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1. QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT (continued)
2. THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS TESTS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As the Committee will recall, at the end of our 957th meeting, which was held in the afternoon of 29 October, I declared closed the general debate on the three items before the Committee and I stated that the discussion on the specific draft resolutions would follow. For reasons which are obviously to all, we had to interrupt our debate for the past two days.

We shall now have the special debate on the draft resolutions and the amendments. Before we do so, however, I should like to remind the Committee of two facts. The first is that at our meeting in the afternoon of 9 October, following the suggestion of the representative of the United States of America, the Committee decided to hold a general debate concurrently on items 4, 7 and 8 of its agenda and, once the general debate was over, to grant priorities to the draft resolutions in accordance with their merits. The second fact is that, according to the statement made at that same meeting by the representative of Mexico, the intention of his delegation was that its procedural draft resolution on the question of disarmament contained in document A/C.1/L.108 should not be put to the vote until after votes had been cast on all the other draft resolutions. Therefore, in accordance with what I have said, we will now go on to discuss specifically the draft resolutions and the amendments.

The representative of the United States has asked to speak on a point of order. I understand that he will raise a point of order and will not go into the subject of the draft resolutions or the amendments, because I already have a list of speakers on that subject. The first speaker on that list, who is the representative of India, has insisted that he wants to be the first to speak in the discussion of the draft resolutions and the amendments.

I recognize the representative of the United States on a point of order.
Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I shall not go into the substance of the resolutions, and I asked for the point of order for procedural reasons. I am sure that all the members of the Committee are aware that extensive efforts have been under way for the past few days to reach agreement on one or several draft resolutions which all members of the Committee could support. The seventeen countries which have sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.205 have done everything in their power to make this effort succeed. We have had numerous meetings on the issue and have been as flexible and co-operative as possible in seeking to find a solution. I want to pay tribute to the energetic efforts of the representative of India and the representative of Yugoslavia, who have worked diligently and hard to accomplish the same objective that we had in mind. We respect their sincerity and the co-operative spirit that they have shown.

At the last minute all these efforts to achieve unanimity were destroyed by the refusal of others to show any willingness to reach any agreement except on the basis of a mere paper prohibition of tests regardless of the outcome of the talks at Geneva -- and of course, that means that without the timely and dependable controls without which any prohibition would be nothing but a cruel hoax upon the peoples of the world. We are very sorry that this is the case.

The conference on nuclear weapons tests has started in Geneva today, so we can no longer delay. We should not continue to debate this issue here while the negotiations are going on in Geneva. We think the time has come for a decision, and in view of the situation in which we all find ourselves both here in the United Nations and in Geneva, I hereby make a motion. I move priority for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.205 and urge that we proceed to the vote as promptly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have taken note that the representative of the United States has requested priority for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.205. When the moment for the vote arrives I shall consult the Committee regarding this point.

The first speaker on the list for the discussion of draft resolutions and amendments is the representative of India.
Mr. IALL (India): In this intervention today it is the purpose of the delegation of India to deal with the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests regarding which the delegation of India, along with twelve other co-sponsors, has submitted a draft resolution which is contained in document A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1.

This whole Assembly, and this Committee, of course, have attached the utmost importance to agreement on the resolutions on the discontinuance of tests, because this Assembly is meeting after the meeting of experts in Geneva at which agreement was reached on the technical and scientific aspects of this matter; and moreover, because the pressure of world opinion has been growing rapidly and calling for a cessation of the testing of atomic weapons.

It is not my purpose to go into these background issues except to mention them as indicating the urgency and primary importance of this particular matter.

As Mr. Lodge, the representative of the United States has said, in the last few days strenuous efforts have been made to reach agreement. I think it is only fair that this Committee should be made aware of the precise stage which those efforts have reached. Along with friendly delegations, particularly the delegation of Yugoslavia, and with the full knowledge and support of the thirteen co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1, the delegation of India has been able to produce a draft resolution which we understand is acceptable to both sides, that is to say, to the United States in particular -- and we have not heard any objection to it from the other co-sponsors of that draft resolution which the representative of the United States mentioned today -- and to the Soviet Union.

Since this document has been accepted by both sides I will now read it into the record. The document reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Desiring to safeguard mankind from the increasing hazards of atomic radiation resulting from tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons,
"Bearing in mind the profound concern evinced by the peoples of all countries regarding the continuance of the testing of nuclear weapons,

Welcoming the agreement which has been achieved in the 'Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests',

Welcoming further the decision of the States which are now testing such weapons to meet in a Conference commencing 31 October 1958 with a view to reaching agreement on the discontinuance of such tests,

Believing that an agreement on discontinuance of nuclear tests would constitute an important first step toward agreement on comprehensive measures of disarmament,

1. Calls upon the States concerned immediately to discontinue the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and to proceed expeditiously with the further action set out in this resolution;

2. Considers that an agreement should be reached between the States concerned for the discontinuance of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons under effective international control;

3. Urges the Conference at Geneva to deal with this matter on an urgent basis and reach such agreement speedily;

4. Requests the States concerned to report to the General Assembly, at a special session if necessary, on the results of the Conference so that the Assembly may take further appropriate action;

5. Further calls upon all other States to desist from embarking upon the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons pending the completion of the action envisaged in paragraph 1 of this resolution;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to render such assistance and provide services as may be asked for and required by the Conference on Nuclear Tests commencing at Geneva on 31 October 1958."
This draft resolution opens wide and fully the door for a continuing and permanent cessation of nuclear tests. It is a draft resolution which, we believe, reflects the fundamental feeling of the Assembly and also of the world at large. We are glad that it has been accepted by both sides. Not only has this draft resolution been accepted, but I feel that I should inform the Committee that a statement interpreting its meaning which I, as the introducer of the draft resolution, would make, has also been accepted by the United States and the USSR. So it has gone a stage further than the acceptance of a text.

However, the representative of the USSR has informed me that, in his opinion, in this crucial matter, all three delegations which are assembling at Geneva from today should make brief identical statements to this Committee on the interpretation of the draft resolution. The delegation of India, for one, fully understands and respects this point of view. This is a crucial matter. We, for one, certainly do not want any ambiguity to remain about the meaning of the draft resolution. We would welcome a statement to which all three of the main delegations concerned could individually and separately subscribe. We would welcome that as attaining the maximum degree of clarity and unanimity at this crucial juncture when these three States are assembling at Geneva to reach agreement which will make it possible for the cessation of tests to become a continuing reality.

In view of the fact that so much progress has been made in the matter of a text interpreting the text of the draft resolution, and that negotiations have been commenced on the possibility of a statement which could be made by all three countries which are meeting in Geneva, the delegation of India, after consulting a number of its co-sponsors, after sounding other friendly delegations; and taking into account the great importance of this issue, taking into account the grave responsibility which rests on this Assembly at this juncture not to take a step which would in any way lessen the chances of success at Geneva, not to take a step which will disappoint the expectations of the world, not to take a step which will not be a forward step -- in view of all these considerations, the delegation of India would move, under rule 119, that this meeting be suspended until Monday morning, 3 November. I so propose for the consideration of this Committee.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened to the motion for suspension by the representative of India. I must say that I had expected the representative of India, as a speaker on the list for the debate on draft resolutions and amendments, to refer to the documents exclusively. In view of the fact that he did not, and in order to avoid any confusion, may I remind the Committee that we have eight draft resolutions before us, of which four refer to the question of disarmament; two to the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests; one to the question of the reduction of the military budgets of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France by 10 to 15 per cent, and one draft resolution covering all three items. These eight draft resolutions, in the order of their presentation, and the amendments thereto are as follows: draft resolution A/C.1/L.202 on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, originally submitted by India and later re-introduced by India and eleven other States, to which the delegation of Ethiopia was finally added and which has been described as the thirteen-Power draft resolution A/C.1/L.202/Rev.1, and to which no amendments have been submitted; draft resolution A/C.1/L.203 on the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, submitted by the delegation of the USSR -- this draft resolution has a corrigendum which applies only to the English text. No amendments have been submitted; draft resolution A/C.1/L.204 on the reduction of military budgets, submitted by the Soviet Union and to which no amendments have been submitted; draft resolution A/C.1/L.205 on all three items, submitted by Argentina and sixteen other countries, for which reason it has been called the seventeen-Power draft resolution. There are two corrigenda to this document, one referring to the Russian translation only and the other to the Spanish translation. Regarding this draft resolution some amendments have been submitted by the delegation of Ireland in A/C.1/L.207 and one by Libya and six other Latin American countries in A/C.1/L.209. The fifth draft resolution is the one submitted by Ireland in document A/C.1/L.206 on the question of disarmament, to which no amendments have been submitted. The sixth draft resolution in A/C.1/L.208 was submitted by Mexico on the question of disarmament, and no amendment has been submitted. The seventh draft resolution in A/C.1/L.210 was submitted by India and Yugoslavia on the question of disarmament. Some amendments
to this have been submitted by France in A/C.1/L.212. The eighth is the joint draft resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia in A/C.1/L.211, also on the question of disarmament. No amendments have been submitted.

Since the representative of India has moved that we suspend our meeting, I would ask him when he wishes us to re-convene. Is it sine die, or would he prefer that we should meet this afternoon or Monday?

Mr. LALL (India): I asked that we suspend the meeting until Monday morning.

Mr. LODGE (United States): I wish to speak on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I cannot permit a point of order at this stage because, according to rule 119, I must put to the vote the proposal of the representative of India, unless the representative of India has no objection to my calling on the representative of the United States. Does the representative of India object to my calling on the representative of the United States? I am obliged to apply the rules of procedure and, according to rule 119, "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote".

If there is no objection, I shall give the floor to the representative of the United States.
Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The reason I asked for this is because the representative of India has very seriously mis-stated what we understand to be the situation when he says that this draft resolution was accepted by both sides. That is the phraseology that he used. He read out the text of the draft resolution which he says was accepted by both sides, but he should have read out also the text of the massive reservation which he informed me last night the Soviet Union made to this draft resolution. It is very brief, and I will read it. The reservation that the Soviet Union wished to have attached to this resolution, and I quote it, contained

"The declarations of the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom ..." -- this is for the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom -- "to the effect that they interpret the resolution in the sense that it calls upon the States to discontinue tests for all time, or pending the achievement of an agreement between the Powers concerned, regardless of the results of the work of the Geneva Conference."

In other words, this reservation completely nullifies the draft resolution, which means that it was not accepted by the Soviet Union in the normal meaning of the word "acceptance", and of course we did not accept it except as a basis for an agreement. We did not accept it as a thing in itself, and I really believe that, if the Committee is to understand the full situation, that point should be made clear.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): A point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): One moment, please. Had the representative of India limited himself merely to making a motion for suspension, I would have to apply the provisions of rule 119; but I think the representative of India will agree that he made a statement prior to that motion, which may call for certain remarks from other representatives. Therefore I am forced to postpone the application of rule 119 until the representatives directly concerned with the question raised by the representative of India feel that they have been given sufficient right to reply.
Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of India has informed the Committee about the efforts made by his delegation and by the delegations of certain other countries in an attempt to find a basis for a unanimous General Assembly decision on one of the most crucial items on the agenda of our Committee, a question which has been discussed for almost three weeks now. I am grateful to the representative of India for his dispassionate analysis of the moves undertaken by his delegation, and the subjects of the unofficial talks that have taken place.

I am unable to agree to the appraisal of that statement given by Mr. Lodge. He endeavoured to correct the picture of the unofficial negotiations which have been accurately outlined by the representative of India. Since Mr. Lodge and he endeavoured to explain why it had been impossible to reach agreement, the Soviet delegation deems it essential, in order to clarify the matter clearly, to outline the considerations which have guided the Soviet delegation in the course of these unofficial talks.

The Committee is well aware that throughout the Committee's deliberations on the question of the cessation of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Soviet delegation consistently advocated the view that the Geneva Conference, which opened today, must set itself a clear and unambiguous task; that is, the achievement of an agreement on the complete and unconditional cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, with the establishment of suitable international control -- control which, basically, has already been worked out by now owing to the labours of the preceding Geneva Conference of Experts.

This position set out by the Soviet delegation has commanded the support of the majority of the delegations that have spoken in this Committee. The statements of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France unambiguously spelled out the unwillingness of the Governments of these States to go to the Geneva Conference with such intentions. Their statements clearly bespoke their desire to bring about only a temporary suspension of tests for a year. As far as the cessation of tests forever was concerned, they put forward conditions, which, as everyone in this Committee is well aware, could not possibly be accepted either by the Soviet Union or by all those who are truly bent on a swift and unconditional cessation of tests.
Since, as our deliberations draw to a close, the question has arisen in so clear-cut a form, and since decisions obviously had to be arrived at, the Soviet delegation, on instructions from the Soviet Government, made a statement on 27 October, the text of which all the representatives on this Committee are familiar with. In that statement the Soviet Government clearly put forward its position on this matter.
It proposed that the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom should declare their intentions with equal forthrightness and directness; that is, their intentions in connexion with the Geneva Conference. I should like to remind the Committee of the paragraph in that statement in which the position of the Soviet Union is clearly set forth and which calls for a specific statement or declaration to be made by the United States and the United Kingdom. That paragraph said the following:

"The Soviet delegation expects that the United States and United Kingdom delegations will state clearly and unequivocally that the resolution of the General Assembly calling for the cessation of nuclear tests should remain valid until the achievement between the States concerned of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests for all time." (A/C.1/PV.694, p.6)

In other words, we asked the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom clearly to tell the Committee, the General Assembly and the whole world of the intentions which they harboured in going to the negotiations which are beginning in Geneva.

What are they driving at? A brief suspension of tests or the preparation of an agreement on the genuine, complete and unconditional cessation of tests for all time? Which of these things is it that they are driving at? We felt and we continue to feel that this question of ours was altogether justified in view of the position hitherto espoused by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, and in view of the obviously unsatisfactory nature of this position from the point of view of other Governments directly concerned, that is, the Soviet Government and the other Governments which have voiced their eagerness to find a solution to this question.

Their positions were also unsatisfactory to the broad circles of public opinion which have consistently clamoured for a positive solution of the question of the cessation of nuclear and hydrogen weapons tests. We expected the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to supply clear and unambiguous answers as to what their intentions were.
On the 29th of this month the United States and the United Kingdom furnished their answers to that statement of the Soviet Government. As the Committee will recall, their answers merely reiterated the old United States-United Kingdom position and emphasized anew that it was their intention to talk in Geneva about a temporary one-year suspension of tests, while at the same time holding out to the Committee the consolatory hope that this temporary suspension of tests for one year may at some time turn into a permanent cessation.

In speaking of that, however, they again mentioned the condition that the solution of this question of the cessation of tests must be tied in with and made contingent on progress in other aspects of the disarmament problem. In so doing, they cut the ground from under a positive solution of the question of the cessation of tests. It became abundantly clear to us that any decision, even one adopted unanimously -- which as the representative of India said would open the way or the door to a solution of the question of the cessation of tests -- could play no positive role if the participants at the Geneva Conference, on whom the positive solution of the question depends, take different positions as far as their intentions are concerned, let alone different positions on concrete practical questions as to the way which the solution of the question should be approached.

That is why, when the representative of India and the representative of Yugoslavia showed us their draft resolution and gave us an account of their conversations with the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, we asked the representative of India the following question: Will any meaning attach to such a unanimously adopted resolution if the intentions of the main Powers, in going to the Geneva Conference, are altogether different? Would not the adoption of such a resolution constitute a mere cover for those Powers which harbour no intention of leading up to a cessation of tests, but which merely, under the pressure of world public opinion and their own national public opinions, have now found themselves constrained to talk formally of the task of the cessation of tests even while in substance they still claim to their own old
positions of a refusal to have such a cessation take place? In order to ensure some genuine forward movement in the solution of this long since overdue question, we therefore propose that the three Powers issue identical statements as they go to this Conference. We in fact produced two variant versions of this statement. We said that it should either be declared by the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union that the resolution of the General Assembly calling for a discontinuance or cessation of atomic tests should remain in force until the States concerned achieve an agreement on the question of the cessation for all time of the testing of nuclear weapons, or else, we proposed the somewhat different alternative version of the same intentions, indicating that the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the United Kingdom construe the resolution in the sense that it appeals or calls upon the States to cease tests for all time, or pending the conclusion of an agreement between the Powers concerned, regardless of the results of the deliberations of the Geneva Conference.
In other words, we wanted all three delegations to the Geneva conference to clearly state in what sense they interpret the decision which they propose to make in this Assembly and what are the fundamental intentions which they harbour in relation to this question lest illusions be spread throughout the world that some sort of unanimous decision was being adopted even while each of the parties is thinking in terms of its own resolves and even while each of the parties seeks to achieve that which it has already announced during debate in this Committee, not at all intending to ever reach a definitive result or a decision to cease all tests for all time.

The representative of India, as he very clearly stated in this Committee, fully understood the legitimacy of this manner of handling the question on our part, and he bent every effort to the achievement of an agreement upon such an identical declaration being issued by the three delegations. We regret that he has not succeeded in this respect and he has not succeeded because the delegation of the United States has remained unwilling to make a clear statement of its intentions. Despite the general phrases mouthed by that delegation in this Committee about moving in the direction of a cessation of tests for all time they have nevertheless refused to make such a declaration in accordance with the resolution which had been submitted to the two parties concerned. This meant and it still means that the United States does not even contemplate any actual cessation of tests. What the United States has in mind is to enter into bargaining at the Geneva conference for a one year suspension upon further conditions which the United States will put forward in order to liquidate any possibility of the achievement of an agreement on the main question of a permanent cessation of tests.

In these circumstances the Soviet delegation has found it impossible to continue talks any further because it has become clear that we take different positions and that no amount of unanimous resolutions will in fact secure the actual forward movement in the direction which all recognize as being the only correct one and the only one which is imperative at this juncture. The Soviet delegation and the Soviet Union consider that it is a poor service to the cause of peace to confuse or to hide differences in positions taken in this matter which is of concern to the whole world and to make it appear as if positions did not in fact differ, but that there was some sort of unanimity of views on the question which is now the subject of the Geneva conference.
We do not want to delude the people with demonstrative unanimity on a matter which alarms every human being. We want the whole world to know who stands for an actual and complete cessation of tests and who opposes such a solution.

As a result of these considerations we deemed it necessary to tell the delegate of India that we regretted that his efforts and the efforts of other delegations to reach a unanimous agreement had unfortunately not been crowned with success. We are hopeful nonetheless that the General Assembly will express its view on this matter and will place itself foursquare in the type of clearcut and unambiguous position which the whole world expects and this position in our opinion can only be one which will seek a cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests for all time. In this direction and in this direction only can our work proceed at this juncture and this is the main task and the meaning of the Geneva conference which begins its deliberations today. It is with this intention in mind that the Soviet Government has despatched its delegation to that conference.

If the General Assembly of the United Nations should express its clear resolve in the same direction, which will constitute weighty support for the solution of this question in Geneva, in accordance with the proposal of the delegate of India for a suspension of our sittings, the Soviet delegation has no objection.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We are really dealing with two completely different matters. On the one hand speakers are referring to the statement made by the representative of India prior to his formulating a motion for suspension, which is a statement of great political import and naturally is one to which delegates will wish to refer but on the other hand we have a motion for suspension. In view of the dual nature of the statement of the representative of India, I had felt that we should apply rule 119 which would suspend the meeting but, upon thinking over the matter I see that the proposal of the representative of India is that we postpone the debate. Therefore, the rule which has to be applied is rule 117 according to which during the discussion of any matter a representative may move the adjournment of a debate on the item under discussion. In accordance with the rules of procedure, two representatives may speak in favour of and two representatives may speak against the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. I therefore call on those delegates who may wish to
refer to the first part of the statement of the representative of India. Thereafter, I shall call on two speakers who wish to speak in favour of the Indian motion for adjournment until Monday and two speakers who may wish to speak against that motion. On my list of speakers I have the representatives of Yugoslav India and the United Kingdom. Do any of those representatives wish to speak to the first part of the statement of the representative of India?

I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic on a point of order.
Mr. LOUIZFI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): I must say that I have some misgivings as to this procedure. The representative of India, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, called for the suspension of this meeting until Monday morning. Rule 119 states: "Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote." The word "immediately" in my opinion, precludes us from debating this matter. The Indian motion was designed precisely to avoid having this debate take place now and to have it take place Monday morning.

Even if the Chairman invokes rule 117 of the rules procedure, we still confront the same difficulty, because that rule states:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

The delegation of India wanted to have the discussion which we have been hearing today take place on Monday morning, and this position holds both under rule 119 and under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened very carefully to the statements of the representative of the United Arab Republic, and I do respect his opinion because I know of his experience as a jurist and as a parliamentarian, as well as his work in the United Nations. However, I must say that I do not share his point of view. At first I did hold that view. However, as I understand it a motion for suspension of a meeting may be made when someone requires, let us say, fifteen minutes to discuss a matter with other delegations. But when a motion is made to end a meeting and not to meet again until a day or two later, that would constitute an adjournment of the debate. When we are asked to adjourn the meeting now, not to meet this afternoon and to meet again Monday morning, we are being asked to adjorn the debate.

That is the understanding of the Chair, and those who do not agree with it can make their views known and can even appeal against the Chair's understanding of the matter.
The representative of India has asked to be recognized. Does he wish to appeal against the Chair’s interpretation of the matter?

Mr. IALL (India): I wish to speak on a point of order. I do not intend to appeal against the Chair’s view that my motion should appropriately come under rule 117. However, the point made by the representative of the United Arab Republic still subsists. That point was that during the discussion, irrespective of what I said in my statement, I made a motion. The Chair has interpreted that motion to be under rule 117. I accept that interpretation. But the effect of that motion nevertheless is that the discussion of the matter should immediately stop, and the only speaking which is permissible under rule 117 is that which is directed entirely for or against the motion, but not on the item itself.

I am in a very awkward position, because I do have something to say about the statements which have been made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union. However, I feel that if I were to do that now I would be in conflict with rule 117. The purpose of that rule can only be fulfilled if the Chair limits the speaking simply to the motion and does not allow discussion of the matter itself. That is what we would request the Chairman to do.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that we are all talking too much about the same thing. The representative of India states that he finds himself in an awkward position because of the stand taken by the Chair. However, may I point out to him that he was the one, undoubtedly with all good faith and the best of intentions, who has caused this situation to come about. He did not limit himself -- and I said this at the beginning -- merely to making a motion for adjournment but he made a statement of political importance. I certainly could not refuse to allow delegations which were referred to in that statement to reply, since they are the delegations directly concerned. Therefore, I am not being legalistic but I am being juridical, perhaps I am being somewhat philosophically juridical.
(The Chairman)

I believe that I should allow those delegations which are directly concerned to reply, and to apply the rule in due course when that has been concluded. I do not feel that the representative of India is justified in refusing to allow delegations to which he has referred to reply.

Therefore, those who wish to refer to the first part of the statement of the representative of India may do so, and then I shall put before the Committee the motion of the representative of India and allow two speakers in favour of, and two against, the motion.

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Chair was quite right in saying that he found himself in a rather delicate position, since the representative of India not only moved the suspension of the meeting but also touched upon some other general questions which could be discussed. I do not blame the Chair for having called on the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union to reply to and to make comments on the statement of the representative of India.

However, what the Chair is saying now, I believe, departs from rule 117 even more considerably. If the Chair now opens the door to additional statements and calls upon other speakers, then he will not be able to avoid replies to the replies. Members will wish to exercise their right of reply. In other words, I am afraid that the result will be that we shall proceed to the consideration of this question in substance and shall simply never reach the motion made by the representative of India. Therefore, while prepared to accept the accomplished fact that the Chair allowed the representatives of what may not unfairly be called the two parties to this question to express themselves, I think he may quite properly confine himself to this and proceed now strictly to the motion of the representative of India and allow two speakers to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion. In this way, we shall have disposed of the difficulty which now confronts us and we shall have disposed of the question which was quite regularly moved by the representative of India. I believe that this would be in the interest of our debate, and I therefore suggest that a ruling of this kind by the Chair would be well advised.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened to what the representative of the Soviet Union has said. Actually, it would have been better if he had thought of that when he asked for the floor to refer to the statement by the representative of India. He exercised his right of reply but now he does not feel that others should be given the same right as that given to him. This is rather difficult for me because I have to treat all representatives in the same way. I cannot show preference to any delegation.

I should like to place this matter in its right perspective. Since the representative of the United States and the representative of the Soviet Union have spoken and the representative of India, who raised the question, has spoken, I would ask the representatives directly concerned whether they wish to speak on the statement made by the representative of India, because on this point I must stand firm. Then I shall apply rule 117.

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): As you yourself have said, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lall did raise two subjects, one of substance and one of the adjournment of the Committee. With all due respect to the Chair, I feel that, representing one of the Powers that will be negotiating at Geneva starting today, I shall wish to speak on both these subjects, and I think that the Committee will probably understand my position. It is very difficult for me, of course, to dissociate the two points, and therefore it might be convenient if I went ahead now and made my few remarks, which will be brief.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): You may refer to the two subjects.

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My delegation was most grateful to Mr. Lall for the efforts he has made to achieve a compromise, but the Committee will realize, I am quite sure, that the informal talks that Mr. Lall conducted on a compromise draft resolution were an effort to bridge a gap between two clearly opposing positions.
On the one hand, there is the position of the United States and the United Kingdom, which desire to reach an agreement at Geneva for the suspension of tests, an agreement which we hope could operate indefinitely if adequate progress on disarmament is also made in due course. On the other hand, you have the position of the Soviet Union, which Mr. Zorin has just reiterated and which demands a declaration by the General Assembly, now in favour of universal, permanent and unconditional cessation of tests regardless of the outcome of the Geneva talks.

Mr. Lodge read to us a few minutes ago the declaration which Mr. Zorin would have the United States and the United Kingdom join with the Soviet Union in making, and I think it might be convenient to the Committee if I read it again. It is very short. It is as follows:

"The declarations of the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom to the effect that they interpret the resolution in the sense that it calls upon the States to discontinue tests for all time, or pending the achievement of an agreement between the Powers concerned, regardless of the results of the work of the Geneva Conference."

I am quite sure that the Committee will realize that this would commit the other two Powers to the Soviet interpretation, and, of course, that is quite unacceptable.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and as you so kindly agreed to allow me to speak on this point, I should like to say that I would oppose the motion for the adjournment of the Committee. This is not, of course, because I am in any way against further efforts to strive to achieve a solution, but I think that the time has come when we ought to look at the time-table. We have been reminded today that the talks in Geneva have started today, and I really think that this Committee should get on and adopt a resolution which will give the views of the Assembly on the problem of nuclear weapons tests and also will give encouragement to the efforts of the negotiators who are meeting today in Geneva.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United Kingdom has spoken against the motion of the representative of India. I call now on the representative of Yugoslavia.

Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia): During our discussions in the past two weeks, earnest efforts have been made to find such solutions for the most pressing aspects of the problem of disarmament as would make it possible for the General Assembly to express the unanimity of all the Member States. A common denominator expressed in a unanimous recommendation by the General Assembly which would include all the positive elements of the positions of the Member States at the United Nations with respect to the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear weapon experiments would represent the most concrete fulfilment of the obligation of our Organization regarding these experiments. Such a recommendation would at the same time offer the most appropriate general framework for the Geneva talks, would contribute to the improvement of the general atmosphere in the world and would facilitate further progress in the field of disarmament.

However, it would now seem, to our regret, that the tendencies which prevailed at the very outset of our discussions are reappearing: that is to say, tendencies to try to find a solution through a rigid opposition of attitudes and by out-voting. I think I am not voicing the opinion of my delegation only when I say that this is not the course we should take. A way out of the present situation should be sought in another direction -- in the direction of renewed endeavours to find a generally acceptable solution, which I feel certain is near at hand.

My delegation is firmly convinced that the objective possibilities for agreement still exist and that the failure of this session to achieve what we all feel is necessary, and most of us feel is possible as well, would not be the result of the absence of such possibilities nor of acceptable platforms and formulations but of other circumstances. The responsibility for such failure, before the public opinion of the world, would be very serious indeed, while the consequences of this wasted opportunity cannot, I fear, at this moment be measured in all their gravity.
For these reasons, my delegation once again calls upon all States members of this Committee, and in the first place upon the delegations of the countries primarily responsible for the problem of disarmament, to make fresh efforts to reach an agreement. Since this will require some time, I associate myself fully with the proposal of my colleague from India to adjourn this meeting under rule 117.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We have heard one speaker in favour of the motion for adjournment and one against the motion. Does any other representative wish to speak on the motion for adjournment made by the representative of India?
Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon): After your ruling that this motion came under rule 117, I tried to raise a point of order but I failed to catch your eye, unfortunately, to move a specific motion under rule 119. But as we are now at the end probably of this discussion, I shall refrain from doing so and I shall proceed under rule 117.

I do want to say only two words in support of the motion for adjournment proposed by the representative of India. Those two words simply refer to the fact that in a matter of so momentous importance, while it is true that we have discussed this for some time, would it not be worth while for the Committee to take a few days off to reconsider the position and to make a further attempt to see whether a rapprochement on the different points of view cannot be reached. I want to ask the Committee whether a delay of probably only a few hours can be allowed, because this is Friday and we would in any case have adjourned until Monday. I would appeal to the members of this Committee to give that little breathing space of time to make a further effort to bridge the gulf which exists on this very important matter.

We feel that the difference, paradoxical as it may sound, though big is still small, and that a possible further effort may prove successful.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would support the proposal for an adjournment until Monday.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I must apologize to my friend, the representative of Ceylon. I did not see him when he was asking for the floor before, on a point of order.

Mr. BOUZA (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): We will vote against the motion for adjournment, submitted by the delegation of India.

We believe that if the Committee adjourns for two days to permit conversations to take place between the Powers concerned in order to achieve a unanimous agreement of the General Assembly, it would have been in keeping with the ends in all our minds. But, after two days of arduous work the true story is that at present we are in exactly the same position as that in which we stood when we started the discussion on disarmament. And, since the Conference of Experts
has already met in Geneva, it is somewhat unbelievable that the Committee has
as yet not made known its views on this fundamental question. It is unfortunate,
but it is true, that we shall not find unanimity; But let each one shoulder
his responsibility. However, we feel that the decision of the General Assembly
is something that we cannot postpone.

Therefore, we speak against the motion proposed by India for adjournment.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): On the motion for
adjournment we have heard the delegations of Ceylon and Yugoslavia speaking
in favour, and the delegations of the United Kingdom and Uruguay speaking against.
Therefore, the time has now come for this motion to be put to the vote.
The motion is the following: that the Committee adjourn or suspend the debate
on the matters before it until Monday. I put this motion to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 28, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We will continue with
our work. Does anyone wish to speak on the draft resolutions and the amendments?
I call on the representative of Yugoslavia on a point of order.

Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, for the same reasons that I
supported the motion of the representative of India, I wish now to move
for the adjournment of the meeting until 4 o'clock this afternoon so as to
allow some time for consultations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Would this not be
the same, because we would normally be meeting at 3 p.m. If we meet at 4 p.m.,
if we meet today or tomorrow, it would be a question of adjournment again. Are
you proposing that we adjourn the meeting?

Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia): I propose to adjourn the meeting until this
afternoon, but not to start at 3 p.m., as scheduled but somewhat later.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall interpret this as a motion for adjournment to meet this afternoon. Therefore I put to the vote the motion of the representative of Yugoslavia. According to rule 119 of the rules of procedure he requests that we adjourn the meeting. We would meet this afternoon at the usual time.

The proposal was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.