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

AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 AND 72

Question of disarmament (A/3929, A/3936, A/C.1/L.208/Rev.1) (concluded)

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)

1. Mr. DE LA OLLINA (Mexico) recalled that the head of the Mexican delegation, speaking in the General Assembly on 6 October 1958 (771st plenary meeting), had requested priority in the debate for a discussion of methods, acceptable to the great Powers, which would make possible a resumption of disarmament negotiations within the United Nations. The Mexican delegation had accordingly introduced a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.208) in the First Committee. The purpose of its proposal had been simply to bring about a rapprochement between the Powers primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and to reaffirm the competence of the General Assembly to initiate informal conversations with a view to securing agreement on means of resuming disarmament negotiations. The active co-operation of the three "nuclear Powers" was imperative, since they were the only States that could conclude agreements on disarmament and enforce their observance.

2. The Mexican proposal had interested many delegations and had gained wide support in the First Committee. That support, coupled with the statement of the USSR representative that he was not opposed to negotiations on disarmament with any Member State, including the Western Powers (971st meeting), showed that the Mexican proposal had in fact achieved its objective: to create a favourable atmosphere, however temporary, for progress on disarmament problems. It had acted as a catalyst which, it was hoped, might lead to a solution of the initial phase of the disarmament problem.

3. In the circumstances, Mexico would not press its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.208/Rev.1) to a vote. It would merely reaffirm its desire that the "nuclear Powers" should not cease their efforts in the United Nations to reach agreement on satisfactory conventions on world disarmament.

4. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) also pointed out that the purpose of the Mexican draft resolution had been partly fulfilled by the adoption of the proposal for an eighty-one-member Disarmament Commission (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2) and by the USSR's expression of readiness to enter into unofficial negotiations with a view to solving the problem of disarmament. He associated himself with the Mexican representative in hoping that such negotiations could take place.

5. Mr. VEGA GOMEZ (El Salvador) expressed gratitude to the Mexican delegation for its efforts to break the disarmament deadlock. The withdrawal of its draft resolution was understandable in view of the Committee's adoption of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution on the new Disarmament Commission. If the Mexican draft had been maintained, El Salvador would have voted for it.

6. Mr. HARARI (Israel) said that his delegation would have voted for the Mexican draft resolution. Israel had consistently held that every effort should be made to bring about a rapprochement between the three "nuclear Powers" in respect of disarmament negotiations and the Mexican draft would have achieved that purpose. Israel was gratified that the USSR was prepared, even without a vote on the Mexican draft, to enter into informal conversations with the other great Powers, and hoped that those conversations would lead to agreement. He wished to thank the representative of Mexico for having withdrawn his proposal.

7. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Mexican representative for his correct interpretation of the Soviet position respecting conversations on the resumption of disarmament negotiations. The Soviet delegation was indeed prepared to enter into unofficial negotiations with all States, including the other "nuclear Powers" with a view to
achieving progress in disarmament. The purpose of the Mexican draft resolution could therefore be said to be fulfilled in part. However, since the burden of the Mexican proposal was to stimulate all powers with primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security to move forward in practical matters of disarmament, corresponding statements of readiness might have been expected from the United States, the United Kingdom and the French delegations. No such statements had yet been heard in the Committee.

8. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France), replying to Mr. Zorin's assertion that the French delegation had not expressed its readiness to take part in the informal conversations called for in the Mexican draft resolution, recalled Mr. Moch's earliest statement of French readiness to do so (595th meeting) as well as his later emphatic statement (964th meeting) to the effect that France was prepared to take part in the informal conversations proposed by Mexico within the hour following adoption of the Mexican draft resolution, for which the French delegation was prepared to cast an affirmative vote.

9. Mr. WEI (China) said that his delegation would also have been prepared to vote in favour of the Mexican draft resolution. Since it had been withdrawn, however, he wished to explain his delegation's vote on the Indian-Yugoslav proposal (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2).

10. China considered disarmament to be one of the primary objectives of the United Nations, for which all States bore responsibility. Despite repeated frustrations, the United Nations must continue its efforts towards genuine disarmament. The progress of those efforts depended on the willingness of the USSR to accept its international obligation to maintain international peace and security and not on the size of the United Nations organ responsible for disarmament. The unreasonable Soviet boycott of the twenty-five-member Disarmament Commission established by the General Assembly in 1957 (resolution 1150 (XII)) had been condemned by many delegations, including the Chinese delegation. It was in a spirit of co-operation that China had voted in favour of the Indian-Yugoslav proposal.

11. Mr. KHALIDI (Jordan) explained that his delegation had not been present during the vote on the Indian-Yugoslav proposal (A/C.1/L.210/Rev.2) and wished to record its affirmative vote for the draft resolution, as amended.

Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.1/806) [continued] 1/

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should deal next with the Korean question [item 24*] and then with the question of the peaceful use of outer space [item 60*], leaving the priority of the remaining items on its agenda to be decided at a later date.

13. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) supported the Chairman's suggestion.

The suggestion was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 24


14. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled his delegation's draft resolution proposing that consideration should be given to the question of inviting the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question (A/C.1/L.214), and drew the Committee's attention to the telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/C.1/807).

It was scarcely necessary to point out that the Korean question was, first of all, the concern of the Koreans themselves, and of all Koreans, whether they lived in the North or the South. That question must therefore be considered by the United Nations with the participation of the representatives of both parts of the country. The fact that the two States into which Korea was divided had differing economic and political systems could not serve as a pretext for excluding one of the sides from the discussion.

15. The interest of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the solution of the Korean question had been recognized by many States; even the United States had engaged in correspondence with it on that question. Consequently, it was absurd to attempt to exclude its representatives from the discussion. Moreover, instead of helping to unify the country, any attempt to hold a one-sided discussion would create new obstacles to a solution of the question, for the Foreign Minister of the Democratic People's Republic had stated in his telegram that his Government would refuse to implement decisions adopted without its participation.

16. The participation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic would be all the more appropriate at the present session since that Government had put forward a number of new proposals which might serve to break the deadlock on the question. In his delegation's opinion, to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would create the conditions for a solution of the Korean problem on the basis of independence, peace and democracy, and for a reduction of tension in the Far East, while to exclude them would mean dooming once again the Committee's discussion of the question to futility. Those were the reasons which had led his delegation to submit its draft resolution. It hoped that all delegations would give that proposal the attention it deserved.

17. Mr. HICKENLOOPER (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the Soviet draft resolution, which would place on an equal footing the representatives of the only lawful Government of Korea—that of the Republic of Korea, which was recognized by the United Nations—and the representatives of the puppet North Korean régime. That régime had been installed by the USSR in defiance of the United Nations. The USSR had obstructed every effort of the United Nations to bring about free elections in North Korea and the North Korean régime remained a convicted aggressor which had constantly refused to co-operate.

1/ Resumed from the 945th meeting.

*Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.
with the designated representative of the United Nations in Korea, the United Nations Commission for the
Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

18. In accordance with the practice consistently followed, his delegation proposed (A/C.1/L.216) that the
Committee should invite a representative from the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to
vote, in the discussion of the Korean question.

19. Mr. MOORE (United Kingdom) suggested that the Committee should adjourn and resume consideration
of the question at its next meeting.

20. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the question should be decided as early
as possible in order to enable the representatives of the two Governments to arrive at the United Nations
in good time.

21. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported the suggestion that the Committee should adjourn.

22. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that his delegation saw no need for prolonged debate on the question and
agreed with the Soviet representative that it would save time to reach a decision immediately. Aside
from the fact that the Government of North Korea had been condemned as an aggressor by the United Nations,
no practical purpose would be served by inviting its representatives to take part in the discussion since its
point of view could be presented to the Committee by friendly countries.

23. Mr. CHANG (China) saw no reason why the United Nations should depart from its practice of
inviting the representatives of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question.
The Republic of Korea had been established by the United Nations and was recognized as the legal Govern-
ment of Korea while the so-called People's Republic of Korea was a puppet creation imposed on the Korean
people by the Soviet Union. His delegation would therefore vote for the United States proposal (A/C.1/
L.215) and against the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/
L.214).

24. Mr. MOORE (United Kingdom) said he did not think most members of the Committee were prepared
to discuss the item as yet. He therefore moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 55 votes to 9, with 11 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.