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The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As you will all recall, at the end of this morning's meeting the representative of Afghanistan asked us to adjourn our meeting; and the Chairman was entrusted with the task of trying to present to the Committee a possible solution to this lengthy debate. This debate has been devoted to the procedural matter of deciding the order in which we will discuss the items on the agenda. Although the matter may seem to be procedural, I am sure that my friend and colleague, the representative of Afghanistan, will agree with me that this problem has great political implications, and therefore is rather difficult for the Chairman to solve. However, in a great effort of understanding and goodwill I have tried to find out the views of the representatives of the countries primarily concerned in this matter. Especially I have tried to find out the views of those delegations submitting resolutions or suggestions such as the United States, the Soviet Union, Panama and Mexico -- although the last two countries made basically similar suggestions.

Now, to see if a compromise solution was possible, in the conversations that took place I took the liberty of suggesting two alternatives, and since they were compromise alternatives we would take into account the two different positions that were taken at yesterday's meetings and at today's meeting. One of these alternatives, suggested by the Chair, is the following. We would hold a general debate on the three following items: the question of disarmament, the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and the reduction of the military budgets, leaving for a later stage -- when, in accordance with the usage of the United Nations, after the general debate one goes on to the discussion of the resolutions that may have been submitted -- the decision on how the discussion and the votes on the resolution submitted would take place.

This suggestion is based on the idea that even though resolutions have been submitted it is possible that new resolutions may be submitted in due course, because this is an extremely complex subject which, as one can see, is covered by three different items in our agenda and has in the past given rise to a number of resolutions and no doubt will do so in the future. At this point we are only seized of two drafts, but in the corridors we have heard rumours of additional resolutions to be submitted. Only when we know these resolutions -- as we may at the end of two weeks, when the general debate on the three items has been completed -- will we be able to gauge our position and decide whether we are going
to discuss and resolve these problems as one, two or three. Well, to take any number, suppose nine draft resolutions are submitted in the end. When we finish our general debate on the three items, we might take three of these draft resolutions -- and I am still giving a hypothetical case -- and decide that these three should be discussed first and voted on first. Then we proceed to discuss and to vote on another group of resolutions, and so on, until we finish all the resolutions submitted. This was one idea that I took the liberty of putting before the delegations concerned.
Taking into account the different views expressed in the Committee, another alternative would be as follows: A general discussion will take place on the three subjects, as proposed by the delegation of Panama and supported by the delegation of Mexico. Then, once we have agreed on this, we will take the draft resolutions in groups in the following order: first, draft resolutions on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests; secondly, draft resolutions on the reduction of the military budgets; and thirdly, draft resolutions on the question of disarmament.

In general, as you see, I have taken in both cases part of the Soviet suggestion and part of the United States suggestion. I know that this was also done by the representative of Panama, except that I am changing the order suggested by him for the discussion and final vote on the draft resolutions. Naturally, if we accept the Panamanian proposal, we can say that there is nothing left of the Soviet proposal, and we will have to concede something to both sides so that it can be called a compromise. Furthermore, I recognize one fact, which was also recognized by the Secretariat -- and this was stressed in my short statement yesterday -- that it would redound to the benefit of this body if it could encourage and help the great Powers that will meet on 31 October at Geneva to consider the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. Perhaps a general debate on all the items and on all the draft resolutions and a vote on all these questions might carry us much further than 31 October.

As I said earlier, I made these alternative suggestions to the delegations concerned. But I must tell my colleague from Afghanistan that unfortunately my efforts were in vain. I did not succeed in bringing their views together. Therefore, I am afraid that the matter has to be thrown open again to the Committee. It was impossible to achieve a successful result to our conversations. Consequently, I shall have to continue with the speakers' list that was interrupted this morning.
Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, as I understood from your statement, you expressed the thought that since it had been impossible to reach a compromise the delegations should perhaps be called upon to express their views on the two proposals contained in your statement. Perhaps the Committee might wish to hear the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union on these points. We might be assisted in our general debate by hearing their views. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in particular would then be happy to give its views.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation in Spanish): In accordance with the request of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR and because of the importance of this matter and the importance of the participation in this discussion of the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, I shall take the liberty of calling on the representatives of these countries. I call first on the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I wish to express heartfelt gratitude to you for your efforts in the last few hours to find an acceptable solution to the controversial question of our Committee's procedure. For our part, we have also made an effort to find such an acceptable solution.

Of all the alternatives which you set forth, the Soviet delegation can accede to the second one, which is a genuine compromise capable of meeting the views of both sides. The delegation of the United States had in fact proposed that we begin a general debate on the three items concurrently. The Soviet delegation proposed that we begin the discussion on concrete items and that, as the first item, we deal with the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. In the proposal which you set forth as a second alternative, these two positions are duly taken into account. On the one hand, the position of the United States is met to the effect that there is need of a general debate on all three questions, and you, Mr. Chairman, in fact proposed that we begin with a general debate on these three questions. In these circumstances, however, if this alone were to be
done, then the views of the delegation of the Soviet Union and of a number of other delegations would be completely ignored. You proposed that when the draft resolutions were discussed they should be grouped by items and that in the first group we should deal separately with the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. Even though this does not satisfy the Soviet and other delegations which have pressed for priority consideration and solution of the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, still it can be acceptable to us none the less, if a spirit of compromise is to preside over our actions.

Guided by a spirit of compromise and eager to move our Committee's deliberations forward as swiftly as possible, we think that the second alternative set forth by the Chairman is the minimum acceptable. Under this proposal, there would be a general debate on the three items, which would be agreeable to the delegation of the United States and the other delegations that supported it, and then concrete draft resolutions related to each of the items would be taken up by groups, and the first of these would be draft resolutions on the item of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. This is all the more important as on this question, of course, a decision should be adopted by us before 31 October. It should be possible to achieve that end if the second alternative is adopted.

I am therefore profoundly grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for your efforts. At the same time, I wish to declare that the second alternative, which apparently basically reproduces the views of the delegation of Panama and, to some degree, of Mexico, is the minimum acceptable to us.

I would appeal to the delegation of the United States to be guided by the same spirit of co-operation and compromise, to do likewise and to accede to this proposal.

As for the first alternative which you, Mr. Chairman outlined, it is not acceptable to the Soviet Union because it could be tantamount to leaving unsolved the main issue: when and in what order decisions are to be adopted on all the questions in which we are interested, and especially on the question as to whether we will be in a position to adopt any decisions on the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and, if so, when.
To postpone a solution of this question, to leave it up in the air, would, in our opinion, be very ill-advised. Concrete resolutions have been proposed on this question. We are all fully prepared to discuss them, and there is no reason to postpone consideration of the question as to when and how we are to do so.

That is why we consider unacceptable this first alternative, which leaves the question unsolved and problematical. On this question, a solution of this kind would not be acceptable to us. The question of the cessation of test explosions can and indeed must be solved in short order. The foundations for this have been laid. Postponing this question is, in our opinion, quite impossible. If other delegations think that the cessation of test explosions should in some way be deferred, let them say so openly.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Let me first say that there is absolutely no foundation for the statements which have been made here today that the United States desires a new item or that the United States desires to reword existing items or that we are going to ask for a meeting of the General Committee. I really think I know what the United States proposal is, and I think I am in a better position to describe it than are those who have described it so erroneously.

The proposal of the United States, if adopted, would mean that the agenda of the First Committee would read as follows -- and I shall read it out with all the punctuation marks, so that Members can be perfectly clear as to what our proposal is:

1. "Question of disarmament."
2. "The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests."
3. "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 - 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries."

That is how the agenda of the Committee would read if our proposal were adopted.
We think that these three items could be considered together, and each representative could deal with them as he saw fit. He could discuss them separately; he could take them up in any order he wished; he could talk about all three in one speech. It is obvious that these three items are inter-related. All of them deal with different aspects of disarmament. We think that the most practical and most efficient way to deal with them is the way that I have proposed. It does not prejudice in any way the Committee's eventual decision as a result of our discussion.

As far as the questions raised by the representatives of Mexico and Panama are concerned -- and, as I understand it, they did not make proposals but they raised questions -- we think that the Committee should decide at the time in what order it wishes to take up specific resolutions. We could not decide today in what order to take up resolutions if we wanted to, because we do not know what all the resolutions are. Two resolutions are pending, but I know of one which has not been introduced yet but which will be introduced, and I have heard rumours of several others.

Of course, it is an absolute impossibility for us to decide this afternoon in what order we are going to take up the resolutions when we end our general debate. The only time we can make that decision is after the general debate is over -- and then we can decide it in the light of the debate, which we hope will lead to some enlightenment, and in the light of the resolutions which are before us at the time. I do not think we can say now that, when the general debate is over, we are going to limit ourselves to resolutions which correspond exactly to the limits of each agenda item. It seems to me that, if a representative wants to introduce a resolution which deals with subjects that are included in various agenda items, he has a right to do so. That happens here all the time. To seek to limit the discussion in that respect would, we think, be self-defeating. We do not think that the question of tests should be singled out and put first, either today or after the general debate is over. We say that because we think that tests are part of the whole contemplation, and also because we do not think that tests are by any means the most dangerous aspect of this whole question. Furthermore, we do not think that a proposal to put tests first can be accurately called a procedural motion.
It follows from what I have said that we would be agreeable to the Chairman's first compromise proposal, which would have a general debate on these three items together and then leave for a later stage the question of how we will deal with the resolutions. We think that is a good compromise, and we would support that.

Mr. Noble (United Kingdom): The Chairman has explained to us very clearly the two proposals which are now before the Committee, and I think that the Committee is also fully seized of the points of view that have been expressed here. I therefore suggest that the Committee should come to a decision on these proposals, and that the proposals should be put to the vote as soon as convenient.

My delegation will support the first of the two proposals, namely, that we should have a general debate on the three items together and should then decide how to deal with all those resolutions which may have been submitted.
Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I take it, Mr. Chairman, that we have now come to the resumption of the debate on the procedural aspect of the item.

It is my pleasant duty to offer the congratulations of my delegation, along with so many others that have been expressed here, to you and to the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur on your election to your respective high offices.

I deeply regret that we cannot congratulate ourselves very much on the state which this debate has now reached. This is one of the items before the Assembly upon which the entire Assembly lays great stress as to both its importance and its urgency. Normally, on a procedural debate, it is not usual to enter into the merits of the question or even deeply into the aspects that do not relate to anything but the strict procedural point before us. But because of the importance of this matter, because of the way in which the two points of view were introduced in the beginning and because of the latitude that has been allowed to previous speakers, a large number of questions of merit have been introduced and we can no longer regard this merely as a procedural discussion.

This morning the meeting adjourned with a request from the representative of Afghanistan for you to find a way whereby there should be no division in the Committee on this subject, and you were good enough to call in our delegation during the recess because India has introduced draft resolutions on one of these subjects and, at past sessions as well as at the present session, has expressed itself as a very concerned party. We submitted our views to you. Normally speaking, our delegation refrains from participating in procedural discussions or from seeking a vote unless driven to that position.

So far as the matters before us are concerned, this morning the representative of Panama made a suggestion that the debate on these items should be simultaneous. Now we hear from the United States representative that that is what was meant by his suggestion so that therefore there was no question of the introduction of a new item. That clears away what may be called a constitutional difficulty, because even if that was the motion it was impossible for you, from the chair, to rule that the decision of the General Committee or the endorsement thereof by the General Assembly should be put on one side and that we could introduce a new item or lump items together.
I have no desire to elaborate on this except to say that the position we have now reached seems to be that there should be simultaneity of discussion -- that the three items of the agenda appearing as items 4, 7 and 8 in document A/C.1/PV.944 should be debated simultaneously. That appears to be common ground. I want to submit that once simultaneity is introduced sequence disappears. That is elementary logic. You cannot have simultaneity and sequence together. If you decide to discuss three items simultaneously, then you cannot go back to the agenda and say, "This is item 4, that is item 7 and the other is item 8". They have equal status. Therefore, all these items have equal priority. The Assembly has before it three items at the same time to which it should give attention and, what is more, the United States representative rightly pointed out that each representative may, in his view, deal with all these subjects, or with item 8 first and item 4 last, or vice versa.

All this points to the fact that any order of priority which exists on the agenda on account of the items being numbered 4, 7 and 8 will disappear once the Committee is seized of all the problems at the same time. The other question that is posed emerges in another way. My delegation is and has always been agreeable that -- if it was the general desire or even if there was an overwhelming desire -- the discussion of these items should take place simultaneously. That is purely a practical, procedural position because these debates overlap, and in Committee representatives usually intervene more than once and therefore no inconvenience or no violation of anyone's sentiments is involved.

Therefore yesterday, the day before yesterday when we heard about it, and today we have always been agreeable to the idea that this Committee might be seized of these three items simultaneously, and that the general debate could go on in this way. This means, of course, not only that there is no sequence but also that the resolution stage could not be reached unless the whole debate were over. It is not possible to introduce in the Committee -- not by circulation, but in the Committee -- a draft resolution on any single one of these items until the debate on all the three items is over because they are being debated at the same time.
That being the case, when we come to the resolution stage the question of priority emerges. Now you, Mr. Chairman, if I may say so with great respect, have made no compromise proposals before this Committee because a proposal is not a compromise if you offer two diametrically opposed suggestions. All that does is to shift the differences from one place to another. It is arguable that the differences are narrower, but nevertheless what you have put before us is two proposals. They no longer emerge from the United States or the Soviet Union, which in a way is rather convenient because one can vote for or against one or the other of your suggestions without being partial in any way. As I say, they are both your suggestions. But those two suggestions together do not make a compromise. They are irreconcilable, they are contradictory, and they spring from different approaches to this proposition. Therefore, all we can do -- and I invite the Committee to do this, whether it accepts it or not -- is to examine this question on its merits.

I want to suggest, Sir, first of all, that if there were only one item on the agenda, the disarmament question, then we could under that item discuss explosions, or tests, or the cutting down of budgets or the reduction of whatever it might be -- all those things that we have been discussing together. But the General Committee, in its wisdom, decided to have three specific items dealing with particular aspects of disarmament, and I submit, as a general proposition of law, that when you have a thing specifically stated it cannot be covered by a general rule. The General Committee said, "Discuss the disarmament question". Then it said, "Discuss tests and discuss whatever the other item is". That means that this corner has been cut off from the large block, and it cannot hereafter be argued that the disarmament question covers everything and that, therefore, an omnibus resolution under the heading of disarmament can cover explosions as well and can, accordingly, be brought up in that way.

That is one aspect of the merits of the question. The other aspect of the merits of the question relates to what the United States representative said just now. It is rather late in the day to argue that these test explosions do not exercise the minds of the vast majority of the peoples of the world. The overwhelming opinion in any country, irrespective of the views of the
representatives who are here, is demonstrably, overwhelmingly and urgently in
favour of the abandonment of these dangerous tests which are so inimical to
the progress of mankind and in the face of which no disarmament is possible.
And I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee could not disregard that
view except in the face of world public opinion and against the interests of
humanity.

Therefore, the test explosions take a different position. The second
consideration is that there has been a conference sitting in Geneva which, by
all accounts, has made some progress. At that conference the consideration of
these test explosions was among the main items. Any decision we reach on this
matter must be not merely the giving of a sentimental blessing to everything that
may succeed, because we all wish that. It must represent the gearing of the
opinion of the United Nations as a whole into the speedy discontinuance of these
tests so that there shall be no further test explosions. When that discontinuance
is permanently established that will be an assistance in promoting the progress
towards this very much desired consummation.
Assuming that there was only one item on the agenda for general debate -- which would be possible if a thing were discussed simultaneously -- in that sense there is one set of circumstances before us. Assuming that, the draft resolutions submitted gain priority by the time when they were submitted. Account must be taken of the draft resolutions which are now before the Committee and of those that will come hereafter, and they should come in the order of priority. And I submit that, under the particular rule which, I am sorry to say, in our opinion, we violate the spirit of too often, priority cannot be sought for a draft resolution under item (b) as under item (a). Priority may be sought for draft resolutions pertaining to the same item, but one cannot ask for priority for a draft resolution under another item or for a draft resolution already submitted under still another item. Therefore, I submit that we should agree to a simultaneous discussion of these matters, and when the draft resolution stage is reached, some draft resolutions will come under these various items. Some of them may overlap. At that time it may be possible for arrangements to be made for their co-ordination, and so on, but at the same time, the discussion on explosions should have priority in the consideration of the draft resolutions. My delegation has submitted a draft resolution which is first on the list of those submitted.

Speaking about draft resolutions which have been submitted, may I, with great humility, say that many resolutions have been adopted here, with the support of many distinguished delegations. They have all become dead letters because, while they have been carried by a large majority, they have not carried with them the one qualification that is required in establishing disarmament; and that is world-wide agreement.

Last year we submitted to this Committee and to the General Assembly a draft resolution saying that this question of the suspension of tests -- which has been jeopardized, which has been impeded by the fear on both sides that there may be undetectable tests -- ought to be met by technical examination, by a committee of technical experts, including the two views, these views to be presented purely on a technical level. We submitted what we thought was a proposition which would be beneficial to this Committee. The General Committee rejected it by, I believe, 34 votes to 24 and a large number of abstentions -- and I say here in passing that, both in the composition of the United Nations and from the way things are proceeding, these abstentions are becoming more and more significant than any
votes that may be cast. Therefore, the resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a minority of the Members present and voting, if you take into account the United Nations definition that an abstention is a vote. Now, several months later, we have the position in Geneva that this conception of trying to meet the test explosion business by technical examination agreement is wholesome. I say that not in any spirit of "I told you so", but simply to point out that the near adoption of a resolution by a majority is not always a proclamation of its final goodness.

Therefore, the submission of my delegation is that we welcome the suggestion made by the representative of the United States, or the substance of it -- I cannot fully agree that the interpretation which he has now given could be the interpretation, but I am prepared to accept that -- that there should be simultaneous discussion since that would avoid three different debates on disarmament. And in a Committee constituted like ours, it is very difficult for you, Mr. Chairman, however good and however strict you may be, to confine our efforts to strict rules of debate. Therefore, it really would mean three relays of debates, with bias on each of these questions at various times. Hence, we not only support, but welcome, the idea that there should be simultaneous discussion.

Secondly, we think that when we come to the draft resolution stage, draft resolutions should have priority after the manner that I have suggested; and I want to make a further appeal to the delegation of the United States -- because it is usually from that source that this practice springs -- not to invoke the rules of procedure asking for priority for draft resolutions submitted afterwards, except in exceptional instances. If the exceptional practice is made a general rule, then what is the use of the rules of procedure? Where does the minority come in in such a practice? What is the use of their devoting all their attention to trying to present their views as early as possible? Therefore, if there is any question of priority to be asked for, first of all, I hope that it will not be invoked unless it is absolutely necessary. It is no answer to say that you get a majority.

Finally, in view of the Conference at Geneva, and the fact that, at the present moment, it is a bilateral, trilateral, or quadrilateral Conference -- and I am not prepared to define at the present moment the size of this bilateral, trilateral, quadrilateral, or whatever it may be -- there is a problem which has
exercised the mind of the United Nations for the last ten years and which, even in these preceding days has been debated and argued by all of us as a most urgent problem. Therefore, whatever resolutions we may adopt, they are to make provision for the result at Geneva -- good, bad or indifferent; conclusive or inconclusive -- to come back to the thirteenth session. Otherwise, what are we doing? We have been debating something for ten years and have got nowhere. We have been debating disarmament for ten years, and the only result has been that the world is more armed today than ever and, what is more, its plans and prospects are worse than ever before. We have not decided anything. We abdicate our functions altogether. I am not a stickler for saying that everything must be decided in these halls. A matter of this kind must proceed according to international convention, and it is a matter in which it is not only the possessors of the bombs, those who have the power to destroy, who are in large numbers, but also those who have not the power to destroy and, even more, those who do not want the power to destroy, the victims of this particular device, who are the vast populations of the world in every single country. Therefore, we cannot say that, on this question, it cannot be left to bilateral, trilateral, or quadrilateral discussion.

From all accounts, it is now obvious that the longer we go on, the greater becomes the danger of this evil spreading in the world. We used to talk about "the third country" problem; and the third country got into the hydrogen class. Now we speak of "the fourth country" problem. It will get into the hydrogen club. Then we would talk about "the 'n' country" problem. Therefore, the possibility of this instrument of mass destruction getting into the hands of large numbers of people where control becomes more difficult, where the complexities in arriving at international agreement become more complicated, increases.

To summarize, I would say that my delegation welcomes the idea of a simultaneous debate on these items. We submit that, once the Committee is seized of these items simultaneously, the priority that is conferred by the numerals to which Mr. Lodge made reference ceases to have any meaning or contact. The simultaneity rubs out sequence -- if there is simultaneity at all.

When we come to the draft resolution stage, it is our submission that priority ought to be decided (a) on the political and other merits, having in mind the meeting at Geneva, having in mind that the consideration of the draft
resolution submitted on a prior occasion should have priority, and (b), to go on to another set of observations which I made, that whatever may be the results of the discussions at Geneva -- and we all hope that they will be results concerning which we can feel elated and congratulate ourselves -- they should come back here to the thirteenth session.

Before I conclude these observations, we should also not forget that one of these items, inscribed at the Secretary-General's request, is disarmament -- by which I presume it means the whole question of machinery, its organization, what has happened in the past, what will happen in the future, etc. It is our experience that, on the last occasion, in spite of the great efforts made by all concerned, including those who supported the majority in adopting the resolution, we were not able to reach a decision that was useful. A resolution was adopted reconstituting the Disarmament Commission. It was adopted by an overwhelming majority and, in order not to create further disharmony, many delegations, including ours, abstained and did not vote against it, because we did not want to take away the benefit of doubt or of hope by saying that even that imperfect instrument would work. But the last twelve months have shown that the reconstituted Disarmament Commission could not perform its functions within the scope of the General Assembly resolution.
Therefore, instead of this majority resolution driven through and passed by the General Assembly having the effect of galvanizing the Disarmament Commission and of providing a more representative instrument that could have worked towards an agreement, it resulted in the taking of this issue entirely out of the ambit of the United Nations discussion. Now we have to recover it, not because of any particular virtue in decisions reached here, but because the decisions are of a character that affects the entire membership of this Organization, the victims even more than those who are in a position to inflict harm, because the victims are universal and the others are only a section.

The Chairman was good enough to call upon my delegation and we have submitted these views that there should be simultaneous discussion, that the resolution stage should be kept separate and that priority should be as I have submitted. This is the submission I wish to make to delegations, and once again I wish to appeal in this procedural discussion that we should not, in this vital matter, be governed by a partisan spirit. My delegation refuses to accept the view that there are two sides and only two sides. The sides in this question number as many as there are people in this world. Therefore, I should like to request once again that we come to an agreement on this matter which will make it possible for us to respond to the urgent and very grave concern of the populations of the world and to proceed with this item in the way I have indicated.

Mr. Lodge (United States of America): On a point of order. I can certainly agree with what the representative of India has said that there should be a general debate on these items together and that the decision on the priority of the resolutions be taken on their merits after the debate is over. In order to bring matters to a head and to clarify the proceedings I therefore move that the Committee decide that a general debate be held on items 4, 7 and 8 together and that the decision on the priority of the resolutions be made on their merits after the general debate is over.
Mr. Krishna Menon (India): On a point of order. I do not know whether the Chairman intends to close the discussion.

The Chairman (interpretation from Spanish): If points of order are really submitted as points of order, then I am willing to call on you. The representative of India has said he has a point of order.

Mr. Krishna Menon (India): I have given you no reason to think that a point of order would not be a point of order. If it is intended to close the debate now and if the draft resolution is going to be put to the vote, my delegation wishes to say here and now that it should be put in two parts.

The Chairman (interpretation from Spanish): It appears to me that what the representative of the United States has done is somewhat to modify one of the suggestions of the Chair. That was what I referred to when I mentioned points of order that may or may not be points of order. We will take this into account, as well as the suggestion of the representative of India, when the time for voting arrives.

I should like also to appeal to the representatives, since this is already the third meeting which has been devoted to procedural questions, to be as brief as possible in their statements so that we can begin the discussion tomorrow.

Mr. Enckell (Finland) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, it is an honour for me to add the congratulations and good wishes of the Finnish delegation to those that have already been expressed to you on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We extend the same good wishes and congratulations to our distinguished Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

In the quest for a practical and reasonable solution to the question before us, my delegation has looked at the concrete facts and data we possess in a spirit of objectivity which, faithful to the traditional policy of Finland, my delegation has always tried to display here.

We have before us two draft resolutions dealing with the continuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. Of course, I shall not refer to the merits of these texts, but would merely note that one of these texts proposes, inter alia,
that we should make certain recommendations to the representatives of the nuclear Powers who are to meet at Geneva on 31 October of this year. Obviously, it is up to them in the first instance to find a solution of this serious problem. It goes without saying, therefore, that we should pronounce ourselves on this text before the Geneva Conference begins on 31 October. It is now 9 October, and, therefore, we should reach the vote on this text within three weeks, but unless we organize our work properly it may be difficult for us to do so. Therefore, it would only be reasonable for us to arrange matters in such a way that we can deal with this question and arrive at the vote before 31 October. My delegation hopes that this Committee will act in this manner and that a decision will be reached without, perhaps, the necessity for a vote.

A vote on a procedural question is unlikely to conciliate the points of view that are pitted against each other. We should like to contribute so far as possible to composing these differences, and I have simply put forward certain considerations of a practical nature which seem to us worthy of being brought out. On this occasion, I will refrain from pronouncing myself on the relationship between the discontinuance of tests and the general problem of disarmament.

Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with the views expressed by the people of Peru, I should like to take the liberty of expressing the consternation and pain that has been felt in my country and in other countries of Latin America which have the same religion at the death of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. In the last years, tremendous forces have been unleashed, forces obeying the will for power or material interests and utilizing the most brutal types of violence. Desolate humanity has sought to restore the sense of spiritual values. That is our hope. That was the hope of all men who watched aghast the great tragedy that began in 1939. If one man has represented that return to spiritual values, that man without doubt was Pope Pius XII. Not only because of his Christian ideals, his constant efforts and his heroic life for peace, not only because of his profound feeling for humanity, regardless of sects, beliefs or religions, but because he was a great spiritual figure of these years, I believe
that the United Nations, through you, Mr. Chairman, was well advised to express
the sympathy which today is felt by humanity all over the world.

Very briefly, in order to try to bring together the differing points of view,
I should like to refer to the question under discussion. Sadly I must say that
in matters of procedure we always seem unwittingly to bring in a few principles
of prestige or some ideas of position. That, I think, should be avoided.
Fortunately, we do agree on one point, and that is that the general debate should be carried out simultaneously on all three aspects of the main question of disarmament. The relationship of these aspects with the main problem itself and the question of whether one of these parts is a determining factor in the problem or warrants special, or even perhaps exclusive, consideration will be clarified in the course of the debate on disarmament. Let us, therefore, take advantage of the generally expressed desire for simultaneity of debate; the differences of opinion will come later.

There are two views regarding the draft resolutions. One is that the draft resolutions could be classified according to their contents and separated as items 4, 7 and 8 are in the agenda. This would be a type of pigeon-holing, and we would put these draft resolutions into the pigeon-holes as they come. Of course, we would have to decide now on such a pigeon-holing process.

However, there is another view, which I think is more appropriate, more prudent and more in keeping with the old saying that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. In other words, let us cross each bridge when we come to it. Unless we take a vote, though it may disturb some of the parties, we shall never arrive at a solution.

However, if we merely agree today that the debate is to begin, then later by a gentleman's agreement and in all good faith and confidence, when the debate is over, the order of the draft resolutions will be taken in accordance with the way in which the debate leads us, the number of draft resolutions submitted and the nature of the draft resolutions themselves. Instead of deciding today definitely which draft resolution should have priority -- which I think would be much too formalistic and rather blind -- let us follow the English concept of solving problems as they crop up, and when we deal with them we shall take into account the information that has been presented.

When the debate is over, we shall have certain elements upon which to judge. First of all, I trust that we shall have an atmosphere very different from that of today, which, to put it mildly, is not conducive to a solution or a compromise that would satisfy us all. Secondly, the way in which the debate takes place will obviously indicate to us the hierarchy of values to be given each of these draft resolutions and also the equally important hierarchy of urgency. There are some
problems that are more important than others, but there are certain problems that, without being more important than others, are more urgent. The importance of a problem is not necessarily contingent upon the time factor, but we must take into account the urgency of a problem when, because of the surrounding circumstances, that problem requires immediate solution. So, after the debate, we shall be able to take into account these two hierarchies: that of importance and that of urgency. Then we shall know what has to be voted upon first. Furthermore, we must recognize that a judgement today on the classifying of the draft resolutions can only be taken blindly. We shall have to wait until we know what the draft resolutions are and can compare them.

Therefore, may I submit an appeal to the delegation of the Soviet Union to allow us to postpone decision on the question of how we are going to discuss and vote upon the draft resolutions. If the Soviet Union will allow us to postpone this decision, on the basis of a gentleman's agreement -- because I think we all feel that we are here to serve the just causes of humanity -- then after the general debate has taken place, and in the light of the facts that should be forthcoming and the draft resolutions that will be submitted, we may decide on the order of priority of the draft resolutions.

Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express the satisfaction of my delegation at your unanimous election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee. Accordingly, we join with those who have already congratulated you and wished you success. The same expressions and good wishes are addressed to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Osman, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Matsch. On your shoulders, Mr. Chairman, and on our collective shoulders lies a heavy burden of political responsibility. It is only necessary to glance at the agenda of the Committee and to ponder the substance of the questions therein to understand this.

The procedural discussion has already served to illustrate this point. At the very outset of the Committee's deliberations as it debated the order of priority of various items on its agenda, the impression has arisen that the delegation of the United States wants the First Committee to be dragged into a general debate
on the whole disarmament problem just at the moment when there are possibilities of finding solutions along the lines of partial measures in certain specific areas of disarmament.

Two proposals were made at the beginning of the debate, one by the Soviet Union and one by the United States. The first proposal was that the Committee begin its work with the discussion of each one of the concrete disarmament questions: that is, first on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, then on the reduction of military budgets, then on the question of the peaceful use of outer space, then the question of disarmament as presented in the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/3936). The Soviet delegation further agreed having the Committee discuss as the first item on its agenda the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, after which the Committee could decide on the other items it would take up and in what order.

The second proposal was made by the delegation of the United States, to the effect that all the disarmament items be covered in the general debate.

Surely everyone realizes that what we are discussing here is no mere procedural quibble. We adhere to the view that it is easier to discuss concrete questions because concrete questions require concrete decisions -- all the more so as the question of the discontinuance of test explosions has in fact been comprehensively studied, and the door to a solution is wide open, provided of course that we are all guided by the interests of the strengthening of peace and security.
If the Committee prefers the United States proposal, even in its latest version, this would to a considerable degree predetermine the result of the debate. On the basis of experience one may well expect such a result to be different from what the peoples want. Not only concrete questions of disarmament but the problem as a whole is likely to be kept at dead centre, riding anchor on the policy which is called the armaments race. Mr. Lodge told us that it would be preferable to discuss all disarmament questions together in order not to waste time. The representative of Italy even offered an arithmetical computation as to the number of speeches to which we were likely to be treated here, under either alternative, if there were a general debate on all items or separately.

Of course the desire to expedite the discussion of an important international problem is praiseworthy especially since the United Nations has spent twelve years of its existence, with no less than eighteen months of discussion on disarmament alone -- with no results. Nevertheless, the factor of time has been dragged in by the hair in order to avoid discussion and solution of partial disarmament measures, especially on the matter of the discontinuance of test explosions of nuclear weapons. This is merely a device to avoid a General Assembly resolution appealing to all States that carry out test explosions of nuclear and hydrogen weapons immediately to discontinue them.

This morning the delegation of Panama proposed a third procedural alternative. If we understood correctly the new variant would have us inaugurate a general debate on all questions of disarmament while resolutions would be discussed item by item, the question of the discontinuance of test explosions being the first item under which resolutions would be discussed. Then the delegation of Afghanistan moved for an adjournment so as to have the Chairman seek a compromise solution taking into due account the views expressed in the Committee. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, your efforts were not crowned with success and the compromise did not materialize. This only confirms what we said earlier about the position of the United States. Our delegation is prepared to adhere to the second procedural variant put forward by the delegation of Panama: start
a debate concurrently on all disarmament problems, and then when we get to the resolutions, take up first the draft resolution submitted on the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen test explosions.

Mr. Lewandowski (Poland): We are sorry, indeed, to hear that no understanding has been reached on the procedural problems which confronted us at the outset of our proceedings.

We voted this morning for the Afghanistan motion because it seemed to be sensible and because it offered a platform for a compromise agreement. We would be the last ones not to support a proposal with such an objective.

What was the situation at the end of this morning's meeting? We had before us the USSR proposal to take up all the items concerning the disarmament question separately, and to start with the consideration of the most urgent problem, namely, the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

On the other hand the United States delegation took the position that we should consider all the items pertaining to the disarmament question as a whole and to have a general debate on it.

The Polish delegation supported the position to consider as the first separate item the problem of atomic and hydrogen tests for the reasons given in our intervention yesterday. We maintain our view and we still think that the problem is of the utmost urgency. We consider also that this feeling of urgency is widespread among our delegations here, and it is obviously widespread in world public opinion. That is why it would be difficult for anybody interested in that problem, for all the peoples, to understand any postponement of a detailed and separate debate as well as of the decisions in this matter.

But we realize also the danger of prolonging a procedural debate which still threatens and which could lead us to a vote creating disagreement and division even before we started this discussion on the merits of the problem. So we supported the Afghanistan motion.
At the beginning of this meeting, as an outcome of your consultations, we were faced with two proposals. The first one which you presented is in our opinion a repetition of the earlier position of the United States delegation and some other delegations which supported that position; the general debate and no decision what to do after the general debate would be closed. That is why our delegation will vote against this position.

The second solution which was presented by you, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion, is a concrete compromise to start a general discussion on all disarmament items of our agenda and follow it by consideration of specific items, and in the first place, the item dealing with discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

We think that this compromise meets the desire of the opponents to the priority of this item which was listed in the provisional agenda as point 7. They wanted the general debate first. Now we can have this general debate. But we should decide also now what will be our next move after that. Because if we do not do it, if we do not make this decision, we will be faced probably with another procedural debate and with the furthering of differences. Now, we have to bear in mind that the time for those procedural debates is not the best one, and that time in general is very short. At the end of this month, the last day of this month, the negotiations will start in Geneva on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. It is highly important, in our opinion, that these negotiations should start possibly in the most favourable atmosphere and that the participants there should have the views and know the position of our Organization on this matter.

As to the question of the resolution which was discussed in our afternoon meeting, item 7—the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests—is the only item on our agenda where the draft resolutions have already been submitted. So, the road is clear for a speedy discussion and decisions to be taken, if everybody would agree, after the general debate. But we feel that there may be some other resolutions—there are rumours about that. Will they deal with this urgent problem of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests? If so, let us decide here and now that we will discuss it, this very urgent problem.
I should like to conclude with a remark we should bear in mind that it is on the question of atomic tests that the views of the great Powers are closest, and if there is to be agreement in the future among them on any major issue, the chances are that it will be in this specific field. We sincerely hope that it will happen so and we submit that our Committee should by its action do everything to foster this prospect.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have no other speakers on my list. That being the case, I believe that we can now proceed to vote.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Before we vote, certain remarks that have been made lead me to ask the indulgence of the Committee for just one minute to say that the United States wants to move ahead on this whole subject. We are getting our hopes up about Geneva because it is the first sign of progress on the cessation of tests. In fact, it is the indispensable first step.

Let me tell the Committee that we hope to introduce a draft resolution very soon with a number of other co-sponsors, which will clearly show to all the world the importance which we attach to this first step. We think that we here in this Committee have the opportunity to do something that bids fair to achieve some real results on this matter of the cessation of nuclear tests, and that is the spirit which animates us.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, before you take the vote, I would also like to say a few words in connexion with Mr. Lodge's last comments and the whole outcome of our discussion on procedure.

Mr. Lodge just said that the United States wants to move forward on this question of the cessation of tests and that the United States is even going to submit a draft resolution on this question. Then I think the United States should agree forthwith that this question or at least the draft resolutions on it should be discussed as a matter of priority. If the United States does not do that, then misgivings and doubts are bound to arise in people's minds with regard to what Mr. Lodge said a while ago. One cannot move forward on this whole question, one cannot even hold out the promise of suitable draft resolutions on it if, in the next breath, one refuses to discuss this very question in the first place. I therefore cannot quite grasp the position of the United States on the question of the discussion of the draft resolutions. For some reason or other, the United States is unwilling to decide now that the draft resolutions on the discontinuance of test explosions should be discussed and voted on first, even though this must be done before the beginning of the Geneva Conference, to which Mr. Lodge referred a moment ago.
In voting on the two alternatives which you, Mr. Chairman, mentioned, I wish to announce that the Soviet delegation can accept a general debate concurrently on the three items on our agenda only in the event that it has an assurance that the discussion of the draft resolutions on the discontinuance of test explosions will be taken up first so as to ensure the solution of at least this most urgent question, which is most ripe for solution. Therefore, if a separate vote is taken on the parts of this proposal, then, in voting on the first alternative, we shall abstain with regard to agreeing to a concurrent general debate because only a decision on the order of the discussion of the draft resolutions will enable us to accept a concurrent debate. I wanted to make this point so as to make the position of the Soviet delegation abundantly clear on this matter.

Mr. Krishna Menon (India): My delegation was gratified to hear the recent observations of the representative of the United States of America. We do not subscribe to the view that one thing or another raises doubts or misgivings. We could not approach these problems from the point of view of doubting because all that we can doubt is motives, and that we cannot fathom.

So far as we are concerned, we welcome the statement that the representative looks forward to progress in this matter. Therefore I hope that he will now view with some sympathy the idea of having these draft resolutions on test explosions come up first so that the expression of the views of this Assembly would promote and not hinder the work at Geneva.

As I said in my observations on your two proposals, Mr. Chairman, that they do not appear to us to be compromise proposals, my delegation wishes to move a proposal providing for simultaneous discussion in the first part and, in the second part, that the draft resolutions be taken in the order of priority in which they were submitted to the Committee.

The Chairman (interpretation from Spanish): We are just about ready to vote on this subject. In order to clarify the matter and to make it easier to vote, I should like to sum up the situation as it stands at the moment.
Yesterday morning, the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted a motion that once and for all the Committee decide on priorities to be granted to four of the items and that, for the time being, it defer a decision on the other four items. At that same meeting and after a statement was made by the representative of Yugoslavia, the representative of the Soviet Union changed his proposal. He said that he was only asking the Committee to decide to discuss first the item entitled "The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests" and to postpone the decision on priorities regarding the other items on the agenda until after this first item was discussed.

The representative of the Soviet Union had agreed to one of the alternatives that the Chair put before his delegation and some other delegations. Can I take it that the delegation of the Soviet Union now withdraws from the position it had taken yesterday? I shall call on the representative of the Soviet Union in a few minutes to answer that question.

To return to yesterday morning's meeting, the representative of the United States made a proposal that the three items bearing on disarmament in the letter from the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/806) -- that is, item 4 on disarmament, item 7 on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests and item 8 on the reduction of military budgets -- be dealt with simultaneously. A logical consequence of this was that the draft resolutions would be discussed and voted upon in accordance with the rules of procedure. This afternoon, the representative of the United States explained the import of his proposal. I would appreciate it if the representative of the United States, in due course, would tell me if I am interpreting his words correctly in my summation.
According to the proposal of the United States, the Committee would decide to hold a general debate on those three items, namely, items 4, 7 and 8, and when that general debate is concluded, the Committee would decide on the priority to be given the different draft resolutions in accordance with the rules of procedure.

This morning, pursuant to the decision of the Committee, at the suggestion of the representative of Afghanistan, the Chairman was entrusted with the task of trying to find some compromise solution to this problem. As I said earlier, I was unable to bring together the differing points of view, but I did put before the Committee the two alternatives which I felt emanated from the views expressed in the Committee. It was these two alternatives that I put before the delegations, but, as I said, without any success.

The two proposals or suggestions were the following. The first was that there would be one general debate on items 4, 7 and 8, and then, having received all the resolutions, a decision would be taken in the Committee regarding the order in which these draft resolutions should be discussed and in due course voted upon. This first alternative was not accepted here by one of the delegations primarily concerned. The second alternative was primarily based on the suggestion of the delegation of Panama, supported by the delegation of Mexico, with some slight modifications regarding the order of the items when the draft resolutions had to be considered. According to the second alternative -- which the delegation of the Soviet Union did accept -- we would hold a first general debate on all three items simultaneously, and then we would hold separate debates on the different groups of draft resolutions, in the following order: first, those draft resolutions bearing on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests; the second group would be the draft resolutions bearing on the reduction of military budgets; and finally, those draft resolutions bearing on the question of disarmament in general.

Since the delegation of the United States maintains the stand it took yesterday, the suggestions of Panama and the Chairman were submitted today. I presume that the first suggestion that has to be put to the vote is the suggestion of the United States, which was submitted yesterday and clarified
Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I believe that your interpretation of the parliamentary situation is correct in that the pending question before the Committee is the motion which I have made. I believe that is true. So that a member will have a chance to record himself, either one way or the other, by voting either for or against this motion. You have stated my motion approximately correctly. You left out the words "on their merits". My original motion said: "with a decision on the priority on all resolutions to be taken on their merits", which is what I understood Mr. Krishna Menon to say and which I therefore put into my motion.

I would like to read it as I have phrased it, because I think that it also seeks to carry out your compromise proposal number one. May I say that contrary to what the representative of the Soviet Union has said, we are just as interested in compromise and just as willing to meet the views of others -- as I think all who ever worked with me here will attest -- as he is. The following is the proposal:

"The Committee decides that there shall be general debate on items 4, 7 and 8 of its agenda together, with the decision on the priority on all resolutions to be taken on their merits after the general debate is over."

If it is necessary, I move the adoption of this motion.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall take into account this correction made by the representative of the United States.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I do not want to intervene for a third time at length, and may I say that my delegation cannot show new interest in the exchange of compliments between those two delegations. But I would like your indulgence to indicate to the representative of the United States that if the expression concerning the consideration of priority on the merits is going to be taken into account by him, I am extremely grateful. At the same time I would request you to take into account all that went with it. I said that priority of
by Mr. Lodge today. Before I put it to the vote, I would ask if there is any objection to this procedure. I should like to know how the representatives feel about what I have said, and concretely the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United States. I should like to have their views of my interpretation of their positions.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for the detailed outline of the history of our consideration of the matter, all the more so as this outline makes it abundantly clear that the delegation of the Soviet Union made every effort at finding a compromise solution. It advocated one variant after another and finally accepted a third one proposed by the Chairman. There was just one delegation which adhered adamantely to its original position and was unwilling to budge from it in the way of a compromise. This was abundantly clear from what you just said, Mr. Chairman, and I am grateful to you for it.

As for the substance of the matter, the position of the Soviet delegation was set out in my last statement, namely that we support the proposal based on the views set out by the delegation of Panama and formulated by you, Mr. Chairman, what you called the second alternative for the solution of this question.

We will agree to a general debate concurrently on the three items, provided that it is also decided at the same time that the draft resolutions will be grouped by items and that on each such group of draft resolutions there will be a separate discussion, and that it should also be decided that the group of draft resolutions dealing with the discontinuance of test explosions should be the first group to be taken up and decided upon. This is what you called the second alternative, Mr. Chairman.

I take it that it is perfectly clear now who is unwilling to have the question of the discontinuance of tests discussed and decided on first, and who, on the other hand, wants to facilitate the solution both of our procedural difficulties and of the progress of the whole question as to its substance.
resolutions must be decided on several considerations, and one of the considerations I mentioned was the merits, political and otherwise. I listed a number of considerations. Otherwise the proposition I put forward would be one for the postponement of this matter altogether, and that was not what was meant, I am sure, by the representative, as he has no desire to allow the position that I put out to be misunderstood.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I assume that now, following
the statements of the representative of the United States and the representative
of the Soviet Union, there will be no objection to voting in the following order --
and I am taking into account rule 132 of the rules of procedure, which states:
"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless
it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been
submitted." Since the proposal of the Soviet Union has been withdrawn, the
first proposal is that of the United States; the second proposal is that of
Panama; then we have the Chairman's first alternative followed by the Chairman's
second alternative. Is there any objection to this order?

Mr. de LEGUERICA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like
some clarification. I understood the representative of the Soviet Union to say
that the proposal of Panama put first the question of the discontinuance of
atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. However, I did not hear the representative of
Panama say this; I believe that the Chairman said it. I think that the
representative of Panama proposed that once the general debate was over the
question of disarmament should be the first item to be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I proposed this order for
the following reasons. The representative of Panama proposed that first a general
debate should be held concurrently on all items and then that a partial
consideration of the items should be held in the following order: (1) the
question of disarmament; (2) the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons
tests; and (3) the reduction of the military budgets. The Chairman's second
alternative coincides to a large extent with the proposal of Panama, except that
it modifies the order of the partial debates. The Chairman's second alternative
provides that once the general debate has been held, we would proceed according to
the following order: (1) the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests;
(2) the reduction of the military budgets; and (3) the question of disarmament.
Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The main question here is the difference between the proposal of Panama and the Chairman's second alternative, which appears to involve a discrepancy.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Does the representative of Panama accept the Chairman's interpretation of his proposal?

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): The Chairman has correctly interpreted my proposal. My intention was to try as far as possible to simplify the general debate and to have it include the three fundamental items. Once the general debate is concluded, we propose that the draft resolutions should be submitted under the different headings of the items. My delegation is interested in ensuring that each delegation will be given complete freedom to submit draft resolutions and that these drafts will receive full consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now proceed to the vote on the United States proposal.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala.
Against: Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana.

The proposal was adopted by 50 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will meet tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. to start the general debate on the three items of disarmament concurrently.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.