

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE 968th
MEETING**

Friday, 31 October 1958,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda items 64, 70 and 72:	
Question of disarmament (<u>continued</u>)	
The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests (<u>continued</u>)	
The reduction of the military budgets of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France by 10 to 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries (<u>continued</u>)	
Consideration of draft resolutions	127

Chairman: Mr. Miguel Rafael URQUIA (El Salvador).

AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 AND 72

Question of disarmament (A/3929, A/3936, A/C.1/L.205, A/C.1/L.206, A/C.1/L.208, A/C.1/L.210, A/C.1/L.211) (continued)

The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests (A/3915, A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.203 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.205) (continued)

The reduction of the military budgets of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France by 10 to 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries (A/3925, A/C.1/L.204, A/C.1/L.205) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolutions before it relating to items 4, 7 and 8 of its agenda. The Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.208) would, in accordance with the request the Mexican representative had made at the 966th meeting, be put to the vote last.

2. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that he had asked for the floor on a point of order and would not touch on the substance of the question. He recalled the efforts made to reach unanimity and regretted that they had been frustrated by the refusal of some to accept any agreement which was not based upon a paper prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, irrespective of the outcome of the Geneva talks. His delegation moved that the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205) should be given priority and asked that it should be put to the vote as soon as possible. The Committee could not continue the debate now that the Geneva negotiations had begun.

3. The CHAIRMAN noted the United States representative's motion for priority. He would consult the Committee on it at the time of the vote.

4. Mr. LALL (India) said that, following consultations with both sides, his delegation, with the co-operation of the Yugoslav delegation in particular, and the full agreement of the co-sponsors of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1), had drawn up a draft resolution on the question of the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests which, he understood, was acceptable to both sides.

5. However, the Soviet representative had expressed the view that the delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR should make brief identical statements to the Committee on the interpretation of the draft resolution. His delegation fully understood that point of view, for the question was a crucial one and there should not remain any ambiguity about the meaning of the resolution.

6. In view of the progress that had been achieved on that important matter and also taking into account the grave responsibility which rested on the General Assembly not to take any step which would in any way lessen the chances of success of the Geneva negotiations and in the hope that a compromise could still be found, the Indian delegation, under rule 119 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, moved the suspension of the meeting until Monday morning, 3 November 1958.

7. The CHAIRMAN enumerated the various draft resolution before the Committee.

8. He pointed out that, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, he should put the Indian motion to the vote immediately. However, as the Indian representative had no objection, he would give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

9. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the representative of India had very seriously misstated the situation, since he had not mentioned the vital reservation which the Soviet Union delegation had put forward the previous day. That reservation consisted of a declaration by which the three States would undertake to discontinue tests for all time, or pending the achievement of an agreement between the Powers concerned, regardless of the results of the work of the Geneva conference. That reservation completely nullified the draft resolution, and his delegation accordingly could not accept it.

10. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in view of the statement which the Indian representative had made before moving the adjournment, he could not apply rule 119 of the rules of procedure until the representatives whom that statement concerned had exercised their right of reply, if they wished to do so. He therefore called on the representative of the Soviet Union.

11. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he disagreed with the representative of the United States and felt that the Indian representative had described the position very accurately. He accordingly

thought it necessary to indicate the considerations by which his delegation had been guided during the informal talks. He recalled the statement of 27 October 1958 (964th meeting) in which his delegation had expressed the hope that the United States and the United Kingdom delegations would state clearly and unequivocally that the General Assembly resolution on the cessation of test explosions would remain in force until the Powers concerned concluded an agreement on the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests for all time. In reply to that statement, the United States and the United Kingdom had simply reaffirmed their former positions.

12. No resolution, even if adopted unanimously, could have positive effect if the participants in the Geneva conference had different intentions. That was why the Soviet Union had proposed that the three "nuclear Powers" should make identical declarations. Two variants had been considered: a declaration to the effect that the General Assembly resolution calling on States to discontinue their nuclear weapons tests would remain in force until an agreement was reached between the Powers concerned on the cessation of nuclear tests for all time, or a declaration to the effect that the resolution should be interpreted as calling on States to discontinue nuclear tests for all all time or until the Powers concerned concluded an agreement, regardless of the results of the work of the Geneva conference.

13. The Indian representative had done his utmost to achieve agreement among the three delegations on such a statement. His efforts had unfortunately failed because the United States had refused to make an unequivocal statement of its intentions. The inference was that it did not want a real cessation of tests. The Soviet Government felt that it would be dangerous to conceal from the world the divergent views held on that question. The world should know who was in favour of a complete and genuine cessation of nuclear test explosions and who was opposed to it. His delegation hoped that the Assembly would take a clear stand and declare itself in favour of a cessation of nuclear tests for all time.

14. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, before moving the adjournment, the Indian representative had made certain remarks of great political importance; it was accordingly proper for delegations to comment on them. After they had done so, he would call on two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion for adjournment, in accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure, since the Indian delegation's motion for adjournment came under that rule rather than under rule 119.

15. Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic) felt certain misgivings about that procedure. The Indian representative had requested the suspension of the debate under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, which laid down that such motions must be put to the vote immediately. Rule 117, which was also relevant, also implied that the debate could not be continued once a motion for adjournment had been made. Thus, what the Indian representative wanted was that any observations on his statement should be made to the Committee on Monday morning.

16. Mr. LALL (India) accepted the Chairman's interpretation that the motion he had made came under rule 117 of the rules of procedure. However, as the

representative of the United Arab Republic had pointed out, the discussion on the substance of the question must nevertheless stop immediately, since under rule 117 members of the Committee could now speak only on the motion for adjournment.

17. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he could not deny delegations wishing to reply to the Indian representative the right to do so, in so far as the latter's statement concerned them.

18. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that, if the Chairman now gave the floor to other delegations, other members would, in turn, wish to exercise the right of reply, and the Committee would, in fact, come to discuss the substance of the question without getting to the point of voting on the Indian motion. He was therefore of the opinion that that motion ought to be considered forthwith.

19. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as some delegations had already exercised their right of reply, he could not deny that right to other delegations.

20. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) wished to say a few words on both question of substance and procedure, which he found it difficult to dissociate.

21. He recalled the position of the United States and the United Kingdom and that of the Soviet Union and read the text of the declaration proposed by the Soviet Union representative. The Committee would undoubtedly realize that that declaration would commit the other two Powers to the Soviet interpretation, and that was unacceptable.

22. As regards the Indian motion, his delegation would oppose the adjournment, because it was time that the General Assembly made its views known and encouraged the efforts of the negotiators who had that very day begun their work in Geneva.

23. Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the most practical way in which the United Nations could carry out its responsibilities with regard to nuclear weapons tests would be by making a unanimous recommendation. He was convinced that a generally acceptable solution could be found and he considered that the Committee should continue to seek it. He accordingly supported the Indian delegation's motion for adjournment.

24. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) also believed that the issue was of such great importance that it was better to adjourn the debate so as to give the parties concerned time to find a solution.

25. Mr. BOUZA (Uruguay) regretted the failure to unanimity. He opposed the motion for adjournment, as he felt the Assembly ought to take an immediate decision in view of the fact that the Geneva conference was opening that very day.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian motion for the adjournment of the debate.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was rejected by 41 votes to 28, with 9 abstentions.

27. Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia) moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for the adjournment of the meeting was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.