectives and as to the time limits for their execution. Consideration of all these items together would not be advantageous.

149. The USSR proposal for "General and complete disarmament" should be discussed as a separate and independent item on the agenda. That is the only approach which will permit the General Assembly to consider in the most useful way all aspects of the disarmament problem and to make a worthy contribution to the maintenance and consolidation of universal peace.

150. The General Committee proposes that the decision on the procedure for the consideration of the Soviet proposal should be allocated to the First Committee. The Chairman and Mr. Matsch, the author of this proposal, explained that, in their view, this meant that the item on "General and complete disarmament" would be examined as a separate item in the First Committee.

151. Since the matter under discussion is the procedure for the consideration of the proposals relating to disarmament, the Soviet delegation has thought it necessary to make this statement in order to make its position clear. We considered it necessary to make this statement for purposes of clarification in order to avoid discussion on this point in the First Committee.

152. Mr. BERARD (France) (translated from French): I should like to begin these brief remarks by expressing my surprise and regret that the agreement of sorts to which the members of the General Committee came this morning has not been respected. It had been agreed in the General Committee this morning that in order to avoid a debate in the General Assembly we would refer the question of the form in which the Soviet proposal should be placed on the agenda to the First Committee and also leave it to that Committee to decide whether or not to maintain the General Committee's decision that the four items it had approved should be grouped as sub-headings under the single title: "Question of disarmament". The First Committee was left free to reject the General Committee's decision and to separate the various items which had been grouped under the general title "Question of disarmament"—in a word, to conduct a debate similar to the one we have heard today. What was said this morning was that we wished to avoid a debate of the kind we have just heard.

153. I regret this all the more since the discussion has, I must confess, taken a turn which I would style regrettable. The draft resolution which has been submitted by the representatives of India, Liberia and Morocco calls for two items—the Indian proposal and the Moroccan proposal—to be taken separately. Now, although I have heard many comments on the Moroccan proposal, I must say that I have not heard any on the Indian one.

154. What, in short, has this discussion become? It has developed into a kind of offensive, in connexion with the Moroccan proposal, against my country's intentions concerning nuclear explosions in the Sahara. Moreover, it has given rise to a number of remarks which plainly have nothing to do with procedure but are comments of substance.

155. I was sorry to hear the representative of Liberia make remarks about my country's desire for grandeur or for status. I would have preferred not to hear them in these surroundings, for such statements are not customary here. I shall simply say to the representative of Liberia that the matter in question is far too serious for my country to be animated by mere considerations of status or of grandeur.

156. I must also point out that the representative of the United Arab Republic has raised questions of sovereignty which were out of place in this question and which are contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

157. In general, I note that this discussion has been far more one of substance than one of procedure. I shall not follow the example of the speakers who have adopted this approach, I shall not speak on the substance of the question. It is the opinion of the French delegation that the question we are dealing with is far too serious to be disposed of rapidly in a hurried debate. We feel that this question deserves lengthy study, detailed explanations and the views of experts, which

we propose to provide in the First Committee. You may rest assured, Mr. President, that we shall do so with all the care, all the interest, and all the seriousness which we attach to this matter.

158. We do not disregard the emotion which may be expressed by a number of African peoples. We know how serious this problem is. We are aware of the gravity of the situation. That is why we wish to be able to discuss it at leisure. I would simply say to the speakers who have preceded me and to those delegations here present which are worried about the urgency of the matter that the urgency is not such as to demand an immediate and disjointed discussion.

159. We have explained at length in the General Committee why we feel that it would be better to group the various questions concerning nuclear explosions put forward by the representatives of Ireland, India and Morocco under the one general heading of "Question of disarmament". We think that these questions should be given their full importance. Far be it from us to try to evade the discussion or, by grouping these questions under a single heading, to belittle their importance. Quite to the contrary, it is because we consider that these are grave and serious matters that we wish to see them grouped under a general heading of "Question of disarmament", which gives them their full importance.

160. In the General Committee, we expounded the logical reasons which lead us to hope that, in accordance with precedents established in former years, all these questions will be grouped together in a discussion that will be truly worthy of this place and of the importance of the questions with which we are dealing.

161. Lastly, it was the representative of Libya, I believe, who alluded to the fact that the French experts could not come here immediately. That is true. It is perhaps regrettable, but you may be sure that if France is asking to be allowed enough time to enable it to furnish the desired explanations and to arrange for its experts to come here, that is an additional sign—and a convincing one—of the importance it attaches to the debate.

162. I shall say no more about this now. It is my Government's intention to provide, through its delegation, all the necessary particulars on the substantive questions during the debate which will take place in the First Committee. I shall simply say in conclusion that we still feel that, if full justice is to be done to the Moroccan proposal, it should be discussed at leisure, as fully as necessary and with all the distinction that the Moroccan delegation would like it to be given, and it should be discussed as part of the disarmament question. For these reasons, my delegation cannot agree to the proposal made by the delegations of India, Liberia and Morocco.

163. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): It is not usual for my delegation to enter into discussions on procedure at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The statements that have been made so far, and the necessity for our coming to the rostrum, indicate that, while this matter may technically be one of procedure, it really relates to the substance of the political issues involved. I should like, however, not to go into the merits of this question except in so far as it is required if I am to point out the reasons for my being here.

164. I would ask representatives to turn to the provisional agenda in document A/BUR/151, where the following four items may be found: 59, the Irish item; 65, the Moroccan item; 68, the Indian item; and 70, the Secretary-General's item. These are the four which have now been grouped together.

165. The proceedings of the General Committee, while they bind only the members of the General Committee—and, unless they are reported to the General Assembly, they do not become an official document—are nevertheless open to the public. What is more, the delegation of India being concerned in this matter was, under the rules, called to attend it. Therefore the proceedings are relevant.

166. Now, there were these four items. What exactly happened? Under your ruling it was decided that these items be placed on the agenda. These items could be rejected or accepted. You accepted them. Then you could consider those items no further in the General Committee. Now under your ruling, or your guidance, they proceed to a new business which was not on the agenda, namely, the grouping of these items. The grouping of these items, it is true, was mentioned, as the Secretary-General said, in the document. But that is not part of the agenda. So the General Committee is entirely out of order.

167. Under the rules it is laid down that the Committee shall not initiate items. There is nothing on the agenda which you could discuss. You disposed of all our items which have been placed on the agenda, and then afterwards, as an after-thought, you grouped them together. That is one part of it.

168. The second matter is this. If this grouping is purely a procedural matter, then both by convention and by the rules it should have been left to the appropriate committee. On the other hand, on a political matter the General Committee could not participate because it is not supposed to discuss politics. So in either case the General Committee is entirely ultra vires in dealing with this; what is more, it was in disregard of the submissions made by the principal parties at that time responsible, because the items had not become your property before you adopted them. The sponsors of the items submitted that it may not be so done.

169. In addition, the Sahara item is a new one, but the question of the suspension of nuclear tests has been before the Assembly for the last four or five years, and the general disarmament problem for eleven years. Why was this item discussed separately? Why were so many resolutions passed upon that matter? The conference in Geneva was set up especially for the purpose of considering the suspension of nuclear tests as distinct from other conferences which have been held, political, disarmament, or whatever it may be.

170. What is more, we are informed that a degree of agreement has been reached between the nuclear Powers in regard to this matter. At the same time, the world is also informed that they and other countries are interested in the nuclear exercise. Therefore the question becomes a problem that is entirely separate from the report of the Disarmament Commission which was before the General Committee when it grouped the various items together, the item proposed by the USSR not having been submitted until only this morning.

171. I wish that the representative of France had spoken before the other delegations. The representative of France told us that some understanding was reached in the General Committee and that what we are doing is contrary to it. We have before us no understandings. We have a report from the General Committee and an agenda which we are asked to accept or reject. Are we to say that eighteen ladies and gentlemen sitting there decided that an understanding had been reached and that we have to follow it? We cannot respect these understandings privately reached and not openly recited. Therefore, no breach of understanding arises as far as the Assembly is concerned. It comes before the General Assembly because the General Committee is not the entire Assembly that is intended to prepare all this business.

172. I regret as much as the representative of France the introduction of the question of merit into this matter, but so far as the Sahara problem is concerned, whatever may be the rules in this matter, it affects the fortunes, the emotions, the sentiments of people so much where any particular action is riding rough shod over sovereignties or the independence of people. It is likely to affect not only the present generation but posterity in that area very much more than people in other areas.

173. Equally, nations are very prone to raise their voices whenever possible when there is any attack on or infringement of their sovereignties. My delegation has approached this matter not from the point of view of to whom the Sahara belongs, or whether it belongs to anyone, or to the whole world. We have reached such a position before when other countries exploded bombs in the oceans or in Trust Territories. We think that, even if these bombs were exploded in Siberia, it is a menace to humanity even though Siberia is Russian territory.

174. For all these reasons, item 68, which is the suspension of nuclear tests item, is one where the discussion will follow the previous years' discussions. Secondly, it ties in logically with the Geneva Conference. The item on the Sahara is one where some action taken by the Assembly may prevent a calamitous development as far as the African continent is concerned. It would be no use our passing resolutions in a general debate on disarmament, especially where, in view of the introduction of the Soviet item, a newer factor has come into existence.

175. Therefore I submit that the grouping together of these items was not within the competence of the General Committee. It is contrary to the purpose for which these items were submitted. It is a political decision which the General Assembly could not have reached. It is not calculated to save any time, because I assure you that even if this item is grouped before the First Committee the procedural arguments will take at least four days because everyone will want to speak on it. Therefore, there is no question of saving time and deciding where nuclear testing becomes disarmament or otherwise. There are some delegations, like the United Kingdom, who have for a long time held the opinion that the suspension of nuclear tests is not disarmament.

176. Therefore, for all these reasons I submit that the recommendations that the General Committee has placed before you should be rejected. The General Assembly should also excuse us from any charge of a breach of any understanding, of which we know nothing.

177. May I say one final word. If you look at your present agenda, items 24 and 25 concern the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. They also are very intimately connected with disarmament. We can find other items like that, and ultimately there will probably be only one other item on the agenda and everything will be grouped under it. Then the whole purpose of the agenda fails.

178. For all these reasons I request the Assembly to reject the recommendations of the General Committee and to accept the amendments here proposed.

179. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (translated from French): I should like to repeat publicly, Mr. President, pending the time in the very near future when I can do so in a more worthy manner, the congratulations I expressed to you on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea at the time of your illustrious election to the presidency of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly.

180. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea is happy to state briefly but firmly its unreserved support of the step taken by the delegation of Morocco and supported by many countries, including all the independent States of Africa. Very pertinent reasons have been advanced by all but one of the speakers who have preceded me in favour of maintaining the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara as a separate item on the agenda of the fourteenth session. I shall not reopen that question. All I will say is that, in the opinion of my delegation, the manoeuvres of those who would have liked to dispose of the specific question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara, with all it signifies for 200 million Africans, by burying it in the general question of disarmament, are only too obvious. Precisely because, as stated by the representative of France, this question is a grave and solemn one, worthy of urgent and careful attention if we are to ward off its terrifying effects, my delegation would like to see it discussed as a separate agenda item.

181. At the appropriate time after the start of the substantive discussion on this question, we shall state our views together with those of all the African peoples, whose security, health and perhaps very existence are directly threatened by this extraordinary problem.

182. On the procedural level, my delegation must state clearly that the inclusion of the problem of French nuclear tests in the Sahara in the general question of disarmament seems to it to be neither normal nor logical nor proper. The Republic of Guinea and the independent States and peoples of Africa are as anxious as anyone else, if not more so, to achieve the best and speediest solution of the vital question of disarmament, on which depend to a great extent those basic objectives of our Organization—peace, happiness and friendly co-operation among nations. Everyone here is of course well aware that it will take a long time—unfortunately too long—before this dream of all the peoples of the world, without distinction, is achieved. Hence, while recognizing all the measures and efforts taken in the interests of prompt and effective disarmament, we urge that the question of nuclear tests in the Sahara should be the subject of a separate agenda item. What, after all,

does this question entail? Basically, in the opinion of my delegation, it entails a preventive or precautionary measure, designed to avoid an increase in armaments. Thus it is not a question of disarmament, since France, thank heaven, does not as yet have the atomic bomb, but a measure intended to avoid an undesirable acceleration of the race in weapons of mass destruction.

183. Need we remind the Assembly that the African peoples and their authentic representatives, including authoritative African spokesmen for the French Community and the representatives of all the independent States of Africa, having exhausted all amicable means of negotiations, are today turning to the United Nations to express their profound distress? Africa is anxious to know at once, without any equivocation, which States are going to announce publicly their decision to turn their backs on this matter which it considers vital to its existence and to its immediate future.

184. On behalf of all the millions of disquieted Africans who are staking their hopes on the action of the United Nations, my delegation issues an urgent and brotherly appeal to all delegations to vote in favour of the Moroccan proposal and agree to consider the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara as a separate agenda item, and to vote in favour of the draft resolution proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco. We hope that in this matter Africa will not be made the scapegoat in the United Nations for any reason whatsoever.

185. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): In view of the lateness of the hour, I shall be very brief and what I say will be in the nature of an explanation of vote.

186. I wish to make a few observations in support of the amendment to the recommendation in the report of the General Committee, this amendment having been proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco.

187. I shall try to abide by the rulling of the President and confine my remarks to the procedural aspects of the question, but at the same time, I should like to make it clear that my Government shares the deep concern and anxiety felt by many African nations regarding the French plan to explode atomic bombs in the Sahara desert.

188. As regards the regrouping of various items on the agenda, as proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco, I fully endorse the views expressed a few moments ago by the representative of India, and I should like to explain why, in the opinion of the delegation of Nepal, the proposed item warrants special treatment.

189. The very fact that the question of nuclear tests has been considered separately in the past by the First Committee and that it has been found necessary to establish a sub-committee to give exclusive attention to this particular aspect of the disarmament problem—that is, the suspension of nuclear tests—warrants, I believe, separate treatment of this question on the agenda. I believe that the suspension of nuclear tests in the Sahara stands in a class by itself, because, as everyone here knows, up to this moment, France has been only an aspirant for membership of what I may describe as the exclusive nuclear club.

190. Another thing which must be borne in mind in this connexion is that the tests in the Sahara will affect the fortunes, the health and well-being of peoples in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. We all know that most of the Territories which are going to be

affected by the results of these explosions are not self-governing. Therefore, in view of these considerations, I believe that the Assembly would be justified in listing these items separately, as requested in the draft resolution.

191. I take this opportunity to appeal to representatives of States Members to give their full support to the draft resolution proposed by India, Liberia and Morocco.

192. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): From the content of most of the speeches which we have heard this afternoon dealing with the draft resolution in the names of India, Liberia and Morocco, it has, I think, become plain that the document which the speakers have been discussing is the first report of the General Committee [A/4214] dated 17 September. Apparently, the second report of the General Committee [A/4222], issued today before the meeting of the Assembly, which makes further recommendations about the treatment of the items on our agenda, is not being taken into account. This, if I may say so, strikes me as a rather strange procedure. The General Committee, after all, is the competent body to make recommendations on questions of the General Assembly's business. We have all elected it for this purpose.

193. The effect of that further recommendation from the General Committee is that there should be no discussion here in the plenary meeting of the way in which either the Soviet item or item 66 should be handled in the First Committee. This would be left to the First Committee itself. That seems to me to be a sensible proposal and one which should meet the conflicting interests involved in this question.

194. If the matter comes up in such a way that a vote is taken on the first report of the General Committee and on the amendments to it, it will be readily understood that, in view of what I have just said, my delegation will be obliged to vote against the amendments and in support of the General Committee's recommendation.

195. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (translated from Spanish): Since this is the first time, Mr. President, that I come to this rostrum under your distinguished presidency, I should like to say, on behalf of my Government and my delegation, how delighted we are at the recognition of your merits and your wide experience in the United Nations, as also of your great country's devotion to the cause of peace, that your unanimous election as President of this session of the General Assembly betokens. I need not add that I reserve the right to refer to your election again when I speak in the general debate.

196. I shall confine my remarks to the question of procedure, without touching upon the substance of the question, i.e., the scope of each of the items on the agenda of this session which gave rise to this discussion.

197. My delegation considers that the question of the manner in which these various items are to be dealt with should be left to the First Committee to decide. To reach an agreement on the matter here, as the General Committee proposes, would be tantamount to a limitation of the functions of one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly.

198. According to rule 23 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, "debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

199. There does not appear to have been any discussion on the inclusion of the different items dealing with disarmament and nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. The above rule does not therefore seem to apply to the case before us. We do not think any delegation objects to the inclusion in the agenda of the four sub-items comprising item 66 in the first report of the General Committee [A/4214], or to the inclusion, at the request of the Soviet Union, of the additional item entitled "General and complete disarmament" as proposed in the second report of the General Committee [A/4222].

200. According to rule 100 of the rules of procedure, "each Main Committee, taking into account the closing date for the session fixed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the General Committee, shall adopt its own priorities and meet as may be necessary to complete the consideration of the items referred to it".

201. Although the rule does not say so explicitly, the implication is that the question now under discussion should be left to the discretion and the wisdom of the First Committee, without imposing upon it a definite way in which to deal with the items relating to disarmament, the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara.

202. The General Committee seems to have understood it in that way, for in paragraph 4 of its second report it states: "At the suggestion of the representative of Austria, the General Committee further decided to recommend that the item be allocated to the First Committee, on the understanding that the Committee would itself decide on the manner and order in which the Committee might wish to deal with it, along with the other items relating to disarmament matters which might be allocated to it for consideration and report."

203. I do not know whether my delegation is mistaken, but this paragraph seems to be a correction of the original proposal made by the General Committee in its first report.

204. With these considerations in mind, my delegation would like to propose an amendment to the draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco [A/L.262], namely that the four sub-items included under item 66 in the first report of the General Committee should appear separately in the agenda, leaving the First Committee completely free to decide whether it will deal with those sub-items as one item or separately, and in the latter case to decide upon the order in which they will be discussed. In the view of my delegation, this is a question of procedure and of the organization of the work of a Committee, and both those matters come within the competence of the Committee rather than of the General Assembly.

205. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I would ask the representative of El Salvador to submit his amendment in writing.

206. I hope that the following explanation will facilitate the course of the debate and expedite our consideration of the two reports of the General Committee. The General Assembly has before it a recommendation submitted by the General Committee that an item entitled "Question of disarmament", comprising four sub-items, should be included in the agenda. This is item 66 in the first report of the General Committee. There is also a draft resolution submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco, proposing that items 66 (c) and 66 (d) should be re-numbered items 67 and 68 respectively.

207. I suggest that the Assembly should deal with the matter in the following manner, bearing in mind the amendment to be submitted by the delegation of El Salvador.

208. The Assembly will vote first on the draft resolution proposed in document A/L.262; if it is adopted, the items in question will appear as items 67 and 68 of the agenda. The Assembly will then vote on the inclusion of item 66, which will consist of only two sub-items: (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission; (b) Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons.

209. We shall take a vote by roll-call, but we shall first wait a few moments to allow time for the amendment of the delegation of El Salvador to arrive.

210. The amendment submitted by El Salvador does not change the proposal submitted by India, Liberia and Morocco, but amplifies it. It reads:

"Decides to re-number agenda items 66 (a), 66 (b), 66 (c) and 66 (d) as 66, 67, 68 and 69."

211. It seems to me, therefore, that the proposal of India, Liberia and Morocco is identical in substance with the amendment of El Salvador, but that the latter goes further and should therefore have priority.

212. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I wish simply to say that I am really far from clear as to exactly what we are being asked to vote on at the moment. Would it not be much more satisfactory if we could see this amendment of El Salvador in writing, see exactly what it means, and continue with our debate tomorrow? I therefore propose an adjournment until tomorrow at whatever time the Chair appoints.

213. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The motion for adjournment of the meeting has priority over any other motion and I must therefore put to the vote the proposal just made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

214. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation is aware that a motion of adjournment has priority over other motions, but I am not aware that it has priority over voting. You already indicated the order of voting; you already accepted the motion.

215. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Unfortunately, because of the distance which separates this high rostrum, physically if not morally, from the seats occupied by most delegations, I cannot always see which representative is rising to a point of order and in that case I have in all good faith to assume that he rose at the correct moment. I therefore think that I must adhere strictly to the rules of procedure and put to the vote the motion for adjournment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom. However, the matter of deciding when a vote has

begun is not within the jurisdiction of the President but is within the jurisdiction of those who are assisting him, and the Secretariat informs me that the roll-call vote had in fact begun, the name of Morocco having been called. I must therefore ask the representative of the United Kingdom to pardon me. We shall proceed with the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg.

France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland did not participate in the voting.

The amendment submitted by El Salvador was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 38 abstentions.

216. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): This morning, the General Committee recommended that, at the request of the Soviet Union, an item entitled "General and complete disarmament" should be included in the agenda. This recommendation is contained in the second report of the General Committee before us [A/4222]. As there is no objection, I declare that this item has been included in our agenda as item 70.

217. I should add that, in paragraph 4 of its second report, the General Committee states:

"At the suggestion of the representative of Austria, the General Committee further decided to recommend that the item be allocated to the First Committee, on the understanding that the Committee would itself decide on the manner and order in which the Committee might wish to deal with it, along with the other items relating to disarmament matters which might be allocated to it for consideration and report."

218. We now come to the question of the adoption of the items on the agenda. The General Committee's recommendations will be found in paragraph 12 of document A/4214. Items 1 to 6 have already been dealt with and do not require any decision. With regard to item 7, "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter" [A/4216], since all that is required is that note should be taken of this document, I will assume that the General Assembly takes note of it.

It was so decided.

219. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Is there any objection to the adoption of items 8 to 18 inclusive?

Items 8 to 18 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

220. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If no representative wishes to speak on the inclusion of items 19 to 22, which deal with the question of amending the United Nations Charter, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 19 to 22 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

221. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on the inclusion of items 23 and 24, which deal with the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the effects of atomic radiation, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 23 and 24 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

222. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Item 25 is the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, item 26 deals with the Korean question, item 27 deals with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and item 28 deals with the United Nations Emergency Force. If there are no comments on the inclusion of these items, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 25 to 28 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

223. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on items 29 to 32, which concern economic matters, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 29 to 32 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

224. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Items 33, 34 and 35 relate to social and humanitarian questions, and items 36 to 41 refer to matters within the competence of the Fourth Committee. If there are no comments on the inclusion of these items, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 33 to 41 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

225. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on items 42 to 54 inclusive, which deal with matters within the competence of the Fifth Committee, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 42 to 54 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

226. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on items 55 to 58, which deal with legal matters, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 55 to 58 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

227. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Item 59, the question of Algeria, has been considered in paragraph 9 of the first report of the General Com-

mittee, and items 60 and 61 deal with the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa and with the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of "apartheid" of the Government of the Union of South Africa.

228. Mr. LOUW (Union of South Africa): I shall detain the Assembly for only one minute. I wish once more, on behalf of the Government of the Union of South Africa, to place on record our objection to items 60 and 61 being included in the agenda of this Assembly. This objection is based on two grounds: first, that the inscription of these items and any subsequent discussions or resolutions in regard thereto would be in violation of a basic principle of the Charter upon which the United Nations was founded, and enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter which stipulates that this Article shall have an overriding effect in regard to all the other Articles of the Charter; secondly, our objection is based on the ground that such action by the Assembly would be in conflict with the terms of a decision unanimously taken and recorded by a plenary session of the San Francisco Conference of 1945 to the following effect:

"Nothing contained in Chapter IX of the Charter can be construed as giving authority to the Organization to intervene in the domestic affairs of Member States."^{2/}

Chapter IX to which reference is here made, I would remind the Assembly, contains Articles 55 and 56 relating to fundamental human rights and freedoms.

229. On these two grounds my delegation objects to the inscription of these two items.

Items 59, 60 and 61 were placed on the agenda.

230. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on the inclusion of items 62 to 70, I shall consider that they have been included in the agenda.

Items 62 to 70 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

231. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We now come to the allocation of agenda items [A/4214, para. 13]. If there are no comments on the twenty-one items proposed for consideration in plenary meetings, I shall consider them adopted.

It was so decided.

232. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no objections to the four items—which, as the result of the recent vote are now of course more than four—allocated to the First Committee, I shall consider them adopted.

It was so decided.

233. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no comments on the allocation of agenda items to the Special Political Committee and the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Committees, I shall consider that the General Committee's recommendations are adopted.

It was so decided.

234. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If there are no objections to the recommendations in paragraphs 14 and 15, I shall consider them adopted.

It was so decided.

235. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Finally, in paragraph 16, the General Committee informs the General Assembly that it has taken note of the suggestion by the Secretary-General that verbatim services should be provided for the First Committee and that it notes that the Secretary-General will also be in a position to have the debates of the Special Political Committee transcribed. I take it that the General Assembly agrees to this. If there are no comments I shall consider it approved.

It was so decided.

236. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have thus completed our consideration of the first and second reports of the General Committee. The necessary arrangements will be made in accordance with these decisions.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

^{2/} United Nations Conference on International Organization, II/12.

