

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE 461st

MEETING

Friday, 30 November 1951, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments (A/1943, A/C.1/667, A/C.1/668, A/C.1/669 and A/C.1/670) (continued)	} 55
International control of atomic energy: report of the Committee of Twelve (A/1922) (continued)	

Chairman : Mr. Finn MOE (Norway).

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments (A/1943, A/C.1/667, A/C.1/668, A/C.1/669 and A/C.1/670) (continued)

[Item 66]*

International control of atomic energy : report of the Committee of Twelve (A/1922) (continued)

[Item 16]*

CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY IRAQ, PAKISTAN AND SYRIA (A/C.1/670)

1. Mr. GUNDERSEN (Norway) was grateful to Iraq, Pakistan and Syria for having suggested in their draft resolution (A/C.1/670) the meeting of the four Powers in a sub-committee, and to the four Powers for having accepted in principle that suggestion. It would make possible a discussion to find out where views coincided and where they differed.

2. The function of the proposed sub-committee was exploratory and the object of the amendment submitted by Norway (A/C.1/672) was to make that task easier by clarifying the terms of reference. That amendment had been put forward in the conviction that the three sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not intended the four Powers and the President of the General Assembly to enter into all the details of the vast problems involved in disarmament and the control of atomic energy with a view to making substantive proposals. The sub-committee should rather give the Committee some guidance as to future steps to be taken.

3. The Norwegian delegation agreed with the representative of Bolivia that a time limit should be established and so proposed in slightly different terms but did not regard the differences as being of great importance.

4. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) stated that the proposal of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria was very timely but it did not prescribe any deadline for the work of the sub-committee.

5. The Bolivian amendment (A/C.1/671/Rev. 1) would not only do that, as did point 2 of the Norwegian amendment, but would explicitly ask the President of the General Assembly to present the report. It was not intended to give the President a mandate to draw up a personal report but only to follow the usual practice of having the report presented by the presiding officer.

6. Faris EL-KHOURY Bey (Syria) expressed his gratification at the acceptance by the four Powers of the proposal for a sub-committee.

7. As to a time limit, the sponsors had thought it better to allow the four Powers to decide how much time was required. However, one of the suggested dates, if acceptable to the four Powers, would be satisfactory, and would show the desire for an early report.

8. The sponsors had also believed that the President of the General Assembly should be asked to preside, especially because their Chairman was occupied with the work of the First Committee. The sponsors accepted the Norwegian amendment to the terms of reference. However, it should be made clear that the object of the sub-committee was not merely to exhaust all avenues of approach but to reach an agreement that would dispose of the question.

9. Mr. MOCH (France) expressed, on behalf of the United Kingdom and the United States as well as his own delegation, appreciation of the proposal of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria, which they had accepted. They supported the Norwegian amendment which made the terms of reference more comprehensive and objective. The terms of reference should enable the sub-committee to seek common ground in the realm of procedure rather than of substance. The amendment, moreover, made it clear that the responsibility remained with the First Committee by making provision for a report. Whether it would be possible to produce a final report by 10 December could not be foreseen, but at least a progress report could be made.

10. The Norwegian amendment in this respect appeared to be preferable to the Bolivian text. Mr. Moch inquired whether the latter had been withdrawn.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

Mr. DU RELS (Bolivia) said his delegation would withdraw its amendment (A/C.1/671/Rev. 1).

Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation regarded the original text of the terms of reference proposed for the sub-committee as preferable to the text of the Norwegian amendment. The original draft resolution clearly stated the purpose of formulating proposals concerning the reduction of armed forces and armaments and the abolition of atomic weapons, while the Norwegian text made only vague reference to the formulation of proposals.

The Soviet Union delegation would support the text of the original draft resolution.

Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) stated that there was no essential difference in regard to the spirit and the objectives between the three sponsors and the Norwegian delegation. Terminology was a secondary matter and the Committee should accept the Norwegian amendment (A/C.1/672) and also that of Lebanon (A/C.1/674).

With regard to the Chilean amendment (A/C.1/673), Mr. Al-Jamali endorsed the remarks of the representative of Syria and also recalled the mediatory experience of the President of the General Assembly on the Berlin question in 1948. In the matter of a time limit, it would be helpful to receive at least a preliminary report in ten days. However, it was to be hoped that the four Powers would seek to reach the areas of agreement which might later be enlarged.

The CHAIRMAN stated that he was fully occupied with the work of the First Committee and urged the representative of Chile to withdraw point 1 of his amendment which related to the chairmanship of the sub-committee.

Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) expressed his support for the draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Pakistan and Syria and of the Norwegian amendment. However, any sub-committee, in addition to taking account of documents referred to it, should be able to entertain new proposals.

To that end, the Lebanese delegation submitted an appropriate amendment (A/C.1/674) to the text of the Norwegian amendment (A/C.1/672), suggesting that the words "as well as any new proposals made by any of its members during the course of its deliberations" be added to sub-paragraph (ii) of the first operative paragraph.

In certain drafting matters, Mr. Malik had some suggestions to make, namely, that in the third paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution, the word "for" be inserted before "the regulation" and "the abolition", and that in the first two paragraphs of the preamble the word "noting" be substituted for the word "considering".

With regard to the Norwegian amendment, it was to be hoped that the terminology instructing the sub-committee to formulate "proposals which it could agree to recommend" would not preclude the possibility of the sub-committee's submitting a report even if no agreement was reached.

Mr. MAZA (Chile) recalled the reasons which had motivated his delegation to submit its amendments and what he had stated at the 459th meeting. The intention in the Chairman of the First Committee preside over

the sub-committee was to avoid the procedural delays which would be involved in arranging for the President of the General Assembly to preside. Their objective had been efficiency and expedition. With regard to the time limit, the Chilean delegation was prepared to accept the deadline of 10 December if that was the will of the Committee.

22. The Chilean delegation would withdraw its amendment (A/C.1/673).

23. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria, with the amendments submitted by Norway and Lebanon.

24. Those amendments would clarify the terms of reference and give the sub-committee full powers to consider. If the sub-committee proved unable to reach unanimous agreement upon proposals, they should nevertheless report upon the situation in an objective manner through a joint report. The report to be presented in ten days need not be final and if the sub-committee was making progress, its duration could be prolonged.

25. Mr. BATLLE BERRES (Uruguay) supported the Norwegian amendments to the draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Pakistan and Syria. A time limit for the conclusion of the sub-committee's work was necessary.

26. The representative of Uruguay opposed the idea that the sub-committee should be required to submit a unanimous report. Pointing out that any restrictions would make it less likely that the four Powers could agree on a solution, he emphasized that the door should be left open for each Power to make a separate report.

27. Mr. GUNDERSEN (Norway) saw no substantial difference between the amendment submitted by his delegation and the position of the USSR delegation. The Norwegian amendment stated clearly that the sub-committee could discuss all the proposals and amendments submitted to the Committee.

28. He accepted the Lebanese amendment (A/C.1/674) to the amendment submitted by Norway. It was intended in the Norwegian amendment that the sub-committee should submit a report in any case, regardless of whether or not agreement was reached.

29. Mr. SANGUINETTI (Argentina) explained that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria, since there could be no hope for the success of any plan, regardless of the majority it might secure in the General Assembly, as long as there was no agreement between the great Powers.

30. Mr. URRUTIA HOLGUIN (Colombia) stated that his delegation had always been of the opinion that the problem of disarmament should be examined primarily by the great Powers. Therefore, it would support the joint draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Pakistan and Syria.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preamble of the joint draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Pakistan and Syria (A/C.1/670) including the drafting changes proposed by the representative of Lebanon.

The preamble was adopted unanimously.

32. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) recognized the desirability of requiring the sub-committee to report within a specific period of time and he therefore supported the Norwegian amendment to that effect. If it so desired, the sub-committee could obviously request more time. He also supported point 1 of the Norwegian amendment, in the conviction that it would in no way detract from the importance of the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution.

33. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his previous statement expressing a preference for the original text of the joint draft resolution of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria could not be construed as an objection to the Norwegian amendment. The matter was

purely a question of wording, especially in view of the clarification made by the Norwegian representative.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the representative of Norway (A/C.1/672), as modified by the amendment of Lebanon.

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote as a whole the joint draft resolution submitted by Iraq, Pakistan and Syria (A/C.1/670), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.