

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**GENERAL COMMITTEE, 161st
MEETING**

Monday, 27 September 1965,
at 3.15 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Consideration of the agenda of the twentieth session and allocation of items (continued)</i>	
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda entitled "Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons": item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</i>	15
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda entitled "The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty": item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</i>	16
<i>Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda entitled Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity": item proposed by Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta and Zambia</i>	17

Chairman: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

Consideration of the agenda of the twentieth session and allocation of items (continued)

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA ENTITLED "NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS": ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/5976)

1. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that he had no objection to the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which was of very great importance and had already been discussed in other bodies. For example, in paragraph 13 of the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/5986), reference was made to a draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, which had been submitted by the United States with the support of the delegations of Canada, Italy and the United Kingdom, and which was annexed to the report. Paragraph 17 of the report mentioned that a joint memorandum on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons had been submitted by several countries. The question was therefore one of recognized importance, and could well be included

in the General Assembly's agenda. He presumed that it would be allocated to the First Committee, which was to consider the reports of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the item "Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".

2. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the urgency and importance of the question his delegation had asked that it should be considered at plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

3. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti), said that the question was of such great importance that it demanded careful study. Since the General Assembly proposed to place on the First Committee's agenda the draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons^{1/} and the joint memorandum on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons,^{2/} it would be logical to include the item proposed by the USSR in the Committee's agenda also. There would then be opportunity for a constructive exchange of views.

4. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) welcomed the Committee's decision to recommend including the item in the General Assembly's agenda. The question was closely linked to that of disarmament, which was to be allocated to the First Committee. In view of the urgency of the subject, however, and of its great importance from the standpoint of disarmament, he agreed with the Soviet representative that the item should be considered at plenary meetings.

5. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) agreed with the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic that consideration of that important and urgent question should be expedited by bringing it directly before the General Assembly.

6. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that people throughout the world were waiting for the United Nations to take decisive steps to end the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He therefore supported the speakers who felt that the item should be considered at plenary meetings. Moreover, the text of the draft treaty was very specific, and would greatly facilitate the conclusion of an agreement on the question; it also should be considered at plenary meetings.

7. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that his delegation too recognized the urgency of the ques-

^{1/} See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965*, document DC/227, annex 1, sect. A.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, sect. E.

tion and the priority it merited. It was precisely to expedite the work, however, that the item should in its view be submitted to the First Committee, which could study it with all due attention. Moreover, it was hard to see how the question could be discussed without reference to the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

8. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Soviet delegation's proposal that the item should be considered at plenary meetings.

The proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

9. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, more than any other, called for the co-operation of all Member countries. He would accordingly accept whatever procedure was decided upon by the Committee.

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the allocation of the item to the First Committee.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA ENTITLED "THE INADMISSIBILITY OF INTERVENTION IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF STATES AND THE PROTECTION OF THEIR INDEPENDENCE AND SOVEREIGNTY": ITEM PROPOSED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/5977)

10. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee recommended to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of a new item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/5977).

The Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the item "The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty".

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to decide which organ should consider the item.

12. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) said that his delegation welcomed the decision the Committee had just taken.

13. The usual practice was to refer consideration of an item to a Committee unless there were imperative reasons for acting otherwise. In the present instance, there were none. His delegation recognized the great importance of the question, but considered that it ought to be discussed in committee and not at plenary meetings. Moreover, the very nature of the subject seemed to mark it out for consideration by a Committee dealing with political matters. For reasons of equal distribution, it should be referred to the Special Political Committee rather than to the First Committee.

14. Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL (Guatemala) reminded the Committee that a few days ago it had recommended that the item "Observance by Member States of the principles relating to the sovereignty of States, their territorial integrity, non-interference in their do-

mestic affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the condemnation of subversive activities" should be allocated to the Sixth Committee. The item proposed by the USSR was very similar. As the Sixth Committee had a rather heavy agenda, however, the new item could be referred to the Special Political Committee; that would at the same time underline the great importance of the question

15. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America) said his delegation welcomed the General Committee's recommendation and expressed agreement with the representative of Guatemala regarding the allocation of the item.

16. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) recalled that in the case of the item "Peaceful settlement of disputes" it had been pointed out that the subject was intrinsically a political one and the item had therefore been referred to a political committee. Moreover, there were many precedents for that procedure.

17. In balancing the work of the various Committees, qualitative rather than quantitative criteria should be applied. Accordingly, he felt that the item proposed by the USSR should be allocated to the First Committee.

18. Mr. FUENTEALBA (Chile) stressed the essentially political nature of the additional item. Non-intervention was a principle guaranteed by all international agreements and by the Charter itself; yet it was continually being violated; and the reasons for that were not legal or contractual but political. Chile considered that the additional item should be referred to the pre-eminently political Committee—in other words, to the First Committee.

19. Mr. RAMANI (Malaysia) said that the Assembly would probably wish to adopt a declaration of principles on the subject; and if the declaration was to have the necessary impact the item should be allocated to plenary meetings.

20. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that in view of the importance of the item his delegation would at first sight have inclined to favour the view that it should be allocated to plenary meetings. However, it had the impression that at plenary meetings items were not discussed thoroughly. To have the item dealt with in the First Committee would be an acceptable compromise.

21. Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL (Guatemala) said that he had stressed the legal aspects of the item because the principle in question was proclaimed in several essential legal instruments—not only in the Charter of the United Nations but also in the fundamental statutes of various regional bodies. That did not mean, however, that its political aspects should be underestimated, and he saw no objection to having the item allocated to a political Committee.

22. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that if the sponsors of the item felt that to allocate it to the Special Political Committee—not to mention the Sixth Committee, an idea which was unacceptable for reasons which had already been stated—would lessen its importance, which he too readily acknowledged, then it should be referred to the First Committee. The

argument in favour of balancing the distribution of items between Committees was not tenable, since transfers could always be made in the course of the session.

23. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) said that the close relationship which existed between non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the peaceful settlement of disputes caused by such interventions constituted yet another reason for allocating both items to the same Committee, namely the First Committee, as had been decided in the case of the item on the peaceful settlement of disputes.

24. Mr. PRADITH (Laos) said he inclined to support the course recommended by the United Kingdom representative, since the question had a great variety of aspects, political, ideological and legal, and since the Special Political Committee's agenda would be relatively light.

25. Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) said that in view of the majority feeling he would not press his proposal to allocate the items to the Special Political Committee; however, he still thought that it should be discussed by one of the Main Committees.

26. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had proposed that the item should be allocated to plenary meetings because of its importance and urgency; in the spirit of compromise that marked relations within the United Nations, however, it would bow to the views of the majority, which had declared itself in favour of allocating the item to the First Committee.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the allocation of the item to the First Committee.

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF AN ADDITIONAL ITEM IN THE AGENDA ENTITLED "CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY"; ITEM PROPOSED BY ALGERIA, BURUNDI, CAMEROON, CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC, CHAD, CONGO (BRAZAVILLE), DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE

CONGO, DAHOMEY, ETHIOPIA, GABON, GHANA, GUINEA, IVORY COAST, KENYA, LIBERIA, LIBYA, MALAWI, MALI, MAURITANIA, MOROCCO, NIGER, NIGERIA, RWANDA, SENEGAL, SIERRA LEONE, SOMALIA, SUDAN, TOGO, TUNISIA, UGANDA, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA, UPPER VOLTA AND ZAMBIA (A/5978)

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the item "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity".

27. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) proposed that the item, which was aimed at strengthening and diversifying the relations between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and was not likely to arouse any controversy, should be discussed by the General Assembly at plenary meetings.

28. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) said that while he did not underestimate the importance of the item he felt that it should be referred to the Sixth Committee, in line with the procedure followed in 1948 when the question of co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of American States (OAS) had been raised, giving rise to some difficult problems.

29. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said he did not think that the present additional item would arouse controversy as had the item referred to by the Mexican representative. He was in favour of allocating the item to plenary meetings.

30. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia), supporting the Moroccan representative's proposal, said that the precedents set by the co-operation established between the United Nations and OAS, or the United Nations and the League of Arab States, for example, would certainly facilitate the task of the Assembly at plenary meetings.

31. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) said that he would not press his proposal.

The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the allocation of the item to plenary meetings.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.