

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE 971st  
MEETING**

Monday, 3 November 1958,  
at 3.55 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda items 64, 70 and 72:	
Question of disarmament (continued)	
The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests (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 (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .	143

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

**AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 AND 72**

**Question of disarmament (A/3929, A/3936, A/C.1/L.208, A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2) (continued)**

**The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests (A/3915) (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) (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
(continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee to explain their votes on the draft resolutions voted on by the Committee at the previous meeting.
2. Mr. ABDON (Iran) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 1 of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) because that paragraph did not make clear what would happen if a control system was not established following the Geneva conference or any subsequent conference.
3. His delegation had of course voted for the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205), of which it was a sponsor, in the hope that the vote would encourage the negotiations in Geneva and pave the way for further progress towards disarmament.
4. The delegation of Iran sincerely regretted that it had proved impossible to reach agreement on the compromise text which both sides had accepted in principle as a result of the strenuous efforts of the Indian and Yugoslav delegations. The insistence of the USSR that the three delegations concerned should make identical statements regarding the interpretation of

that draft resolution had prevented final understanding, although the United States and United Kingdom delegations had made great concessions by accepting a text which called upon the "nuclear Powers" immediately to discontinue the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and to proceed expeditiously with the further action set out in the draft resolution.

5. His delegation hoped that the Soviet Union had not said its final word on the subject and that a compromise solution which could be adopted unanimously in the General Assembly could still be found.

6. The efforts at conciliation should be continued, for unanimity in the General Assembly would undoubtedly have a beneficial influence on the course of the negotiations in Geneva, while a lack of unity might prejudice the success of the talks.

7. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had been guided in its votes on the draft resolutions dealing with disarmament, the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests and the reduction of the military budgets of the great Powers by the views expressed on those questions by Mr. Lange, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway, on 30 September 1958 at the 765th plenary meeting.

8. His delegation had co-sponsored the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205), which contained the main points made by Mr. Lange. It was glad that the draft resolution had been adopted.

9. His delegation had been prepared to vote in favour of the compromise text worked out by the Indian and Yugoslav delegations (968th meeting) because that text had seemed capable of ensuring unanimity on the question of nuclear tests, which was clearly the most important issue before the General Assembly at the current session. It was most regrettable that one of the parties principally concerned had not considered it possible to make the necessary concessions. A system of control must obviously be established as soon as possible and not at some indefinite time in the future. That was why his delegation had been unable to vote for the key paragraph in the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2).

10. His delegation had abstained on the paragraph in the Irish draft resolution (A/C.1/L.206) dealing with the danger inherent in the dissemination of nuclear weapons. While it shared the anxiety expressed by the Irish representative at the 970th meeting with respect to the increased insecurity which might result from an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons, his delegation did not think that the best way to solve that important problem was to set up a new committee to examine it. On the other hand, it agreed with the proposal made by the Irish delegation at the 970th meeting that the problem should be taken up by the new Disarmament Commission, which it

hoped would be established unanimously at the current session.

11. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Denmark) said that the votes his delegation had cast at the previous meeting had been consistent with the efforts it had always made to help in finding a solution to the disarmament problem. Because of the lack of confidence which today characterized relations between States and groups of States, only such measures of disarmament as were subject to effective control had any possibility of being applied. That was what had led his delegation to join the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution.

12. Moreover, that draft resolution, which showed the need for proceeding by stages and recommended a technical approach to the problems, was based on a realistic estimate of the present international situation. The main objective of its sponsors was general disarmament covering arms of all sorts.

13. The adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Austria, Japan and Sweden (A/C.1/L.213) made it possible to hope that the Geneva conference would lead to constructive results and that in the future the United Nations would, in conformity with the principles of the Charter, be able to co-operate in the vital field of disarmament.

14. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said his delegation regretted the character which the debate on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests had assumed in the last few days. It considered that the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2), of which it was a sponsor, reflected the desire of all the peoples for an immediate discontinuance of tests and regretted that the draft had had to be withdrawn because of the lack of adequate support for its main operative paragraph. It had abstained in the vote on the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205) because that draft did not provide for an immediate discontinuance of testing. While it appreciated the efforts of the Austrian, Japanese and Swedish delegations to prepare a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.213) which might obtain unanimous support, his delegation had abstained in the vote on that draft because it considered that the General Assembly should not only express the hope that the Geneva conference would be successful, but make more positive and concrete recommendations to the "nuclear Powers" concerned.

15. His delegation regretted that the result of the vote on the second paragraph of the Irish draft resolution (A/C.1/L.206) had obliged its sponsor to withdraw the entire draft, for an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons could only increase international tension.

16. His delegation had of course voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.211) concerning measures to prevent the possibility of surprise attack.

17. It had also voted in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.204 since that draft could have served as a basis for further study and negotiation on the general problem of disarmament.

18. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) said he earnestly hoped that the participants in the Geneva conference would take into account, not only the resolutions adopted

by the First Committee, but the deep anxiety of the peoples of the whole world which had been expressed in the debate.

19. Convinced that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests and general disarmament were problems which went far beyond political disputes based on ideological differences, his delegation had joined the sponsors of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2). It had abstained on the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205) because that draft would not enable the United Nations to take a positive stand with respect to the Geneva conference and because its recommendation with regard to the suspension of nuclear tests did not cover any potential Powers that might later join the group of countries already testing and manufacturing nuclear weapons.

20. His delegation had abstained on the draft resolution submitted by the Austrian, Japanese and Swedish delegations (A/C.1/L.213) because the adoption of that too moderate text might give the impression that the General Assembly was inclined to be passive.

21. It had also abstained on the USSR draft resolution regarding the reduction of the military budgets of the great Powers (A/C.1/L.204) because the agreement of the Powers concerned was indispensable.

22. It had voted for the second paragraph of the Irish draft resolution (A/C.1/L.206) and regretted that that draft resolution had not been adopted.

23. He recalled that during the general debate his delegation had proposed (955th meeting) the adoption of a declaration of principle prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons for military purposes. Since its appeal had found little response, his delegation was withdrawing its proposal, which it reserved the right to resubmit at a later date.

24. Mr. PERDOMO (Honduras) felt that, in view of certain false and slanderous statements by the Soviet delegation which had been published in The New York Times, he should explain why the Honduran delegation had voted for the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205).

25. While the draft resolution was perhaps not an exact reflection of the sentiments of mankind it was, among all those which had been submitted, the one which held out prospects for a proper solution of the various problems under consideration. It was obvious that, unless they were provided with the guarantee of an effective system of international control, those Powers which were acting in good faith would have no way of checking on the actions of dishonest negotiating partners. A further virtue of the draft resolution was that it called attention to the urgency of achieving the widest possible measure of agreement in the study of the technical aspects of measures against the possibility of surprise attack.

26. The principal defect of the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) was that it did not make the suspension of nuclear weapons tests subject to any kind of international control in the event that one of the parties obstructed the conclusion of an agreement.

27. The USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.203 and Corr.1), for propaganda purposes, called for the immediate, unconditional cessation of nuclear weapons

tests without making such cessation dependent on the outcome of the negotiations the initiation of which it recommended.

28. The Honduran delegation had also voted against the Soviet draft resolution on the reduction of the great Powers' military budgets (A/C.1/L.204) because no provision was made for a careful study of the budgets of the States concerned or for a system of control.

29. It had abstained from the vote on the second paragraph of the Irish draft resolution (A/C.1/L.206) because, while it was true that the dissemination of nuclear weapons increased the dangers inherent in their existence, only negligible results would be obtained if the "nuclear Powers" were permitted to go on manufacturing such weapons. The draft would have the effect of discriminating in favour of the "nuclear Powers" and granting them a kind of monopoly.

30. The Honduran delegation had voted for the draft resolution submitted by Austria, Japan and Sweden (A/C.1/L.213) because it expressed the desire of all peace-loving peoples.

31. The Honduran delegation categorically rejected the assertion that the United States had brought pressure to bear on certain delegations to vote for the seventeen-Power draft resolution. For its part, the Honduran delegation had not been subjected to any pressure. The Latin-American countries were not colonies of the United States. The treaties which they had signed with the United States had been concluded on the basis of equality, and their sovereignty was fully respected; that was not true of relations between the USSR and its satellites.

32. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the explanations of the vote had been completed, called upon the Committee to proceed to consideration of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution on the composition of the Disarmament Commission (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1) and of the Mexican draft resolution calling for an informal meeting of the representatives of the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the USSR (A/C.1/L.208).

33. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the United States delegation supported the French amendments (A/C.1/L.212) to the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution.

34. His delegation proposed, together with the United Kingdom delegation, an amendment adding to the draft resolution a paragraph 5 which would read as follows:

"5. Decides that the Disarmament Commission shall be governed by rule 162 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure and that its first meeting shall be convened by the Secretary-General after consultation with the members".<sup>1/</sup>

Under rule 162, the new body would be able to adopt its own rules of procedure after it had come into existence.

35. He asserted, in explanation of his proposal, that the rules which governed the twelve-member Disarmament Commission were not applicable to an eighty-one-member commission.

36. If the amendment which he had just submitted

was adopted, the United States would vote for the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution.

37. Mr. VEGA GOMEZ (El Salvador) said that the Salvadorian delegation would vote for the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1) with the amendment proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom.

38. Nevertheless, because of the amendment, it formally proposed that the words "and as a committee of the General Assembly" in paragraph 1 of the operative section should be deleted, since a committee of the General Assembly would remain in existence only until 31 December 1959; that could hardly be the intention of the amendment which had just been submitted.

39. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) said that, while the disarmament problem was one which affected all peoples in equal measure, it could be solved only by the great Powers, since they alone had the material means of unleashing a general war.

40. The Disarmament Commission had been unable to discharge its responsibilities because of the USSR's stubborn opposition to every equitable solution which provided for mutual guarantees. The Soviet Government and its allies had sought unilateral disarmament by the Western Powers so that the Soviet Union would be left with indisputable superiority in conventional armaments and military manpower. It could be said that the Soviet Union had never agreed to an effective system of inspection because it had never intended to disarm.

41. At the twelfth session, when it had been proposed to increase the membership of the Disarmament Commission to twenty-five, the Cuban delegation had stated (888th meeting) that the solution of the problem did not depend on the composition of the Commission or of its Sub-Committee; the causes of the difficulty went deeper, and the more the membership of the Commission was increased, the more difficult it would be to reach a unanimous agreement. Events had borne out that contention. An eighty-one-member commission would surely end in failure; the Cuban delegation would therefore be unable to vote for the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1).

42. The Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.208), on the other hand, seemed quite logical. If the delegations of the countries concerned supported it, the Cuban delegation would vote for it. Otherwise, the Cuban delegation would abstain as a tribute to the generous motives which had inspired the Mexican delegation.

43. The Cuban delegation would vote for the amendments submitted by France (A/C.1/L.212) and by the United States and the United Kingdom because those amendments represented an improvement over the original text of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution.

44. It requested that paragraph 1 of the operative section be voted upon separately when the draft resolution was put to the vote.

45. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) felt that an eighty-one-member commission would be too large to deal with a problem as complex as that of disarmament. Nevertheless, he considered that the idea should be given a trial, since there was need for immediate action and it was difficult to find any other solution. It was understood that such a commission would be es-

<sup>1/</sup> Subsequently distributed as document A/C.1/L.215.

tablished on an ad hoc basis and that the General Assembly would have to review the situation at its next regular session. Moreover, the United Kingdom delegation attached particular importance to the fact that the new commission could establish such smaller committees and groups of experts as might be considered necessary.

46. With respect to the rules of procedure, those of the present Disarmament Commission were inappropriate for a body of eighty-one members. For that reason, his delegation had joined with the United States delegation in proposing the amendment which had been read out by Mr. Lodge. If it was adopted, and subject to the understandings he had indicated, the United Kingdom would vote for the draft resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1).

47. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) stated that the experience of the preceding year had shown that the setting up of United Nations machinery which could be used for outvoting one of the major Powers and the minority of Member States could serve no useful purpose. He urged the Committee to be guided by that experience in its appraisal of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1) and the proposed amendments to it.

48. The Polish delegation would support that text, which had the advantage of placing no limitations nor unnecessary precision on the organization, procedure and conduct of work of the new Commission. Each United Nations body was the master of its own procedure. It was difficult to see any reason for departing from that principle in the case of the Disarmament Commission. The amendment submitted by France to operative paragraph 1 was entirely unnecessary since its adoption could create the impression that there was a tendency in the United Nations to forward all disarmament problems to technical groups, where they would be subjected to endless arguments while the armaments race went on.

49. Operative paragraph 2 of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution was fully justified. On the other hand, the amendments which France proposed with regard to that paragraph could only limit the Disarmament Commission's freedom of action and might well impede any constructive efforts which might be made towards partial solutions.

50. The Polish delegation considered that the Commission should be established on a permanent basis. It accordingly supported the request for a separate vote on the words "for 1959 on an ad hoc basis and as a committee of the General Assembly" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

51. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that bodies comprising a large number of members were useful for purposes of supervision and control, whereas action was the proper function of small bodies or individuals.

52. The responsibility for disarmament lay with the great Powers, but the small Powers had an interest in following step by step the progress achieved and in establishing before world public opinion the responsibility of those who, by their acts, were obstructing the achievement of disarmament. The proposal of India and Yugoslavia was therefore appropriate, especially as it was consistent with the principles of the Charter, which laid on the United Nations the obligation to con-

sider the question of disarmament. By adopting that two-Power draft resolution, the Committee would reaffirm the competence of the General Assembly in the matter and would establish a body endowed with moral authority. It would perhaps be argued that a large commission might be exposed to propaganda manoeuvres, but delegations were surely able to distinguish readily between proposals which were nothing more than propaganda and those which contained constructive elements.

53. Turning to a consideration of the amendments which had been submitted, he pointed out that the first French amendment (A/C.1/L.212, para. 1) was unnecessary, since the Disarmament Committee had the right to set up working committees or groups of experts whenever it deemed them necessary.

54. The amendment proposing to alter the wording of operative paragraph 2 (A/C.1/L.212, para. 2) involved no change of substance: it was obvious that disarmament should be effective and balanced and everyone knew that only the "Powers directly concerned" had the last word in any disarmament negotiations. The Peruvian delegation would therefore vote in favour of that amendment.

55. The Peruvian delegation would also vote for the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom, since the rules of procedure of the present Disarmament Commission were not applicable to an eighty-one-member commission.

56. Lastly, it joined other delegations in recommending the deletion of the words "for 1959 on an ad hoc basis and as a committee of the General Assembly" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

57. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, on the whole, the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia was acceptable to his delegation. He supported the proposal to delete the words "and as a committee of the General Assembly", and, like the Polish representative, called for a separate vote on the words "for 1959 on an ad hoc basis".

58. The French amendments appeared to prejudice the trend of the Commission's work and the procedure it would follow. However, it was not for the General Assembly to decide at the present stage what the proposed commission's method of work would be. The experience gained from establishing sub-committees had been unfortunate, and if the General Assembly adopted the first French amendment his delegation would be unable to participate in the work of the new commission. It was already sufficiently clear from the statements of various representatives that the composition of the proposed working committee would be similar to that of the former Sub-Committee.

59. There was no justification for the second French amendment. The original text was sufficiently explicit and the new wording proposed for paragraph 2 added nothing that was really new. Moreover, that amendment did not lead the Commission in the right direction, since it expressed a purely Western point of view, as borne out by the expression "effective and balanced disarmament".

60. The Soviet delegation did not consider that the amendment proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom was justified. However, in a spirit of compromise, it would be prepared to accept the amend-

ment if it was amended to read as follows:

"5. Decides that the first meeting of the Disarmament Commission shall be convened by the Secretary-General after consultation with the Member States and that the Commission, bearing in mind rule 162 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, shall adopt its own rules of procedure."

61. He also proposed that operative paragraph 4 of the draft should be amended by the insertion of the words "to the Security Council and" after the words "Requests the Disarmament Commission to convene as appropriate and to submit". That amendment was entirely consistent with the procedure followed in the past by the Disarmament Commission, which had always reported to the Security Council and the General Assembly. It was the Security Council, after all, which bore the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the solution of disarmament problems.

62. Mr. LALL (India) presented the latest version of the draft resolution which his delegation had submitted jointly with the delegation of Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2). It was a new revision which took into account the wishes of several delegations. Thus, the words "and as a committee of the General Assembly", whose deletion had been proposed by the representative of El Salvador, did not appear in the new text. Paragraph 2 of the previous version (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.1) had been dropped. It would therefore be unnecessary to consider further the second French amendment, since it related to that paragraph. The first French amendment, relating to operative paragraph 1, had not been incorporated in the latest version, as it was clear that the Disarmament Commission would be free to establish any body it considered useful.

63. It would be for the Disarmament Commission to formulate its own rules of procedure. However, there was some analogy between a commission of eighty-one Members of the General Assembly and a main committee of the Assembly, so that a reference to rule 162 of the Assembly's rules of procedure would not be entirely out of place. Since the position of the Soviet Union delegation was not far removed from that of the United States and United Kingdom delegations, it would surely be possible to find a wording for the paragraph proposed by Mr. Lodge which would be satisfactory to all delegations. So amended, the revised draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia would undoubtedly be acceptable to the whole Committee.

64. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) considered that, even with the amendments submitted by France, the United States, the United Kingdom and El Salvador, the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia was not an ideal solution, but that it might enable a satisfactory solution to be found if it were combined with the proposal of the Mexican delegation.

65. His delegation felt that there was no justification for claiming, as the Polish representative had done, that the French amendments prejudged the solution of the disarmament problem. On the other hand, it might be better to omit paragraph 1 of the text of those amendments (A/C.1/L.212), as well as paragraph 2 (b).

66. As for the rules of procedure to govern the work of the Disarmament Commission, he believed that

the fears expressed by the United States and the United Kingdom on the one hand, and by the Soviet Union on the other, were not justified, since the terms of rule 162 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure were such as to dispel any misgivings of that nature.

67. Lastly, it was unnecessary to specify, as the Soviet Union representative wished to do, that the Disarmament Commission should submit its proposals and recommendations to the General Assembly and the Security Council, since Articles 11 and 26 of the Charter of the United Nations were clear enough to remove any fears in that regard.

68. It was his delegation's opinion that the Committee should not go into details and should adopt a draft resolution which would be flexible and would take into account all the constructive comments that had been made. Those taking part in the informal meeting proposed by the Mexican delegation in its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.208) could then consider the course of action to be recommended to the Disarmament Commission, which would make the final decision.

69. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) proposed, in a spirit of compromise, that the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom delegations should be replaced by the following text:

"Decides that the first meeting of the Disarmament Commission shall be convened by the Secretary-General after consultation with the Member States and that the Commission, having begun its activities under rule 162 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and taking that rule into account, shall adopt its own rules of procedure."

70. The United States delegation was also willing to accept the insertion of the words "to the Security Council and" after the words "and to submit" in operative paragraph 3. On the other hand, it was opposed to the deletion of the words "for 1959 and on an ad hoc basis" from operative paragraph 1.

71. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was prepared to accept the new wording of the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom, although he did not consider it entirely satisfactory.

72. Mr. LALL (India) stated, on behalf of the Yugoslav and Indian delegations, that he accepted the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom.

73. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) regretted that the appeal of the French representative (964th meeting) had not been heard and that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not taken into account the French amendment to operative paragraph 1. That refusal to make the necessary clarifications was not reassuring for the future. Nor was the fact that agreement on paragraph 2 had proved impossible a happy augury for the new Disarmament Commission's future work.

74. In view of the assurances given by the sponsor of the draft resolution and by the representative of Peru, the French delegation would not press its amendments to the vote. In those circumstances, however, it would not be able to vote in favour of the amended draft resolution since it considered that text to be a sham.

75. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) said that

his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia as amended, but with considerable reluctance. In any case, the delegation of the Union of South Africa could not have agreed to the establishment of the proposed commission on a permanent basis, as the representatives of the Soviet Union and Poland wished.

76. He was glad to note that operative paragraph 2 of the original draft resolution had been deleted, since it merely duplicated operative paragraph 4 of the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205).

77. Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain) would vote in favour of the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia. His delegation would have voted in favour of that draft resolution even without the amendments, because in its opinion the text constituted a step forward towards the solution of the disarmament problem.

78. Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic) proposed that the Committee should proceed to the vote.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised text of the draft resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2), incorporating the revised text of the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom.

80. In accordance with the request of the representative of Cuba, the Chairman called on the Committee to vote separately on operative paragraph 1.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 2 abstentions. 2/

81. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia, as amended, so as to make it possible for the draft to be adopted in near unanimity and to enable the United Nations to carry out its responsibilities in the matter of disarmament. Nevertheless, his delegation thought that the study of the disarmament question required a smaller body than a commission composed of eighty-one members. For that reason it was prepared to agree to the establishment of such a commission on an ad hoc basis only. He would point out that the third paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution did not imply any commitment to continue those ad hoc arrangements after 1959.

82. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) read the revised text 3/ of the draft resolution originally submitted by the Mexican delegation as document A/C.1/L.208. He wished to remind the Committee that the draft resolution dealt only with a procedural matter and left the parties concerned entirely free to choose the ways and means of resuming negotiations.

2/ See 972nd meeting, para. 11.

3/ Subsequently distributed as document A/C.1/L.208/Rev.1.

83. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the adoption of the Mexican draft resolution would be inappropriate now that the Committee had decided to set up a Disarmament Commission composed of eighty-one members. The Soviet delegation would therefore be unable to participate in the work of the committee proposed in that draft resolution, which sought to replace the Disarmament Commission itself with a body which would predetermine the Commission's work. Without being opposed to the idea of informal conversations on the work of the Commission in general, the Soviet delegation would vote against the Mexican draft resolution.

84. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) thought that it might perhaps be better if the Mexican representative withdrew his draft resolution since the Soviet Union representative was not prepared to take part in the proposed committee.

85. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that during the general debate (957th meeting) he had stated that he was in favour of the Mexican draft resolution. However, in view of the adoption of the draft resolution of India and Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union representative's decision not to take part in the negotiations contemplated in the Mexican proposal, his delegation had decided to abstain during the vote on the Mexican draft resolution.

86. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) considered that the Mexican representative's purpose in submitting his draft resolution had been achieved, since the Soviet Union representative had said he was ready to take part in informal consultations of the kind envisaged in the Mexican draft resolution. Accordingly, in the opinion of the Irish delegation, it would be preferable for the Mexican representative to withdraw his draft resolution.

87. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) wished to ask the representative of the Soviet Union to clarify his attitude and confirm that he was willing to take part in informal discussions with the representatives of the United States, France and the United Kingdom; if that was so, the purpose of the Mexican delegation would have been achieved.

88. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) regretted that the representative of the Soviet Union had rejected the invitation contained in the Mexican proposal, the sole purpose of which was to help to bring closer together the representatives of the States primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, while at the same time reaffirming the unquestionable competence of the General Assembly of the United Nations in the matter of disarmament.

89. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote a motion to adjourn the meeting made by Mr. ABDOH (Iran).

The motion was adopted by 72 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.