

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 122nd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 16 September 1959,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the agenda of the fourteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	
Items 62 and 63	5
Item 64	5
Items 65 to 70	5

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

Consideration of the agenda of the fourteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/151) (*continued*)

ITEMS 62 AND 63

1. Mr. LOUW (Union of South Africa) said that his Government strongly objected to the inclusion of items 62 and 63 in the agenda of the General Assembly because they were excluded from the competence of the United Nations by Article 2 (7) of the Charter. Discussion of the items by the General Assembly would therefore constitute a breach of one of the basic principles of the Charter.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Krishna Menon (India) took a place at the Committee table.

2. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that he recognized the position of the Union Government in the matter. However, he was confident that the Committee would recommend inclusion of the two items in the General Assembly's agenda.

3. Mr. KING (Liberia), referring to item 63, drew the Committee's attention to its previous decisions on the same question and to the fact that the General Assembly had previously voted by an overwhelming majority to include the item in its agenda in spite of the objections of the Government of the Union of South Africa.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 62 and 63 should be included in the agenda.

Mr. Krishna Menon (India) withdrew.

ITEM 64

4. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that the United States would not object to the inclusion of item 64 since it was its usual practice not to oppose requests for the inclusion of items in the agenda of the General Assembly. However, consideration of the item was neither necessary nor desirable. The General Assembly's practice in electing its President had worked well and afforded an opportunity to select the person most qualified for the office. The General Assembly's freedom of selection had never been circumscribed in the past and should not be in the future.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 64 should be included in the agenda.

ITEMS 65 TO 70

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 65 to 70 should be included in the agenda.

5. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the observation in paragraph 7 of the Secretary-General's memorandum concerning a possible grouping of any or all of the items related to disarmament.

6. The SECRETARY-GENERAL pointed out that the remarks in paragraph 7 concerning the procedural situation should be construed as an observation and not as a recommendation, which was a different matter. He simply drew the attention of the General Committee and the General Assembly to the question, without formulating any proposal. Neither the Committee nor the Assembly need take a decision in the matter unless a formal proposal were submitted to it.

7. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) observed that the Committee had already decided to include in the agenda, as separate items, the question of the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons and the item on suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. Could it now reverse its decision?

8. The CHAIRMAN replied that the question of a possible regrouping of the various items relating to disarmament had been left open. It was for the Committee to take a decision in the matter, providing it received a formal proposal. Neither the Secretary-General nor the Chairman had any recommendation to make.

9. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that since the matter had not been formally raised there was no reason to discuss it.

10. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that he was inclined to favour a grouping of the various items relating to disarmament under one general heading, preferably "Question of disarmament". The First Committee would thus avoid repeating the general debate on disarmament in connexion with each of the items.

11. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) remarked that there was an inevitable relationship between the items on nuclear tests and weapons and the question of disarmament. He therefore formally proposed that items 59, 65 and 68 should be considered sub-headings of item 70, which would then read: "Question of disarmament: (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission: letter dated 11 September 1959 from the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission to the Secretary-General; (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".

12. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the question of disarmament, the discussion of which had reached an important stage both inside and outside the United Nations, should be considered separately. However, before the Committee took a decision it might wish to hear the views of the Moroccan representative, since Morocco had introduced the item on French nuclear tests in the Sahara. The Indian delegation had already made known its view that the item on the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests should be discussed separately. It might wish to restate its position.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Krishna Menon (India) took a place at the Committee table.

13. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) felt that the Committee should not detract from the importance of the question of disarmament by combining it with other items. While India would prefer to have each of the items in question discussed separately, it would not formally object to the three items on nuclear tests and weapons being considered at the same time. However, the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara was a matter of urgency. He therefore hoped that the Committee would not recommend joint consideration of the various items. Any decision in the matter was for the Main Committee of the General Assembly in which the items would be discussed.

14. Mr. BEN ABOUD (Morocco) agreed that the question of disarmament should not be combined with any other item. With regard to the items on nuclear tests, the French Government expected shortly to undertake such tests in an area which was not part of France. The tests would immediately affect the populations of neighbouring areas in the continent of Africa, and eventually of the whole world. The question of French nuclear tests was only indirectly related to the overall question of disarmament and should therefore be discussed separately in the General Assembly.

15. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) felt that there was merit in the idea put forward by the Secretary-General. There was an obvious logical connexion between the three items concerned with nuclear tests and weapons, as there was between nuclear questions and the general topic of disarmament. It was true, as his delegation had always maintained, that the discussion of nuclear questions did not of itself constitute a discussion of disarmament, but there was no doubt that any agreement in the former sphere would contribute towards the ultimate goal of disarmament. His delegation would therefore prefer that nuclear questions should be discussed against the general background of disarmament. Such an arrangement need not prevent the full discussion of each item on its merits, and the Moroccan representative should feel reassured on that point. It was simply a matter of practical good sense and the orderly conduct of the Assembly's business. He therefore supported the Brazilian proposal.

16. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of disarmament was clearly an important one, since there were four separate items in that connexion on the Assembly's agenda. Previous speakers had indicated their desire that those items should be taken up and discussed separately and there was obviously good reason for that, since each dealt with a specific and distinct aspect of the matter. He too felt that questions essentially so different could not and should not be merged into one. That did not

mean that his delegation was not ready to discuss the general question of disarmament; on the contrary, it was anxious to secure a radical and comprehensive solution of the whole problem, as its past record made abundantly clear.

17. Mr. BEN ABOUD (Morocco) remarked that if the sole preoccupation of those in favour of the grouping of those items was to see an orderly arrangement of them on paper, that was fair enough, so long as it was clearly understood that in actual fact the items would be discussed separately, as most speakers clearly wanted. That being so, however, he saw no real need to insist on the grouping.

18. U THANT (Burma) suggested that, having heard the views of the representatives of Morocco and India, the Committee might wish to hear those of the representative of Ireland, the proposer of the last of the three items concerned.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Aiken (Ireland) took a place at the Committee table.

19. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) observed that the item proposed by his delegation concerned a special facet of the question of disarmament. It was, however, intimately bound up with the disarmament question as a whole and his delegation would not object if the Committee decided to adopt the Brazilian proposal and group all those related items together.

20. Mr. BERARD (France) was inclined to share the views of the United States and United Kingdom delegations, on grounds of logic, good sense and also precedent—the First Committee had discussed those matters together at its last session.

21. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) could not agree to the Brazilian proposal. It was the very complexity of disarmament matters and the urgency of some questions, especially those concerned with nuclear weapons, that had prompted the Governments concerned to put forward separate items. He therefore supported the recommendation of a number of delegations that the three items in question should be retained as separate items on the Assembly's agenda and should be discussed separately.

22. Mr. KING (Liberia) said that his delegation was not in favour of merging the items under one heading. His Government earnestly hoped for a total ban on nuclear tests and a general agreement on disarmament. So far, however, little headway had been made towards agreement on substantial measures of disarmament. Meanwhile, nuclear tests continued, with dire consequences for the people in the areas concerned. Liberia had, some months earlier, protested to the French Government against the carrying out of nuclear tests in the Sahara, but without result. The question was a matter of urgency, and there was every reason why the General Assembly should discuss it and deal with it separately.

23. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines) stated that his delegation could support the Brazilian proposal on the clear understanding that it implied, not a merging, but a grouping and that each item would in fact be discussed and voted on separately.

24. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) opposed the Brazilian proposal. While it was true that logically the items in question could be grouped together because they dealt with related topics, it was to be feared that such a

grouping would serve to prevent specific decisions being taken on different aspects of disarmament. The experience of the last session showed that the grouping of items led to a paucity of results. The Assembly should learn from its mistakes and it ought therefore to keep those items separate.

25. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that if those four items were to be put together there would appear to be no reason why, say, items 24 and 25 of the agenda should not be added to them: the same arguments would apply. In fact it seemed that even those who were prepared to agree to the grouping did so on the understanding that the items would be discussed separately. In that case there was little point in wasting more time over the matter.

26. Although at first his delegation had felt that the three items on nuclear matters might be discussed together, it was now convinced, after hearing the representatives of Morocco and Liberia, that there was a difference in the degree of urgency of each, and it was prepared to support the prior discussion of the Sahara question even over the report of the Disarmament Commission.

27. Mr. TSIANG (China) said the discussion had shown that all the delegations, whether in favour of grouping or not, wanted the items to be given the fullest treatment. He would vote for the Brazilian proposal, as the grouping might save time and avoid repetition, without, in his opinion, resulting in the nuclear items being overshadowed by other issues. His delegation would resist any attempt to submerge those items in the discussion of the general question of disarmament.

28. Mrs. RÖSSEL (Sweden) supported the views expressed by the Moroccan and Indian representatives regarding the items submitted by their countries for inclusion in the agenda as separate issues. She believed that items 59, 65 and 68 fully justified individual treatment.

29. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) said his delegation had always regarded the subjects of the items in question as indissolubly interrelated. It would therefore be an advantage to group the items together, thus saving time and avoiding repetition. He would not object to all or some of those items appearing separately on the agenda if that was the wish of other delegations. The Committee had, however, been given an assurance that the items would not lose their identity or importance through being grouped together, and he would support the Brazilian proposal on that understanding.

30. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) felt that, as each of the items would in any case be fully debated, it would not in fact be possible to save time by grouping them. He was therefore in favour of retaining the agenda in its present form.

31. Mr. TAMAYO (Bolivia) supported the Brazilian proposal, which, in his opinion, would facilitate the consideration of items closely related in subject-matter.

Mr. Krishna Menon (India) and Mr. Aiken (Ireland) withdrew.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Brazilian proposal.

33. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) said he would vote on the understanding that the grouped items would not lose their separate status, which had already been accepted by the Committee.

34. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the inclusion of each sub-item under the general heading "Question of disarmament".

35. The CHAIRMAN accordingly called for a separate vote on the retention of sub-item (a) of item 70, "Question of disarmament".

The Committee decided, by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, to retain sub-item (a) under item 70.

At the request of the Burmese representative, the votes were taken by roll-call.

36. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote with regard to item 59.

Austria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, France, Guatemala, Philippines, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Austria, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Liberia, Morocco, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The proposal for the inclusion of item 59 under agenda item 70 as sub-item (b) was adopted by 11 votes to 9, with no abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote with regard to item 65.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: China, France, Guatemala, Philippines, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Burma, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Liberia, Morocco, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria.

Abstaining: Turkey.

The proposal for the inclusion of item 65 under agenda item 70 as sub-item (c) was adopted by 10 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

38. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote with regard to item 68.

Liberia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Philippines, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, France, Guatemala.

Against: Liberia, Morocco, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia.

The proposal for the inclusion of item 68 under agenda item 70 as sub-item (d) was adopted by 11 votes to 9, with no abstentions.

The Brazilian proposal as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that items 59, 65 and 68 should become sub-items (b), (c) and (d) of item 70.

39. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines), explaining his vote, said he had supported the Brazilian proposal on the understanding that it contained nothing to prevent any delegation from moving the priority of the items in question when they came to be considered.

40. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the allocation of items proposed in paragraph 9 of

the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/151).

The Committee decided to recommend the allocation proposed in the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/151) of the items it had recommended for inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.