

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE 446th

MEETING

Saturday, 17 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Election of the Vice-Chairman.....	3
Election of the Rapporteur.....	3
Order of priority of items of the agenda (A/C.1/665).....	3

Chairman: Mr. Finn MOE (Norway).

Election of the Vice-Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN, after introducing Mr. Zinchenko, Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Security Council Affairs, and Mr. Protitch, Secretary of the First Committee, invited the Committee to proceed to the election of the Vice-Chairman.

2. Mr. MOCH (France) nominated Mr. Blanco (Cuba).

3. Mr. RESTREPO JARAMILLO (Colombia), Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) and Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) supported the nomination.

Mr. Carlos Blanco (Cuba) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

Election of the Rapporteur

4. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom) nominated Mr. Thors (Iceland).

5. General ROMULO (Philippines), Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) and Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) supported the nomination.

Mr. Thor Thors (Iceland) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

Order of priority of items of the agenda (A.C.1/665)

6. Mr. DE PIMENTEL BRANDAO (Brazil) proposed that the Committee consider the items listed in the letter from the President of the General Assembly in the following order ;

- (1) Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments ;
- (2) International control of atomic energy : report of the Committee of Twelve ;
- (3) Methods which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter : report of the Collective Measures Committee ;
- (4) The problem of the independence of Korea ; report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea ;
- (5) Measures to combat the threat of a new world war and to strengthen peace and friendship among the nations ;

(6) Admission of new Members, including the right of candidate States to present proof of the conditions required under Article 4 of the Charter ;

(7) Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of China and to the peace of the Far East, resulting from Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 14 August 1945 and from Soviet violations of the Charter of the United Nations.

7. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no reason why less significance and urgency should be attached to the item proposed by the USSR (A/C.1/665, point 7) than to the one proposed by the United States, France and the United Kingdom (A/C.1/665, point 6) relating to the reduction of armaments, a matter in any case covered by the USSR proposal. Since the three-Power item had been submitted earlier than that of the USSR, he would, however, not insist that the latter be considered first, but requested that it be taken up immediately after consideration of the three-Power item.

8. The CHAIRMAN asked the USSR representative if he would agree to simultaneous discussion of items 1 and 6 in the letter from the President (A/C.1/665), to be followed by consideration of the item proposed by the USSR.

9. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had proposed that the USSR item be discussed immediately after item 6, if that were placed first on the agenda.

10. Mr. ACHESON (United States of America) supported the Brazilian proposal. Analysing that proposal, he pointed out that it would permit a logical programme because the first three items in it were closely linked. The fourth point in the suggested order of priority (the problem of the independence of Korea) would then be in a position which would allow consideration in the light of the negotiations currently being conducted for the purpose of securing an armistice. He noted that the item proposed by the USSR, on several points, and in particular on those to which the greatest importance had been given by the USSR representative, overlapped the items listed first in the Brazilian proposal. Other points in that item had been discussed during several of the previous sessions and could well be left until a later stage in the discussion.

11. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) failed to understand the argument according to which the first place on the agenda should be given to the United States proposal, leaving the item proposed by the USSR near the bottom. The latter covered most urgent and timely questions and the argument that it was not new was no argument at all. A novel element of the USSR item was that all the most important questions would be considered together as an entity. The proposals put forward by Mr. Acheson were themselves not new, but were repetitions of plans put forward previously.

12. He supported the order proposed by the representative of the USSR.

13. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) supported the Brazilian proposal on the order of the Committee's business, with the understanding that the position of the item relating to Korea could be altered later if the need should arise.

14. Mr. MOCH (France) emphasized that the most urgent questions as far as the man in the street was concerned were the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. Consideration of the items relating to those matters first would also mean early covering of the points most stressed by the USSR.

15. Regarding the procedural proposal advanced by the USSR representative, he feared that an attempt to deal with the whole range of questions in the USSR item at once might well prejudice the reaching of a solution on some of the individual points. He therefore supported the Brazilian proposal.

16. Mr. BATLLEBERRES (Uruguay) also supported the Brazilian proposal.

17. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-ČAKRTOVÁ (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR proposal concerning the order of consideration of the various items. The argument that it would be logical to delay consideration of the USSR item until the first four items on the Brazilian list had been discussed, on the ground that those items covered aspects of the USSR item, was hardly valid and indeed could be used to justify placing the item proposed by the USSR first.

18. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the United States representative appeared to assume that the United States proposal would be adopted and therefore wished to dismember the USSR item accordingly. The latter was an entity in itself and should be considered as such.

19. Its importance would argue for placing it first, but in view of the considerations mentioned by the representative of the USSR, he supported the proposal made by the latter.

20. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered it inadmissible that the various elements of the USSR item should be taken up separately. He realized that various representatives would discuss the USSR proposal simultaneously with the items concerning the reduction of armaments and atomic energy, but would not object to having those questions considered first if the USSR item were considered immediately thereafter as an entity.

21. An attempt had been made to minimize the significance of the USSR proposals on the grounds that they were not new. Not only was that not the case, but the proposals declared to be so urgent were in fact the same armaments

and atomic energy plans which had been discussed by the General Assembly in previous sessions.

22. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that most representatives speaking in the general debate in the General Assembly had called for an attempt to achieve harmony. The Brazilian delegation then had proceeded to introduce discord into the Committee by relegating the Soviet Union proposals to the fifth place on the agenda. It would be logical to place the Soviet Union proposals immediately after the three-Power item as they were so listed in the letter from the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/665). Further, it was incorrect to state that the first three items on the Brazilian list would exhaust the Soviet Union proposals also since the latter were quite different. They contained eight topics which had been combined in a single comprehensive draft (A/1962). If the Committee wanted to be businesslike and also avoid charges of discrimination, it should follow the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

23. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom) remarked that there was agreement that the Committee should settle its entire agenda at once, and that the three-Power item should be the first on the agenda. The conflict concerned the discussion of the Soviet Union item. It would be unsuitable to try to discuss eight different topics in a single debate. It would be preferable to deal with matters one at a time and after considering the question of disarmament, to proceed to atomic energy and collective measures.

24. As to the question of Korea, it was a matter which appeared high among the topics in the Soviet Union draft resolution and it ought to be satisfactory to the Soviet Union representative if it were discussed after the Collective Measures Committee's report.

25. Mr. ACHESON (United States of America) stated that since both atomic energy and the report of the Collective Measures Committee were intimately concerned with disarmament, the real question was whether the item proposed by the Soviet Union should precede the Korean question in the agenda. In other words, the problem was whether there should be orderly preparation for debate upon the Soviet Union's proposals.

26. Mr. KYROU (Greece) stated that the Soviet Union proposals covered almost all items on the Committee's agenda and it might therefore have been logical for the Soviet Union representative to ask for the first place for them. However, he had not done so and ought therefore to be ready to accept the Brazilian proposal.

27. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) was of the opinion that the Soviet Union proposals in fact comprehended the entire agenda of the Committee. Even the question of the admission of new Members should be regarded as a measure to strengthen friendship among nations. The Brazilian proposal was therefore logical since it would deal with the matters contained in the Soviet Union item one at a time. That would simplify the discussion when they came to the Soviet Union proposals, and make it easier to deal with the remaining questions.

28. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that the eight different points in the Soviet Union proposals were all various facets of the problem of peace which confronted the world. They were all inter-related. The three-Power proposal also dealt with a wide variety of subjects. A harmonious atmosphere could not be achieved by relegating the Soviet Union proposals to the background and bringing forward all the various proposals of the United States.

29. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) moved, under rule 76 of the rules of procedure, that the debate be closed.

30. The CHAIRMAN stated that he had one speaker still on his list and would, if everybody agreed, close the debate the end of that statement.

31. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had never sought to place their proposals first on the agenda. They had agreed that as the three-Power proposal had been submitted first, it should be discussed first. However, they saw no reason for the Soviet Union item to be in fifth place. The record of the 77th meeting of the General Committee showed that it had been agreed that the Soviet Union item should be allocated to the First Committee before it had been agreed that the same should be done with the three-Power item. On the basis of the record, the Soviet Union delegation could have demanded priority for their item. It would be practical and reasonable to agree to discuss the three-Power proposal, the question of atomic energy and the Soviet Union proposals concurrently, since they were all related.

32. Mr. Malik moved formally that the item proposed by his delegation should be listed immediately after the three-Power item and the question of atomic energy.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal whereby item 5 in the suggested order of priority of items would be discussed immediately after items 1 and 2.

The proposal was rejected by a vote of 38 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Brazilian proposal concerning the order of priority of items on the agenda.

The proposal was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN stated that it was his understanding that the first two items on the agenda would be discussed concurrently under the terms of the proposal which had been adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.